

---

# Full Site Assessment

---

# Berwickshire HMA

## Allanton

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
AALLA001	West of Blackadder Drive	Allanton	Eastern	Housing	40	1.9	Excluded

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

The River Tweed SAC and SSSI is adjacent to the site, located to the north west of the site. Taking into consideration the comments below, it is considered that the International/National designation constraints are minor.

SEPA: In respect of flood risk, SEPA require a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) which investigates the presence of any small watercourses on or adjacent to site. Historic maps indicate the presence of a small watercourse, identified as Gold Nick may be culverted to the south of the site. Consideration will need to be given to any culverts/bridges and we do not support development over any culverted watercourses. Site is sufficiently elevated above the Blackadder/Whiteadder Water confluence. There is the potential that the development of this allocation would increase the probability of flooding elsewhere.

There is a body of water, within, forming part of the site boundary, or immediately adjacent to the site. SEPA therefore request that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and the built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

In respect of foul water, it must connect to the existing Scottish Water foul network. It is likely that for a development of this size, an upgrade to the existing STW will be required. SW should confirm.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is outwith both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extent. No objection to the proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	On site	Greenfield	Local Plan: (BAL5) - The previous site considered formed part of this site Housing SG: (AALLA001) - Exact same site as it currently under consideration. (An initial stage 1 RAG assessment was undertaken and not a full site assessment) Record still within the Housing SG database). LDP2 (AALLA001) - The site was submitted at the 'Pre MIR' stage and the 'MIR Consultation' stage.

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

**Access to public transport**

Limited

**Access to employment**

Limited

**Access to services**

Good

**Wider biodiversity impacts**

Major

**Site aspect**

South

**Accessibility and sustainability summary**

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: The Northern part of the site contains Ancient Woodland (Ancient & semi-natural origin). Potential for EPS (bats) and breeding birds. The rest of the site is arable fields backing onto garden ground. Potentially unsuitable site if Ancient Woodland affected.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the west of Allanton. There is a bus stop at the end of Blackadder Drive and the gradient is relatively flat to the bus stop. The nearest railway station is Berwick-Upon-Tweed, located 8 miles away. Allanton is approximately 6 miles from Duns, which has a variety of employment opportunities and public services, however these are limited within Allanton itself. There are major biodiversity issues, which are highlighted in the consultation responses from the Ecology Officer and SNH, in respect of the Ancient Woodland Inventory, which is located within the northern section of the site.

**Local impact and integration assessment****Conservation area**

Adjacent to site

**Open space**

Not applicable

**Listed buildings**

Not applicable

**Scheduled Monument**

Not applicable

**Ancient woodland inventory**

On site

**Archaeology**

Not applicable

**Garden and designed landscape**

Not applicable

**Local impact and integration summary**

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Although outside the Allanton Conservation Area, the proposed site straddles the access drive to the former Blackadder House which is framed within the village by the pair of former gate lodges; any development should retain the open vista along the drive.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Advised, no known archaeological issues.

**Landscape assessment****NSA**

Not applicable

**SLA**

Not applicable

**Over 200 metres?** **Over 12 degree slope** **Wild Land**

Not applicable

**Landscape summary**

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: The advice is based on the prior knowledge and desktop assessment using GIS and streetview. SNH advise they may provide further advice based on a site visit if the potential allocation is carried forward. The north part of this potential allocation includes an area of ancient woodland, identified in the Ancient Woodland Inventory as of semi-natural origin. SNH strongly recommend that, if the site is to be allocated, this area is not included within the development boundary. This would have the additional benefit of maintaining this long-established woodland as backdrop to the site, helping establish a stronger sense of place for the new development. Re-defining the site boundary would also reduce the proximity to the River Tweed SAC from approximately 23 metres to 62 metres. SNH advise that modification to the proposed extent of the allocation may avoid or reduce likely natural heritage impacts.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: The site is a substantial departure to the west out with the current Development Boundary changing the linear development character of the village. Access is not straightforward. However, if access can be achieved without detriment to the Blackadder DL and ancient woodland, the development will be mitigated by the fairly level nature of the site and its location behind the village main street. The existing woodland will provide a setting for the housing and assist its integration into both the village and the wider landscape.

**Planning and infrastructure assessment**

## Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Existing access, Blackadder Drive appear to be only 1 car width wide. This is unlikely to operate effectively as an access to a further 40 houses.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I am unable to support this proposal. Allocated housing sites should be in locations that allow accessibility to local amenities by sustainable transport modes such as walking and public transport. The site is detached from any settlement and so does not benefit from expected provision for pedestrians living adjacent to 'B' Class roads such as footways and street lighting or a 30 mph speed restriction. Scope for safe means of access to the B6437 is a further concern.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Contribution towards bus infrastructure upgrade.

## Right of way

On site

## TPOs

Not applicable

## Contaminated land

Not applicable

## Water supply

Yes

## Sewerage

Limited

## Gas Supply

No

## Education provision

Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Allanton village and Conservation Area have a generally linear development pattern with most dwellinghouses in the village fronting onto or facing the main road. In contrast the proposed site is set back from the village and Conservation Area, breaking into an open field with no logical boundary to the west or south. The northern portion of the site is a designated Ancient Woodland, reducing the developable area and limiting vehicular access opportunities.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW, sufficient capacity in the network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Sufficient capacity at Rawburn WTW, sufficient capacity in the network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Core Path (83/1) to the north is a promoted route. Enhancement to existing path network would be recommended.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

EDUCATION OFFICER: Raised no issues.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

### PP status

Excluded

### Overall assessment

Unacceptable

### Site capacity

40

## Conclusions

The site was previously considered as part of the Housing SG. An initial stage 1 RAG assessment was undertaken for the proposal, however it was concluded that the site should not be taken forward for inclusion within the Housing SG.

The site was submitted at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process and was not included within the MIR for the reasons outlined below. The site was most recently re-submitted at the 'MIR consultation' stage and the supporting statement makes reference to a phased development. However, it was not considered that any additional or new information was submitted which required a re-consultation. Therefore, the conclusion from the 'Pre MIR' stage is still valid and is outlined below.

There are a number of natural and built environment constraints, which were identified through the consultation process, including the following;

- Presence of an Ancient Woodland Inventory within the site, which results in a major biodiversity risk;
- Prime Quality Agricultural land within the site;
- Adjacent to the River Tweed SAC and SSSI;

- Flood Risk Assessment would be required;
- Adjacent to the Conservation Area;
- Limited access to public transport and employment;
- Roads Planning Officer cannot support the proposal; and
- Potential for EPS (bats and breeding birds).

Overall, taking the above into consideration, it is not considered that the proposal would be in keeping with the existing linear settlement pattern evident within Allanton, nor would it respect the character of the existing village or the Conservation Area. There is potential that such an allocation would result in an adverse impact upon the natural and built environment as highlighted above. Furthermore, the Roads Planning Officer cannot support such a proposal. The site was not included within the Main Issues Report as either a preferred or alternative option for housing. In conclusion, given the above constraints within and adjacent to the site, the site will not be taken forward for inclusion within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b> AALLA002	<b>Site name</b> Land south of Allanton I	<b>Settlement</b> Allanton	<b>SDA</b> Eastern	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 5	<b>Ha</b> 0.3	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	----------------------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not lie within any International/National designation.

SEPA: We require a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) which investigates the presence of any small watercourses on or adjacent to the site. Historic maps indicate the presence of a small watercourse, identified as Gold Nick may be culverted near the site. Consideration will need to be given to any culverts/bridges and we do not support development over any culverted watercourses. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within/adjacent to site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the Flood Prevention Officer. There is the potential that development of this site could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a Surface Water Hazard identified at the site.

Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> On site	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> Local Plan: (BAL6) - A small part of this site was considered as part of the Local Plan
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Limited	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Site is arable field with trees & hedgerow on boundary and garden ground. Protect trees and boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds. Biodiversity risk is low impact.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the south east of Allanton, the western part of the site lies within the Allanton settlement boundary, while the eastern part of the site lies outwith the settlement boundary. There is a bus stop located within Allanton and the gradient of the site is relatively flat to the bus stop. The nearest railway station is Berwick-Upon-Tweed, located 8 miles away. Allanton is approximately 6 miles from Duns, which has a variety of employment opportunities and public services, however these are limited within Allanton itself. There are minor biodiversity issues, as stated in the response from the Ecology Officer.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Adjacent to site

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: Lies just outwith the Conservation Area, development of the site should take account of the potential impact on the conservation area. The proposed site pushes back the east boundary of the village beyond the historical pattern.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: There are no known archaeological issues.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to the size and location of site.

LANDSCAPE OFFICER: Low density 1/1.5 storey, grey roofs and buff stone - street frontage to reflect existing streetscape pattern. Hedge boundaries. Preferable to retain and enhance the natural village 'Gateway' defined by existing woodland belt on the west side of the B6437 to retain the village character. The existing field boundary hedges to be retained (or replaced closer to the road frontage) for their habitat and screening values with additional hedge and tree field boundaries along the eastern and southern parts of the site.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: May impact on the location of the 30mph limit.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I have no objection to this land being zoned for development. The existing footways and street lighting will have to be extended and a marginal shift of the 30mph limit may be required.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Were consulted, however raised no issues regarding development.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Allanton has a very clearly defined settlement edge to the east which this proposed site would extend beyond. An adverse affecting on the character and setting of the village and its Conservation Area would likely result. The portion within the site boundary could potentially accommodate a smaller housing development of one or two units but this could more appropriately be tested by a planning application under existing LDP policy.

HOUSING STRATEGY OFFICER: Did not raise any concerns regarding development of the site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW, sufficient capacity in the network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Sufficient capacity at Rawburn WTW, sufficient capacity in the network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS OFFICER: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH OFFICER: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

EDUCATION OFFICER: Did not raise any issues regarding capacity.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Doubtful	5

### Conclusions

The site was submitted at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process for housing development, with an indicative site capacity for 5 units.

The site lies to the south of Allanton. The western part of the site is currently sited within the Development Boundary for Allanton, while the eastern part of the site is outwith and breaks into the field.

There are a number of constraints regarding the development of this site, including the following;

- A Flood Risk Assessment would be required for any development;
- The site is located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural Land;
- Mitigation would be likely for protected species;
- The site is located adjacent to the Conservation Area; and
- The trees and boundaries within the site should be protected.

However, the main concern is that the proposal pushes back the eastern Development Boundary and would not be consistent with the existing linear development pattern. Furthermore, the western part of the site is currently included within the Development Boundary and should a planning application come forward for housing, could be assessed against the Infill Policy contained within the LDP, to ascertain whether it is acceptable. It is not considered that the extension of housing eastwards would respect the existing settlement or development pattern. The site was not included within the Main Issues Report as a preferred or alternative option for housing. In conclusion, for the reasons outlined above, the site is not included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b> AALLA003	<b>Site name</b> Land south of Allanton II	<b>Settlement</b> Allanton	<b>SDA</b> Eastern	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 10	<b>Ha</b> 0.6	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not lie within any International/National designation.

SEPA: We require a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) which investigates the presence of any small watercourses on or adjacent to the site. Historic maps indicate the presence of a small watercourse, identified as Gold Nick may be culverted near the site. Consideration will need to be given to any culverts/bridges and we do not support development over any culverted watercourses. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within/ adjacent to site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. There is the potential the allocation of this site could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a Surface Water Hazard identified at the site.

Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> On site	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> Local Plan: (BAL6) - the site previously considered includes part of the site currently being considered
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Limited	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Site is arable field with trees & hedgerow on boundary and garden ground. Protect trees and boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds. Biodiversity risk is low impact.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the south east of Allanton, the western part of the site lies within the Allanton settlement boundary, while the eastern part of the site lies outwith the settlement boundary. There is a bus stop located within Allanton and the gradient of the site is relatively flat to the bus stop. The nearest railway station is Berwick-Upon-Tweed, located 8 miles away. Allanton is approximately 6 miles from Duns, which has a variety of employment opportunities and public services, however these are limited within Allanton itself. There are minor biodiversity issues, as stated in the response from the Ecology Officer.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Adjacent to site

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: Lies just outwith the Conservation Area, development of the site should take account of the potential impact on the Conservation Area. The proposed site pushes back the east boundary of the village beyond the historical pattern.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: No known archaeological issues.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to size and location of site.

LANDSCAPE OFFICER: Low density 1/1.5 storey, grey roofs and stone. Street frontage to reflect existing streetscape. Hedge boundaries to N and E. Opportunity to reinforce village 'gateway' with woodland block on approach on S boundary. Allows greater space for mitigating planting and reinforcement of village gateway. Recommend the area south of the village entrance planted as a woodland belt linking with tree belts in wider landscape and across the road.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: May impact on the location of the 30mph limit.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I have no objection to this land being zoned for development. The existing footways and street lighting will have to be extended and a marginal shift of the 30mph limit may be required.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Were consulted, however made no comment on this site

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Allanton has a very clearly defined settlement edge to the east which this proposed site would extend beyond. An adverse affecting on the character and setting of the village and its conservation area would likely result. The portion within the site boundary could potentially accommodate a smaller housing development of one or two units but this could more appropriately be tested by a planning application under existing LDP policy.

HOUSING STRATEGY OFFICER: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW, sufficient capacity in the network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Sufficient capacity at Rawburn WTW, sufficient capacity in the network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS OFFICER: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH OFFICER: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

EDUCATION OFFICER: Did not raise any issues.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Doubtful	10

### Conclusions

The site was submitted at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process for housing development, with an indicative site capacity for 10 units.

The site lies to the south of Allanton. The north west corner is currently sited within the Development Boundary for Allanton, while the eastern and southern part of the site is outwith and breaks into the field.

There are a number of constraints regarding the development of this site, including the following;

- A Flood Risk Assessment would be required for any development;
- The site is located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land
- Mitigation would be likely for protected species;
- The site is located adjacent to the Conservation Area; and
- The trees and boundaries within the site should be protected.

However, the main concern is that the proposal pushes back the eastern and southern Development Boundaries and would not be consistent with the existing linear development pattern. Furthermore, the western part of the site is currently included within the Development Boundary and should a planning application come forward for housing, could be assessed against the Infill Policy contained within the LDP, to ascertain whether it is acceptable. It is not considered that the extension of housing eastwards and southwards away from the existing Development Boundary would respect the existing settlement or development pattern. The site was not included within the Main Issues Report as a preferred or alternative option for housing. In conclusion, for the reasons outlined above, the site is not included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

# Auchencrow

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
AAUCH001	Land to west of Auchencrow	Auchencrow	Eastern	Housing	5	1.4	Excluded

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable				

### Initial assessment summary

The site is not within an international/national designated areas. Furthermore, the site does not lie within a floodrisk area. There are areas identified as surface water flood extents adjacent to the site, however not within it. Taking into consideration the comments below, it is considered that the international/national designation constraints are minor.

SEPA: In respect of flood risk, SEPA require a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), which assesses the risk from the Auchencrow Burn. Consideration will need to be given to any culverts/bridges which may exacerbate flood risk. The site may be constrained due to flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within/adjacent to the site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the Flood Prevention Officer. There is the potential that development of the allocation could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a Surface Water Hazard identified at the site.

There is a body of water within, forming part of the boundary, or immediately adjacent to the site. SEPA therefore request that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and the built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

In respect of foul water, it must connect to the existing SW foul network. Opportunities should be taken to protect and enhance the watercourse which runs along the site boundary.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. Auchencrow Burn runs to the North of the site and it would have to be ensured that any flows are to be routed around housing.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	On site	Combination	There is a lot of planning history within Auchencrow, need to look into this in a bit more detail, as appears to be a lot of building group additions.

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Limited	Limited	Good	Minor	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: The site contains improved pasture with trees & burn on boundary and garden ground. Protect trees and boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds. The site has a low biodiversity impact.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located within Auchencrow, which is not an identified settlement within the LDP. Therefore, the proposed site is located within the countryside. There is a bus stop located at the Crow Inn Hotel, which run to Berwick-Upon-Tweed and Tweedmouth, connecting Auchencrow to other nearby settlements within Berwickshire, including Coldingham, Duns, Eyemouth, Ayton and Reston. The nearest railway station is Berwick-Upon-Tweed, located 14 miles away. Auchencrow is approximately 9 miles from Eyemouth and 8 miles from Duns, which have a variety of employment opportunities and public services, however these are limited within Auchencrow itself.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Evidence of significant archaeology in the vicinity creating a low to moderate potential for unknown archaeology to exist. Some mitigation maybe needed.

---

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable			Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: The advice on this site is based on prior knowledge and desktop assessment using GIS and streetview. We may provide further advice based on a site visit if the potential allocation is carried forward. This is a relatively small allocation which cumulatively (with AAUCH002 and AAUCH003) could change the village and its setting. We advise that if they are to be allocated, site requirements are used to co-ordinate development and maintain landscape character or village setting.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: 5 units of 1/1.5 storeys. Recommend individual plots relating to new housing along streetscape and exploit views to north. NE part of site - extend existing riparian woodland along Auchencrow burn into site. This development would be a parting from the current approach of incremental house building as single units following a linear pattern along the Main Street. New housing would need to relate well to the existing row of modern houses when seen across the landscape from the north to east. Introducing woodland structure planting in the northern and eastern part of the site is recommended to help contain the visual impacts of the development to this open slope and connect visually to the existing woodland to the west and the riparian woodland that follows the Auchencrow burn to the east of the site. Boundary hedgerows would also assist in this respect. Drystone walls should be reinstated on the road side to retain the character of the area.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

<b>Physical access/road capacity</b>	<b>Near a trunk road?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------

NETWORK MANAGER: May impact on location of 30 mph limit. Need to consider impact of access roads on existing road layout.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I have no objection to this land being allocated for housing. All access should be taken from the C113 on the south side of the site. Linear development with direct access onto the public road would follow the existing form of development in Auchencrow. The existing street lighting network will have to be extended to accommodate this site.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Possible bus stop infrastructure required.

**Right of way**

Not applicable

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

Not applicable

**Water supply**

Yes

**Sewerage**

Limited

**Gas Supply**

No

**Education provision**

Good

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Auchencrow is not an identified settlement within the LDP. The village has a generally linear development pattern, with buildings mostly facing onto a minor road that rises over sloping ground between the B6438 and B6437. The proposed site runs along the boundary with the B6438, deep into an existing field, conflicting with the existing development pattern. The site sits on sloping ground and would be very prominent when approaching the Auchencrow turnoff on the B6438 from the north east. It is difficult to see how this site could be developed without a significant adverse impact on the character and setting of the building group.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding development on this site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW, sufficient capacity in the network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Sufficient capacity at Rawburn WTW, sufficient capacity in the network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues regarding capacity.

NHS: No response received.

**Overall assessment****PP status**

Excluded

**Overall assessment**

Unacceptable

**Site capacity**

5

**Conclusions**

The site was submitted at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process and is located to the north west of Auchencrow. Auchencrow is not an identified settlement within the Local Development Plan, therefore occupies a countryside location. Ultimately, the allocation of a housing site at such a location, would not comply with the principles of the LDP. It is therefore not appropriate to allocate this site for housing. Should the applicant wish to pursue this matter, a planning application could be submitted for consideration against Policy HD2: Housing in the Countryside, contained within the Local Development Plan.

A number of constraints were identified, through the consultation process, which include:

- Flood Risk Assessment would be required for any development;
- The site lies within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Protect trees and boundary features;
- Mitigation for protected species including breeding birds;
- Potential archaeological mitigation;
- Cumulative landscape concerns regarding the landscape character and village setting;
- The site gradually falls down from the south to the north; and
- The proposed development would not respect or be in keeping with the existing linear development pattern evident within Auchencrow.

The site was not included within the Main Issues Report as a preferred or alternative option for housing. In conclusion, taking the above into consideration, the site is not included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

<b>Site reference</b> AAUCH002	<b>Site name</b> Land to east of Auchencrow	<b>Settlement</b> Auchencrow	<b>SDA</b> Eastern	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 5	<b>Ha</b> 0.6	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site is not within an international/national designated areas. Furthermore, the site does not lie within a floodrisk area. There are areas identified as surface water flood extents adjacent to the site, however not within it. Taking into consideration the comments below, it is considered that the international/national designation constraints are minor.

SEPA: We require an Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) which assesses the risk from the Auchencrow Burn. Consideration will need to be given to any culverts/ bridges which may exacerbate flood risk. Site may be constrained due to flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within/ adjacent to site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. There is the potential that development of this site could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a Surface Water Hazard identified at the site.

There is a water body immediately adjacent to the site. SEPA therefore request that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and the built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

In respect of foul water, it must connect to the existing SW foul network.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. Auchencrow Burn runs to the North of the site and it would have to be ensured that any flows are to be routed around housing.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> On site	<b>Current use/s</b> Other	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no planning history on this site.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Limited	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Site contains improved pasture with stone dyke, trees & burn on boundary and garden ground. Protect trees and boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the north east, just outside Auchencrow, which is not an identified settlement within the LDP. Therefore, the proposed site is located within the countryside.

There is a bus stop located at the Crow Inn Hotel, which run to Berwick-Upon-Tweed and Tweedmouth, connecting Auchencrow to other nearby settlements within Berwickshire, including Coldingham, Duns, Eyemouth, Ayton and Reston. The nearest railway station is Berwick-Upon-Tweed, located 14 miles away. Auchencrow is approximately 9 miles from Eyemouth and 8 miles from Duns, which have a variety of employment opportunities and public services, however these are limited within Auchencrow itself.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Within the medieval and post-medieval settlement core. May include remains of earlier buildings or related features. Mitigation likely.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: The advice on this site is based on prior knowledge and desktop assessment using GIS and streetview. We may provide further advice based on a site visit if the potential allocation is carried forward. This is a relatively small allocation which cumulatively (with AAUCH001 and AAUCH003) could change the village and its setting. We advise that if they are to be allocated, site requirements are used to co-ordinate development and maintain landscape character or village setting.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: Introduction of development at sites AAUCH002 and 003 would connect the buildings of Grammar Hall, Sunny Bank and Viewfield to the rest of Auchencrow village although this may not be desirable.

Both these areas should be fairly well contained in the views by the relatively low lying nature of the sites the rolling landform and hedges.

Woodland planting wrapped round the southern and eastern boundaries of AAUCH002 with intermittent groups of trees and garden hedgerows will soften the impact of this site and a stone wall street frontage would visually connect the site to the village.

There is an argument to say that this site should not be recommended in favour of AAUCH001 and AAUCH003 so that new development is contained in close proximity to the existing village to allow pedestrians safe access to the village without having to negotiate a difficult junction made worse by the increased volume of traffic that will be created by additional housing.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: May impact on location of 30 mph limit. Need to consider impact of access roads on existing road layout. In particular the adjacent junction.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: Safe vehicular access is not achievable to this site and as such I am unable to support its inclusion as a development site.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Possible bus stop infrastructure required.

**Right of way**

Not applicable

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

Not applicable

**Water supply**

Yes

**Sewerage**

Limited

**Gas Supply**

No

**Education provision**

Good

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Auchencrow is not an identified settlement within the LDP. The village has a generally linear development pattern, with buildings mostly facing onto a minor road that rises over sloping ground between the B6438 and B6437. The proposed site sits on sloping ground off the B6437. Development of this site would be expected to have an adverse impact on the character and setting of Auchencrow.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW, sufficient capacity in the network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Sufficient capacity at Rawburn WTW, sufficient capacity in the network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues regarding the capacity.

NHS: No response received.

**Overall assessment****PP status**

Excluded

**Overall assessment**

Unacceptable

**Site capacity**

5

**Conclusions**

The site was submitted at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process and is located to the north east of Auchencrow. Auchencrow is not an identified settlement within the Local Development Plan, therefore occupies a countryside location. Ultimately, the allocation of a housing site at such a location, would not comply with the principles of the LDP. It is therefore not appropriate to allocate this site for housing. Should the applicant wish to pursue this matter, a planning application could be submitted for consideration against Policy HD2: Housing in the Countryside, contained within the Local Development Plan.

A number of constraints were identified, through the consultation process, which include:

- Flood Risk Assessment would be required for any development;
- The site lies within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Protection of trees and boundary features;
- Mitigation for protected species including breeding birds;
- Archaeological mitigation is likely;
- There are cumulative landscape concerns regarding the potential allocation of this site along with others put forward within Auchencrow, as part of this process; and
- The Roads Planning Officer is unable to support this development on the grounds that a safe vehicular access cannot be achieved.

The site was not included within the Main Issues Report as a preferred or alternative housing option. In conclusion, taking the above into consideration, the site is not included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

<b>Site reference</b> AAUCH003	<b>Site name</b> Land to north of Auchencrow	<b>Settlement</b> Auchencrow	<b>SDA</b> Eastern	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 5	<b>Ha</b> 0.3	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site is not within an international/national designated areas. Furthermore, the site does not lie within a floodrisk area. There are areas identified as surface water flood extents adjacent to the site, however not within it. Taking into consideration the comments below, it is considered that the international/national designation constraints are minor.

SEPA: We require an Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) which assesses the risk from the Auchencrow Burn. Consideration will need to be given to any culverts/ bridges which may exacerbate flood risk. Site may be constrained due to flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within/ adjacent to site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. There is the potential that the development of this site could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a Surface Water Hazard within the site.

There is a body of water, within, forming part of the site boundary, or immediately adjacent to the site. SEPA therefore request that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and the built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

In respect of foul water, it must connect to the existing SW foul network. Opportunities should be taken to protect and enhance the watercourse which runs along the site boundary.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. Auchencrow Burn runs to the North of the site and it would have to be ensured that any flows are to be routed around housing.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> On site	<b>Current use/s</b> Other	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no planning history.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Limited	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Site contains improved pasture with trees & burn on boundary and garden ground. Protect trees and boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds. The site has low biodiversity impact.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the east of Auchencrow, which is not an identified settlement within the LDP. Therefore, the proposed site is located within the countryside. There is a bus stop

located at the Crow Inn Hotel, which run to Berwick-Upon-Tweed and Tweedmouth, connecting Auchencrow to other nearby settlements within Berwickshire, including Coldingham, Duns, Eyemouth, Ayton and Reston. The nearest railway station is Berwick-Upon-Tweed, located 14 miles away. Auchencrow is approximately 9 miles from Eyemouth and 8 miles from Duns, which have a variety of employment opportunities and public services, however these are limited within Auchencrow itself.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Site lies to the North of the Category C listed Crow Inn, care would be needed in any development to respect the scale and setting of the listed building.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Within the medieval and post-medieval settlement core. May include remains of earlier buildings or related features. Mitigation likely.

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable			Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: The advice on this site is based on prior knowledge and desktop assessment using GIS and streetview. We may provide further advice based on a site visit if the potential allocation is carried forward. This is a relatively small allocation which cumulatively (with AAUCH001 and AAUCH002) could change the village and its setting. We advise that if they are to be allocated, site requirements are used to co-ordinate development and maintain landscape character or village setting.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: Some terraced and semi detached housing would be appropriate in this location on lower ground. Woodland structure planting is recommended along the northern perimeter of the site to connect visually with the existing woodland along the Auchencrow Burn and to provide a back drop to the new housing in views from the south. There is an argument to say that this site should be recommended in favour of AAUCH002 so that the development is contained in close proximity to the existing village to avoid the issues of pedestrians having to negotiate a difficult junction in order to cross the B6437 and the two sites requiring vehicle access at this location.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

<b>Physical access/road capacity</b>	<b>Near a trunk road?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------

NETWORK MANAGER: May impact on location of 30 mph limit. Need to consider impact of access roads on existing road layout. In particular the adjacent junction.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: Safe vehicular access is not achievable to this site and as such I am unable to support its inclusion as a development site.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Possible bus stop infrastructure required

<b>Right of way</b>	<b>TPOs</b>	<b>Contaminated land</b>	<b>Water supply</b>	<b>Sewerage</b>	<b>Gas Supply</b>	<b>Education provision</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Yes	Limited	No	Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Auchencrow is not an identified settlement within the LDP. The village has a generally linear development pattern, with buildings mostly facing onto a minor road that rises over sloping ground between the B6438 and B6437. The proposed site sits on sloping ground off to the east off the B6437. Development of this site would be expected to have an adverse impact on the character and setting of Auchencrow.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW, sufficient capacity in the network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Sufficient capacity at Rawburn WTW, sufficient capacity in the network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues regarding the capacity on the site.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	5

## Conclusions

The site was submitted at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process and is located to the north west of Auchencrow. Auchencrow is not an identified settlement within the Local Development Plan, therefore occupies a countryside location. Ultimately, the allocation of a housing site at such a location, would not comply with the principles of the LDP. It is therefore not appropriate to allocate this site for housing. Should the applicant wish to pursue this matter, a planning application could be submitted for consideration against Policy HD2: Housing in the Countryside, contained within the Local Development Plan.

A number of constraints were identified, through the consultation process, which include;

- Flood Risk Assessment would be required for any development;
- The site is located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Protection for trees and boundary features;
- Mitigation for protected species including breeding birds;
- Archaeological mitigation is likely;
- There are cumulative landscape concerns regarding the potential allocation of this site along with other put forward within Auchencrow, as part of this process; and
- The Roads Planning Officer is unable to support this development on the grounds that a safe vehicular access cannot be achieved.

The site was not included within the Main Issues Report as a preferred or alternative option for housing. In conclusion, taking the above into consideration, the site is not included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

---

# Ayton

<b>Site reference</b> AAYTO004	<b>Site name</b> Land north of High Street	<b>Settlement</b> Ayton	<b>SDA</b> Eastern	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 6	<b>Ha</b> 0.7	<b>PP status</b> Retain LDP Site
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b>	<b>SAC</b>	<b>SPA</b>	<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
------------------	------------	------------	-------------	---------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site is already allocated for the proposed use within the Adopted Supplementary Guidance on Housing (November 2017). It is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b> Combination	<b>Planning history references</b> 05/00816/OUT: Demolition of garage premises and erection of 5 dwellinghouses (RH & DH Allan applicants) 08/01283/REM: Road and layout for 5 plots in the 1st phase of development including drainage (RH & DH Allan applicants)  Housing SG: (AAYTO004) - This site was allocated for housing as part of the Housing SG in November 2017, forming part of the LDP.
--------------------------	------------	----------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b>	<b>Access to employment</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b>	<b>Site aspect</b>
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
--------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------------

## Local impact and integration summary

---

### Landscape assessment

NSA                      SLA                      Over 200 metres?                       Over 12 degree slope                       Wild Land

#### Landscape summary

---

### Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

Right of way

TPOs

Contaminated land

Water supply

Sewerage

Gas Supply

Education provision

#### Planning & infrastructure summary

---

### Overall assessment

PP status

Overall assessment

Site capacity

Retain LDP Site

6

#### Conclusions

The site was submitted at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process for consideration. However, the site was allocated for the proposed use, as part of the Housing Supplementary Guidance in November 2017, with an indicative site capacity for 6 units.

It is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation (AAYTO004) within the Proposed LDP.

---

# Birgham

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
<b>ABIRG005</b>	Land south east of Treaty Park	Birgham	Rest of Borders	Housing	15	1.7	<b>Excluded</b>

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable				

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not lie within any International/National designation.

SEPA: In respect of flood risk, review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues in this area. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. There is the potential that the development could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a Surface Water Hazard identified at the site.

In respect of foul water, it must connect to the existing SW foul network.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	On site	Other	<p>Local Plan: (BB2) included the proposed site and an area to the north</p> <p>Local Plan: (BB9) included the small access area to the east of the proposed site</p> <p>LPA: (ABIRG001) included the proposed site and an area to the north, but omitted the eastern access, which is now proposed. As part of the LPA, the Reporter agreed with the Council. However, stated that the site is capable of accepting development and whilst this potential could always be considered, if appropriate, in a future review of a Local Plan. (Page 58 of Reporter's Recommendations).</p> <p>LDP: (ABIRG004) included the proposed site and an area to the north. The site assessment concluded that there were outstanding objections from the Roads Planning team and a safe vehicular access could not be achieved.</p>

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Good	Good	Good	Minor	Not applicable

## Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response to date.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the north of Birgham. There are bus stops located within Birgham and the gradient is relatively flat to the bus stop. The nearest railway station is Berwick-Upon-Tweed, located 18 miles away. Birgham is located approximately 4 miles from Coldstream and 5 miles from Kelso, where there are a variety of shops, employment and other local services located within the town. There is a lack of employment opportunities and local services located within Birgham itself.

## Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area	Open space	Listed buildings	Scheduled Monument	Ancient woodland inventory	Archaeology	Garden and designed landscape
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	On site	Not applicable

## Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: On the edge of the medieval village, some evaluation likely.

## Landscape assessment

NSA	SLA	Over 200 metres?	Over 12 degree slope	Wild Land
Not applicable	Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not applicable

## Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to existing landuse and location of allocation as contained extension of existing settlement.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No response to date.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity	Near a trunk road?
	<input type="checkbox"/>

NETWORK MANAGER: Additional junctions onto A698 but not felt to be a significant issue.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I am unable to support this site being allocated for housing due to the absence of suitable vehicular access from the A698. The two locations where the site abuts the A698 would fail to provide appropriate junction visibility requirements due to a combination of factors such as the geometry of the road and the position of adjacent buildings. As such, I am unable to see how residential development can be accessed safely. The site could be satisfactorily accessed from Main Street via the area of ground immediately to the west of the car park serving the Fisherman's Arms Public House, but this land is outwith the site boundary. If this issue can be resolved then I would only be able to support an extent of development which reflects the limitations of the road infrastructure in the village. Pedestrian connectivity would be required with the main street at the east end and, ideally, with Treaty Park though this would require agreement with a third party land owner.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

**Right of way**

Not applicable

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

Not applicable

**Water supply**

Limited

**Sewerage**

Yes

**Gas Supply**

No

**Education provision**

Good

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: There is a historic enclosure to the west of the site, so there may be archaeological interests in this site. The site is Prime Quality Agricultural land. Roads Planning Service response is key in terms of acceptability of visibility at the proposed access points. Connectivity/double access points desirable? The site is level and well related to the remainder of the settlement.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Birgham WWTW has sufficient capacity, sufficient capacity in the network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Sufficient capacity at Rawburn WTW, in terms of the network, a flow and pressure test will be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraint.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues regarding the school capacity.

NHS: No response received.

**Overall assessment****PP status**

Excluded

**Overall assessment**

Unacceptable

**Site capacity**

15

**Conclusions**

The site was submitted for consideration at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process. The site lies to the north of the Birgham Development Boundary.

It should be noted that this site formed part of a larger site, which was considered as part of the Local Plan, Local Plan Amendment and Local Development Plan. The larger site considered, included an additional area to the north of the proposed site. The larger site was rejected by the Reporter at the Local Plan Inquiry, where the Reporter agreed with the Council's assessment. However, the Reporter stated that the site is capable of accepting development and this potential could always be considered, if appropriate, in a future review of a Local Plan.

The site currently under consideration must be assessed on its own merits. There were a number of constraints identified through the consultation, which are outlined below;

- Flood investigations would be required;
- Site is located on Prime Agricultural land;
- Potential archaeology evaluation would be required; and
- Roads Planning Officer is unable to support the proposal, due to the absence of a suitable vehicular access point.

The Roads Planning Officer expanded and advised that the 2 locations proposed, would fail to provide appropriate junction visibility requirements due to a combination of factors such as the geometry of the road and the position of adjacent buildings. The site could be satisfactorily accessed from Main Street via the ground immediately to the west of the car park serving the Fisherman's Arms Public House, however this land is outwith the site boundary. The site was not included within the Main Issues Report as a preferred or alternative housing option. In conclusion, taking the above into consideration, the site is not included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

# Burnmouth

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
ABURN005	Land to west of Lyall Terrace	Burnmouth	Eastern	Housing	15	1.2	Excluded

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable				

### Initial assessment summary

The site is not located within any international/national designation constraint, which are considered to be minor.

SEPA: In respect of flood risk, the surface water map is picking up low point along railway. Due to steep topography adjacent/ through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and the proposed development is not affected by surface runoff. Surface Water Hazard identified within the site.

In respect of foul water, it must connect into the existing SW foul network.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Other	Local Plan: (BBU5D), this site included the proposed site and the existing housing allocation (ABURN003) which is currently allocated within the LDP. This site was rejected as part of the Local Plan Inquiry Reporter's Report (pages 11-7). Local Plan Amendment: (ABURN004), this site included the eastern part of the proposed site and the existing housing allocation (ABURN003) which is currently allocated within the LDP.

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Good	Good	Good	Minor	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response received.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the north west of Burnmouth. There is a bus stop within Burnmouth itself and the gradient is relatively flat to the bus stop. The nearest railway station is

Berwick-Upon-Tweed, located 6 miles away. Burnmouth is approximately 3 miles from Eyemouth and 6 miles from Berwick-Upon-Tweed, which has a variety of employment opportunities and public services, however these are limited within Burnmouth itself.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: There are no known issues within the site.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

On site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to size and location.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No response received.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Appears somewhat divorced from main settlement. Unclear where access is to be taken from and how site will integrate with existing housing. Potential trunk road complications; in particular potential right turn across climbing lane.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Access is recommended to be taken through the adjacent site (ABURN003) allocated within the LDP.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I have no objections to this land being allocated for development. Access must be taken from the existing allocation to the east ABURN003, with the access from the C class public road being upgraded to an adoptable standard. The westerly half of this proposal does not lend itself to good street design in terms of its linear nature.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Did not raise any concerns to the development of this site.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Limited

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: This site is sandwiched between the A1 (and A1 layby) and the East Coast Main Line. It would form an extension of the existing housing allocation site (ABURN003), for which a planning brief is in place. The site would benefit from existing screening to the south west but would sit prominently on sloping ground when viewed from the Eyemouth road. Whether the access could accommodate further development on the scale proposed would be a key consideration.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Sufficient capacity at Eyemouth WWTW, sewer network is some distance away from the proposed site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Sufficient capacity at Rawburn WTW, a flow and pressure test will be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns to the development of this site.

EDUCATION OFFICER: Advised that an extension or new school may be required. However, not specified whether a primary or secondary school.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Doubtful	15

### Conclusions

The site was submitted for consideration, at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process. This site was previously assessed as part of a larger site, at the Local Plan Inquiry 2006. Furthermore, the eastern part of this site was assessed as part of the Local Plan Amendment (ABURN004). However on both occasions the site was not included.

The site is assessed overall as doubtful because development of this extended site would create a large housing area out of proportion with the small cluster of the settlement to the east and change its character when viewed from the A1. The site would extend the settlement in a linear fashion to the north west into the countryside, which currently forms its setting. The site is also sited within the Berwickshire Coast SLA and there is the potential that this site would impact upon the setting of the coastline. The Roads Planning Officer does not object to the proposal, stating that access must be taken from the existing allocation to the east (ABURN003). Therefore, this site would be reliant on the delivery of (ABURN003) in the first instance before it could be developed. Consideration would also need to be given to any surface water runoff. There are also potential school capacity issues.

There is currently an existing housing allocation (ABURN003) within Burnmouth for 10 units, which remains undeveloped to date. It is not considered that this site would be an acceptable addition to the settlement for the above reasons, especially given it would be reliant on the delivery of a currently undeveloped site. The site was not included within the Main Issues Report as a preferred or alternative option for housing. In conclusion, taking the above into consideration, the site is not included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

---

# Cockburnspath

<b>Site reference</b> SBCOP001	<b>Site name</b> Cockburnspath Development Boundary Amendment	<b>Settlement</b> Cockburnspath	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Development Boundary	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> n/a	<b>Ha</b> 0.8	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site is not located within any international/national designation.

SEPA: The site is on the edge of the sewered catchment and hence must connect to the public foul sewer.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site does not lie within the SEPA 1 in 200 year fluvial (river) flood extent. I would have no objections on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> On/Adjacent to site	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> Housing SG: (ACOPA004) - this site formed part of a larger site which was considered LDP2: (ACOPA007) - this site formed the western part of the proposal for the boundary amendment
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response received. Although no response was received, taking into consideration the site and surrounding area, it is considered there are likely to be minor wider biodiversity impacts.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The development boundary amendment is located to the west of Cockburnspath. There is a bus stop within Cockburnspath, located to the east of the village and the gradient to the bus stop is relatively flat. The nearest railway stations are Dunbar and Berwick-Upon-Tweed, with Dunbar located 9 miles away. Cockburnspath is approximately 9 miles from Dunbar, 13 miles from Duns and 15 miles from Eyemouth, which both have a variety of employment opportunities and public services, however these services are limited within Cockburnspath itself. There are minor biodiversity risks.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

On site/adjacent to

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific H&D issues.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Prehistoric cropmarks nearby. Evaluation required.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: We note that the current settlement profile for Cockburnspath states that 'Development into the open fields to the west and over the road to the east should be avoided to maintain the settlement form. This land is also designated as prime agricultural land.' There are existing allocations and no further allocations are to be made until these are built out. We have no concerns regarding the proposed development boundary amendment but refer to our comments on (ACOPA007) in relation to preferred phasing of sites within any new boundary.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No response received.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: May impact on existing speed limit.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: Whilst not objecting to the development boundary being altered to include this area, I would be concerned should this lead to new development on the site which would increase traffic given the deficiencies in infrastructure between the site and the village centre.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: I would have concerns with this proposal. The edge of this settlement is well defined by mature hedging at this location. The proposed boundary change does not relate to any obvious natural or existing man-made boundary to the north and would weaken controls over development at this sensitive edge of the settlement location. Land within the proposed new boundary is Prime Agricultural Land and views to the north across the site contribute to the character of the area and the attractive setting at the entrance to the village.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): There is sufficient capacity at the Cove WWTW.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): There is sufficient capacity at the Castle Moffat WTW. There are no real concerns however it would depend on anticipated water consumption.

OUTDOOR ACCESS OFFICER: Housing on this site would benefit greatly from a pavement down to the village.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

EDUCATION OFFICER: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

NHS: Did not provide a site specific response.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Doubtful	n/a

### Conclusions

The site was submitted at the 'MIR consultation' stage of the LDP2 process. This site formed part of a larger site (ACOPA004), which was previously considered as part of the Housing SG, however was not included. The current proposal is for a Development Boundary amendment. The land owner indicates within their submission that Berwickshire Housing Association are investigating the potential for affordable housing on the eastern part of the site. However, it should be noted that this proposal is merely considering a Development Boundary amendment and not a formal allocation for housing.

The site lies to the west of Cockburnspath, beyond Hoprig Road. The adopted LDP states that development into open fields to the west of Cockburnspath should be avoided to maintain the settlement form. Although the proposal is for a Development Boundary amendment, the site is currently an open field, therefore this would allow proposals to essentially be assessed against the infill policy (Policy PMD5: Infill Development). It is not considered that allowing the Development Boundary amendment would maintain or respect the existing settlement form of Cockburnspath. Following a site assessment and consultation, a number of constraints were identified, which are outlined below;

- The site is located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Any development must connect to the public sewer;
- 'Verges Hoprig Rd' lies along the southern boundary with Hoprig Road, which is identified within the SBC Greenspace Strategy 2009;
- Potential archaeology within the site, therefore appropriate investigations and mitigation would be required; and
- The Roads Planning Officer raised concerns regarding the potential development of this site in the future, which would increase traffic.

It is noted that the Roads Planning Officer does not raise an objection to the Development Boundary amendment, however raises concerns regarding the potential development of this site in the future. A separate site assessment was undertaken for a housing allocation (ACOPA007), on the western part of this site. In response to being consulted on (ACOPA007), the Roads Planning Officer stated that they cannot support housing on the site.

Furthermore, it is not considered appropriate to expand a Development Boundary merely in order to provide infill opportunities within the settlement itself, without a formal allocation. It is considered that there is sufficient housing land within Cockburnspath for the Proposed LDP period. In conclusion, taking the above into consideration, the Development Boundary amendment will not be included within the Proposed LDP.

<b>Site reference</b> ACOPA006	<b>Site name</b> Land west of Callander Place	<b>Settlement</b> Cockburnspath	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 40	<b>Ha</b> 1.5	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site is not located within any international/national designation constraint, which are considered to be minor.

SEPA: In respect of flood risk, due to steep topography adjacent/ through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and the proposed development is not affected by surface runoff. There is the potential that development of this site could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a Surface Water Hazard within the site.

In respect of foul water, it must connect to the existing SW foul network. For a development of this scale, there may be issues with the pumping station capacity. SW should confirm this.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> On site	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> The site formed part of a much larger site, which was considered as part of the Local Plan (BC100). Local Plan Inquiry (Page 11-11).
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Site is arable field adjacent to housing and road, small part hedgerow on boundary. Protect hedgerow and boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the west of Cockburnspath. There is a bus stop within Cockburnspath, located to the east of the village and the gradient to the bus stop is relatively flat. The nearest railway stations are Dunbar and Berwick-Upon-Tweed, with Dunbar located 9 miles away. Cockburnspath is approximately 9 miles from Dunbar, 13 miles from Duns and 15 miles from Eyemouth, which both have a variety of employment opportunities and public services, however these services are limited within Cockburnspath itself. There are minor biodiversity risks.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Adjacent to site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: There are no known archaeological issues. There are archaeological cropmarks in the area suggesting unknown archaeology elsewhere around Cockburnspath. Archaeological mitigation may be needed.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to location.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: Potential for 25/30 houses. Low density 1-1.5 storey at frontage reflecting existing streetscape scale. Higher density 2 storey properties on rising ground behind. Woodland planting to W to contain site in landscape and connect visually with woodland to NW. Exploit views to NE. Exploit the long range views, vehicle access options could limit number of properties and good location for pedestrian access to school/facilities.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Existing road infrastructure serving site is less than ideal. Area is an existing 20s Plenty zone with plans to convert to a permanent 20 mph limit.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: While this site is in a good central location, well placed to take advantage of the local services available, I find I am not in favour of this land being zoned for housing. The existing public road infrastructure surrounding the site, particularly the initial length from The Square, is not of a sufficient standard to accommodate the traffic associated with a development of this size. There is little opportunity for vehicles to pass one another and limited warning of opposing vehicles approaching. More concerning is the mix of vehicular traffic and pedestrians/cyclists on the narrow section of road between the roadside walls. This is particularly relevant with the existence of the school. While the road network seems to cope at present, housing on this site would exacerbate the shortcomings of the road infrastructure.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Limited

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: This is not a particularly prominent site, sitting in a relatively discreet location on the edge of the village and being partially screened by the landform and by trees to the north/ north west. However, there is an abundance of unfulfilled housing land in the village.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Cove WWTW has sufficient capacity, a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Castle Moffat WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment (WIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Potential for improvements to Core Path/Right of Way to the east.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding development on this site.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues regarding the capacity.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	40

### Conclusions

The site was submitted for consideration at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process. The land owner has indicated that a RSL is interested in developing this site for affordable housing. The proposed site extends to the west of the existing Development Boundary, beyond Callander Place. The LDP states that development into the open fields to the west should be avoided to maintain the settlement form. It is not considered that the site would maintain or respect the existing settlement form of Cockburnspath. There are a number of constraints identified, which are outlined below;

- Consideration would need to be given to surface water runoff;
- Surface Water Hazard identified at the site;
- Site located within Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Protect the hedgerow and boundary features;
- Mitigation for protected species including breeding birds;
- Archaeology mitigation may be required;
- Drainage Impact Assessment would be required in respect of WWTW;
- Water Impact Assessment would be required in respect of WTW; and
- The Roads Planning Officer cannot support development on this site, given that the existing public road infrastructure is not of a sufficient standard to accommodate the traffic associated with such a development.

It should be noted that the existing established housing land supply within the settlement includes two large housing allocations. Therefore, it is considered that Cockburnspath has sufficient housing allocations for the Local Plan period. The suitability for allowing RSL housing on this site could be tested via a planning application. The site was not included within the Main Issues Report as a preferred or alternative housing option. In conclusion, the site is not included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

<b>Site reference</b> <b>ACOPA007</b>	<b>Site name</b> Land to North of Hoprig Road	<b>Settlement</b> Cockburnspath	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 4	<b>Ha</b> 0.3	<b>PP status</b> <b>Excluded</b>
------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site is not located within any international/national designation.

SEPA: The site is immediately adjacent to the public foul sewer network and as such foul water must connect into this network.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site does not lie within the SEPA 1 in 200 year fluvial (river) or pluvial (surface water) flood extent. I would have no objections on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> On/Adjacent to site	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> Housing SG: (ACOPA004) - this site formed part of a larger site which was considered.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response received. Although no response was received, taking into consideration the site and surrounding area, it is considered there are likely to be minor wider biodiversity impacts.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the west of Cockburnspath. There is a bus stop within Cockburnspath, located to the east of the village and the gradient to the bus stop is relatively flat. The nearest railway stations are Dunbar and Berwick-Upon-Tweed, with Dunbar located 9 miles away. Cockburnspath is approximately 9 miles from Dunbar, 13 miles from Duns and 15 miles from Eyemouth, which both have a variety of employment opportunities and public services, however these services are limited within Cockburnspath itself. There are minor biodiversity risks.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Not applicable	<b>Open space</b> On site/adjacent to	<b>Listed buildings</b> Not applicable	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> Not applicable	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> Not applicable
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

## Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific H&D issues.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Prehistoric cropmarks nearby. Evaluation required.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: Note that the current settlement profile for Cockburnspath states that 'Development into the open fields to the west and over the road to the east should be avoided to maintain the settlement form. This land is also designated as prime agricultural land'. There are existing allocations and no further allocations are to be made until these are built out. On that basis, if this site is allocated, the adjacent site created by (SBCOP001) should be phased first to maintain overall cohesion of the settlement.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No response received.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: No significant issues but may need to extend existing 30 mph.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I am unable to support the development of this site for housing. Hoprig Road between the site and the village centre is narrow with a lack of footway provision over significant lengths and with no room to improve this without third party land and at significant expense.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: The site is outwith the Cockburnspath settlement boundary. There is no shortage of housing land within this village. Existing allocations should be developed before further allocations are considered. The current LDP notes that the preferred location for any further allocations would be the area between the development boundary and Pathhead House. Notwithstanding the above, this part of the village is not considered particularly suitable for expansion. The local road network is fairly poor at this end of the village. Whilst Braeside Cottage sits in isolation, the edge of the settlement is still fairly well defined. Land between Braeside Cottage and the settlement boundary is Prime Quality Agricultural Land and views across it contribute to the character of the area and the attractive setting at the entrance to the village. HSE may need to be consulted given the nearby quarry.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any objections.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): There is sufficient capacity at WWTW at Cove.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): There is sufficient capacity at WTW at Castle Moffat. There are no concerns for 4 units.

OUTDOOR ACCESS OFFICER: Housing on this site would benefit greatly from a pavement down to the village.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.  
PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.  
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.  
EDUCATION OFFICER: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.  
NHS: Did not provide any site specific comments.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	4

### Conclusions

The site was submitted at the 'MIR Consultation' stage of the LDP2 process. This site formed part of a larger site (ACOPA004), which was previously considered as part of the Housing SG, however was not included. The current site (ACOPA007) was submitted for housing, as part of the MIR Consultation stage, for 3-4 self build plots.

The site lies to the west of Cockburnspath, beyond Hoprig Road. The adopted LDP states that development into the open fields to the west of Cockburnspath should be avoided to maintain the settlement form. Furthermore, the site is separated from the existing houses (The Manse, Gayfield & Romanno) along the north of Hoprig Road. Therefore, for these reasons, it is not considered that the site would maintain or respect the existing settlement form of Cockburnspath. Following a site assessment and consultation, a number of constraints were identified, which are outlined below;

- The Roads Planning Officer is unable to support the development of this site for housing, for the following reasons; Hoprig Road, between the site and the village centre is narrow with a lack of footway provision over significant lengths and with no room to improve this without third party land and at significant expense.
- The site lies within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land; and
- Archaeology evaluation would be required;

Furthermore, it is noted that the proposal is for 3-4 self build units within the site. It is not the purpose of the Local Development Plan to identify and allocate single plots for development, only sites with a capacity of five or more units will be allocated. It is considered that Cockburnspath has a sufficient housing land supply for the Proposed Plan period. There are two housing allocations (BSO4B) and (BCO10B) which will be carried forward from the adopted Plan into the Proposed Plan.

In conclusion, taking the above into consideration, it is not considered that the site should be included within the Proposed Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b> <b>ACOPA008</b>	<b>Site name</b> Land to North of Dunglass Park	<b>Settlement</b> Cockburnspath	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 28	<b>Ha</b> 2.8	<b>PP status</b> <b>Excluded</b>
------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any identified International/National designation constraint. The site has an identified SEPA Flood Hazard (Surface Water Flood Extent) within a small area in the site.

SEPA: There is surface water adjacent to the site. SEPA note that the Railway line flooded at Cockburnspath in 2002 but it sits in a deep cut adjacent to the site. Note that waste water drainage from the site would exacerbate an existing point source sewage, private drainage in this instance.

The development appears to be outwith the Scottish Water foul sewer catchment. There do not appear to be any private drainage options either as the site is not located near to any watercourses. It appears unlikely therefore that the development could proceed on lack of foul drainage options.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site does not lie within the SEPA 1 in 200 year fluvial (river) flood extent. There is a very small pocket of potential surface water impact shown on the South Western side of the site at a 1 in 200 year pluvial flood event. I would have no objections on the grounds of flood risk. However, I would ask that due to surface water risk and the capacity of the development that surface water flooding is considered and it is ensured that any water would be routed around the housing.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> On site	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> The southern part of the site was previously considered, as part of the Local Plan (BC05), which was subject to the Local Plan Inquiry.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Site appears to be improved pasture and arable fields. Hedgerow, mature trees and young trees on the boundary. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats (lighting), badger and breeding birds. Biodiversity Risk: Low impact.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the west of Cockburnspath. There is a bus stop within Cockburnspath, located to the east of the village and the gradient to the bus stop is relatively flat. The nearest railway stations are Dunbar and Berwick-Upon-Tweed, with Dunbar located 9 miles away. Cockburnspath is approximately 9 miles from Dunbar, 13 miles from Duns and 15 miles from Eyemouth, which both have a variety of employment opportunities and public services, however these services are limited within Cockburnspath itself. There are minor biodiversity risks.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On/adjacent to site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific H&D issues, but site may be better to be constrained land to S of farm track – avoiding “nibbling away” as a corner of the field to the NW with no natural boundaries.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Greenfield site next to medieval farmstead. Evaluation required.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: An initial review of this site on streetview suggests it is relatively well screened in views from the surrounding road network. The site also appears to accord with the placemaking principles set out in the current settlement profile for Cockburnspath as it conforms to '... the preferred area for expansion would be between the development boundary [BCO4B] and Pathhead House to the north.' We have no further comments to make.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No response received.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: May impact on existing speed limit.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I have no objection to this site being allocated for housing. Access points are available from the C130 to the east and from the allocated site (BCO4B) to the south. A rationalisation of the accesses, for this site and Pathhead House, onto the C130 will be required and the existing speed limit and street lighting will have to be extended to include the site entrance. A Transport Statement is likely to be required depending on the scale of development.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Contribution to bus stop infrastructure required on old A1 at suitable location to serve development. No marked bus stops in village other than at Cockburnspath Memorial.

### Right of way

On/adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: This site is outwith the settlement boundary. The site is a considerable distance to the centre of the village. There is no shortage of housing land within Cockburnspath and existing allocations should be brought forward before further allocations are considered. That said, the current LDP notes that the preferred location for any further allocations is the area between the development boundary and Pathhead House, and the site is remarkably well contained when viewed from the old A1. HSE may need to be consulted given the nearby quarry.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): There is sufficient capacity at the Cove WWTW.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): There is sufficient capacity at the Castle Moffat WTW. Water Impact Assessment would probably be required.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Improved path/cycle links into town are recommended (Right of Way BB2).

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

EDUCATION OFFICER: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

NHS: Did not make site specific comments.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Acceptable	28

### Conclusions

The site was submitted at the 'MIR consultation' stage of the LDP2 process. The site (ACOPA008) was submitted for housing, as part of the MIR Consultation stage, with an indicative capacity for 28 units. The southern part of the proposed site was previously considered as part of a larger site, at the Local Plan Inquiry (BC05). The Reporter stated that there was merit in considering at least the northern part of (BC05) (immediately adjacent to the allocated BC04B site) as a possible direction for limited longer term expansion of Cockburnspath beyond the Local Plan period. The Reporter stated that it could be regarded as a natural extension to the village and a consolidation of the village in the context of the new housing development that has already been permitted immediately to the north of Pathhead House. Its limited scale would probably mean that it could be accessed satisfactorily via (BCO4B).

The site currently under consideration lies to the north of Cockburnspath, directly adjacent to the existing housing allocation (BCO4B). As outlined above, the area to the north of the Development Boundary, up to Pathhead House, is identified within the adopted LDP as being the preferred area for the future expansion. Further to a site assessment and consultation, a number of constraints were identified, which are outlined below;

- Surface Water Hazard identified at the site;
- Water Impact Assessment for WTW;
- SEPA raised concerns regarding foul drainage;
- Site located within Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Protect existing boundary features;
- Mitigation for protected species;
- Historic Environment Record, 'Pathhead' lies adjacent to the site;
- Archaeology investigations and mitigation would be required;
- A Transport Statement would be required for any development and
- Improved path/cycle links into the town are recommended.

Although the adopted LDP states that the preferred area for future expansion lies to the north of Cockburnspath, it is noted that there are two allocated housing sites within the adopted LDP, which are not yet complete (BCO4B & BCO10B). (BCO4B) lies directly to the south of the site in question. Given that the site (BCO4B) has only partially been developed and no building works are currently on site, it is considered that the allocation of any additional land to the north of (BCO4B), at this moment in time, would be premature. Any additional release of land to the north should await until such time that (BCO4B) is complete or near complete, in order to avoid a development to the north which is effectively separated from the rest of the settlement.

The applicant states within their submission, that if the Council considers three housing allocations too many in Cockburnspath, that this site (ACOPA008) could substitute the existing allocation (BCO10B). However, this does not address the issue raised above, that (BCO4B) should be complete (or near complete) before this site is considered for development. The applicant also states that the existing two housing allocations have not delivered and questions their effectiveness. However it should be noted that since the recession overall completion rates for the whole of the Scottish Borders have been low for marketability reasons.

In conclusion, taking the above into consideration, it is not considered that the site should be included within the Proposed Local Development Plan. Furthermore, it is considered that there is sufficient housing land within Cockburnspath for the Proposed LDP period. However, the site (ACOPA008) could be re-considered in future Local Plans.

---

<b>Site reference</b> MCOPA002	<b>Site name</b> Land opposite Dunglass Park	<b>Settlement</b> Cockburnspath	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Mixed Use	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 40	<b>Ha</b> 5.3	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designations. However, there is evidence of surface water adjacent to the site and potential ponding at Cockburnpath's Burn. Furthermore, there may be network capacity issues regarding foul drainage.

SEPA: Surface water Flood Map adjacent to site is picking up low point of railway. Site elevated above the railway line. There would also appear to be water ponding at Cockburnpath's Burn behind the A1. This may require further information at the detailed design stage.

In respect of foul drainage, there may be sewerage network capacity issues. Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. For a development of this scale there may be issues with the pumping station capacity. SW should confirm.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> On site	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> Housing SG: (MCOPA002), Stage 1 RAG undertaken but not a full site assessment
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Site is arable field adjacent road, hedgerow and trees on boundary. Railway cutting on N/E boundary. Wall butterfly recorded. Protect trees and hedgerow boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the north east of Cockburnspath, on the opposite side of the road to the settlement boundary. There is a bus stop located within Cockburnspath, located on the opposite side of the road. The nearest railway stations are Dunbar and Berwick-Upon-Tweed, with Dunbar located 9 miles away and Berwick-Upon-Tweed 20 miles away. Cockburnspath is approximately 13 miles from Duns and 15 miles from Eyemouth, which along with Dunbar and Berwick-Upon-Tweed, provide a variety of employment opportunities and public services, however these are limited within Cockburnspath itself. There are minor biodiversity impacts.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Adjacent to site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: The site lies close to the A1 and the East Coast Main Line, presumably screening both visual and acoustic will be needed to provide buffers on the N and E boundaries.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: There are no known archaeological issues. There are archaeological cropmarks in the area suggesting unknown archaeology elsewhere around Cockburnspath. Archaeological mitigation may be needed.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: Seek reasonable alternative - The site is likely to present significant and/ or adverse impacts on the natural heritage. We advise that reasonable alternatives may present less significant impacts and therefore they should be considered in advance of these sites.

Our advice on this site is based on prior knowledge and desktop assessment using GIS and streetview. We may provide further advice based on a site visit if the potential allocation is carried forward. The site is in a prominent position west of the A1, is perceptually detached from the existing village and is outwith the preferred area for expansion outlined in the settlement statement in LDP1. We agree with the placemaking considerations in the settlement statement which note that "Development into the open fields to the west and over the road to the east should be avoided to maintain the settlement form".

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: Linking this site visually and physically to the existing village requires careful consideration. Take account of the heritage of the village and integrate this site with other new developments in due course into the built form of the expanding village. Hedge and tree planting along Edinburgh Road to improve connectivity. Blocks of tree planting through site to break up vast area and reduce scale more appropriate to village. Footpath and safe crossing for pedestrians and cyclists going to school and village facilities will be required.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Somewhat divorced from main settlement.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I have no objections to this land being zoned for development. Access is readily available directly from the C130. A strong street frontage onto the existing public road is strongly recommended and this will compliment an extension of the 30mph speed limit and street lighting infrastructure as well as a relocation of the village entrance signage to reflect what would be the new extent of the village. A Transport Statement will be required.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Possible bus stop infrastructure.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Limited

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: This settlement has generally developed to the west of the main road. This prominent site would not be a logical extension of the village and would adversely impact the setting and character of the village, when viewed from multiple key receptor points including the A1.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Cove WWTW has sufficient capacity, a drainage impact assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Sufficient capacity at the Castle Moffat WTW, a water impact assessment is required to establish what impact, if any, development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Potential for improvements to Southern Upland Way and Coastal Path links to Cove.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Question whether the site is out of proportion to the size of settlement and perhaps premature in view of the current undeveloped zoned sites. If approved, however, we would support a small allocation of mixed use as the village has no current non-housing development land.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No capacity issues.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	40

## Conclusions

The site was considered as part of the Housing SG, however was not included. The site was most recently submitted at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process for consideration. The proposal is for a mixed use development on the east side of the A1, outwith the Cockburnspath Development Boundary. The LDP states that development over the road to the east should be avoided to maintain the settlement form. It is considered that development on this site would be detached from the existing Development Boundary and separated by the road. There is no connectivity or linkage from the proposed site into the existing settlement boundary. Furthermore, the LDP outlines that the preferred area for any expansion within Cockburnspath is to the north.

There are a number of other constraints identified which are outlined below:

- Transport Statement would be required;
- Drainage Impact Assessment for WWTW required;
- Water Impact Assessment for WTW required;
- Potential ponding;
- Site is within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- SNH raised concerns regarding the potential adverse impact on the natural heritage and advise that reasonable alternatives should be considered;
- Potential for archaeological mitigation; and
- Protection of trees and hedgerow boundary features, mitigation for protected species.

It should be noted that the existing established housing land supply within Cockburnspath includes two large housing allocations. Therefore, it is considered that Cockburnspath has sufficient housing allocations for the Local Plan period. The site was not included within the Main Issues Report as a preferred or alternative option for housing. In conclusion, taking the above into consideration, the site is not included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

# Coldingham

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
ACOLH005	Land north west of Creel House	Coldingham	Eastern	Housing	5	0.8	Excluded

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable				

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designation constraints.

SEPA: Contours and SEPA Surface Water Flood Map indicates a flow-path through the site but there is no evidence of a small watercourse on OS Maps or historic maps. Site layout may need careful consideration to ensure surface water runoff is managed (from both off-site and on-site sources) and site may be constrained due to flood risk. There is the potential that the development of this site could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a Surface Water Hazard identified within the site.

Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial, surface water and coastal 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Greenfield	LDP2 (ACOLH005) - The site was submitted at the 'Pre MIR' stage and the 'MIR Consultation' stage.

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Poor	Good	Good	Moderate	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Site is semi-improved neutral grassland, established hedgerow on boundary (path). Protect hedgerow boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds. Moderate biodiversity impact.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the north east of Coldingham at Coldingham Sands and occupies a countryside location, detached from Coldingham itself. The nearest bus stop is within Coldingham itself. The nearest railway stations are Berwick-Upon-Tweed located 13 miles away and Dunbar located 19 miles away. Eyemouth is located approximately 3 miles away, which has a variety of employment opportunities and public services, however are no provisions within the vicinity of the proposed site, given the countryside location.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No concerns regarding the development of this site, no specific comments provided.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: No concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: There are no known archaeological issues.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

On site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to size and location.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: The site is out with the Coldingham development boundary. Policy HD2, Housing in the Countryside does not support the scale of this proposal (ie) for 5 additional dwellings. 4/5no, modest size, taking account of narrow valley shaped site and RPA of existing trees and hedgerow trees. Scale and height of houses should not intrude on the wider landscape. Consider that the site could be developed sensitively and be discreet in the landscape without adverse effects on the Berwickshire Coast SLA, if the scale and height of the houses is modest, so as not too intrude on the wider landscape or adversely affect the character of the adjacent housing group.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Existing road is not ideal.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I have previously expressed concern about the road infrastructure at Coldingham Sands and its inability to cope with additional traffic to the extent that we have recommended refusal to new housing served by this road. This particular site is very close to the bottom of the road and it is only a short length before you reach St Veda's Hotel where the road infrastructure improves to a degree. I will therefore be able to support a small scale development on this site of no more than 4 houses (5 if the number of dwellinghouses permitted off a private access is increased from 4 to 5, in line with the National Roads Development Guide, through the LDP process) on the provision that the bend in the road at the hotel is improved to allow two vehicles to pass. This could be by way of a road widening on the outside of the bend with the existing embankment being regraded. Such work would appear to affect third party land and would directly impact on a private access.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: This site is located outwith Coldingham settlement boundary, at Coldingham Bay, within a sensitive part of the Berwickshire Coast SLA. The rationale and logic for the site is unclear and the site is considered to relate poorly to the nearby building group. A popular path runs alongside this site to the north.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Eyemouth WWTW has sufficient capacity and sufficient capacity in the network. There is a rising sewer main within the site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Raeburn WTW has sufficient capacity and there is sufficient capacity in the network. There is a 125mm water main within the north of the site.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Improved path/cycle links into town along Creel Path to St Abbs and Coldingham are recommended.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

EDUCATION OFFICER: There are no capacity issues.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	5

## Conclusions

The site was submitted at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process and was not included within the MIR for the reasons outlined below. The site was most recently re-submitted at the 'MIR consultation' stage. However, it was not considered that any additional or new information was submitted which required a re-consultation or which altered the previous reasons for exclusion. Therefore, the conclusion from the 'Pre MIR' stage is still valid and is outlined below.

This site is not located within or adjacent to the settlement of Coldingham. The site is in fact detached, by approximately 3 miles from Coldingham and is located at Coldingham Sands. Therefore, the site occupies a countryside location. Ultimately, the allocation of a housing site at such a location, would not comply with the principles of the LDP. It is therefore not appropriate to allocate this site for housing. Should the applicant wish to pursue this matter, a planning application could be submitted for consideration against Policy HD2: Housing in the Countryside, contained within the LDP. Furthermore, there are a number of constraints regarding this site, which are outlined below;

- Consideration of potential surface water run-off;
- Protect hedgerow boundary features;
- Mitigation for protected species;
- Lies within the Berwickshire Coast SLA; and
- The Roads Planning Officer is supportive of the proposal, as long as it is for no more housing than is permitted off a private access. Furthermore, they would require some road improvements to the existing road.

It should be noted that although the site is located within the SLA, the site is relatively contained and not readily visible from the surrounding area. Therefore, some form of development could be accommodated within the site. However, notwithstanding the above, the site is ultimately not within or adjacent to an existing Development Boundary and is ultimately housing within the countryside. Such a proposal would require to be assessed against Policy HD2. The site was not included within the Main Issues Report as a preferred or alternative option for housing. In conclusion, taking the above into consideration, the site is not included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b> ACOLH006	<b>Site name</b> Land to west of Reston Road	<b>Settlement</b> Coldingham	<b>SDA</b> Eastern	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 20	<b>Ha</b> 1.1	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designation constraint. There are potential flood hazards adjacent to the site.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the St Andrew's Burn which flows along the northern perimeter. Consideration will need to be given to any culverts/ bridges which may exacerbate flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within/ adjacent to site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. There is the potential that this development could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is an identified surface water hazard at the site.

There is a water body within, forming part of the site boundary, or immediately adjacent to the site. Therefore, SEPA advise that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. Site is immediately adjacent to the St Andrew burn so any development should ensure this is protected.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial, surface water and coastal 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. I would recommend that surface water runoff is considered at this site.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> On site	<b>Current use/s</b> Other	<b>Planning history references</b> Local Plan: (PBCL6), larger site which includes an area to the south; (BCL6B), larger site which includes an area to the south Local Development Plan: (ACOLH002), larger site which includes an area to the south west
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response received.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the south of Coldingham. There is a bus stop adjacent to the east of the proposed site. The nearest railway stations are Berwick-Upon-Tweed, located 13 miles away and Dunbar, located 19 miles away. Coldingham itself has a limited range of services including; shops, café, primary school and hotel. Eyemouth is approximately 3 miles away, and offers a

wider range of services and employment opportunities. Coldingham is sited relatively closely to the A1 running to Edinburgh in the north and Newcastle in the south.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	On/adjacent to site	Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Lies just outwith the conservation area, development of the site should take account of the potential impact on the conservation area.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: No concerns to the development of this site. No known issues.

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable			Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to size of the site.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No response received.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

**Near a trunk road?**

NETWORK MANAGER: May impact on location of 30 mph limit

Increased traffic volume on sub-standard junction (visibility necessitates STOP rather than Give way) with A1107. Also need for new junction with B road.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING SERVICE: I am opposed to development at this location due to the limitations of the site. The retaining wall and the level difference between the road and the field would result in significant engineering works to achieve the necessary gradients and visibility splays. In addition, the absence of a footway in Bridge Street (A1107), and inability to provide one, make it difficult to integrate the proposed site into the hub of the community and raises the question of pedestrian safety.

PASSNGER TRANSPORT: Improved access to bus stops.

<b>Right of way</b>	<b>TPOs</b>	<b>Contaminated land</b>	<b>Water supply</b>	<b>Sewerage</b>	<b>Gas Supply</b>	<b>Education provision</b>
Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	Limited	Limited	No	Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: This field is largely undeveloped and partially defines the setting of Coldingham when approached from the south west (Reston Road). The conservation area extends to the settlement boundary. The setting and character of both would likely be adversely affected by developing this field. There is possible flood risk associated with the adjacent St Andrew's Burn, and the junction with the A1107 is poor.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns to the development of this site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Eyemouth WWTW has sufficient capacity, a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any, this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Rawburn WTW has sufficient capacity, a Water Impact Assessment (WIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns to the development of this site.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No capacity issues.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	20

### Conclusions

The site was submitted at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process for consideration. This site was previously assessed as part of a larger site, as part of the previous Local Development Plan (ACOLH002) and was not included.

The site lies to the south west of the existing Coldingham Development Boundary and is immediately adjacent to the Conservation Area. There are concerns that the development of this site could allow for backland development, which could affect the overall status of the Conservation Area of the town. There is a drop in levels between the road and the eastern boundary of the site. Therefore, the development of the site would likely result in the loss of a large portion of mature trees and retaining wall, to allow an access to be formed. This has the potential to have an adverse impact upon the landscape and visual character of the area. Furthermore, the Roads Planning Officer cannot support the development of this site, given the limitations of the site. The Officer states that the retaining wall and the level difference between the road and the field would result in significant engineering works to achieve the necessary gradients and visibility splays. Secondly, the absence of a footway in Bridge Street (A1107), and inability to provide one, make it difficult to integrate the proposed site into the hub of the community and raises the question of pedestrian safety. There are a number of other constraints to development of this site, which are outlined below;

- Flood Risk Assessment would be required;
- Maintenance buffer strip required, in respect of the water body within/adjacent to the site;
- Drainage Impact Assessment would be required in respect of the WWTW;
- Water Impact Assessment would be required in respect of the WTW;
- Consideration would need to be given to surface water runoff; and
- The site is located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land.

The site was not included within the Main Issues Report as a preferred or alternative housing option. In conclusion, taking the above into consideration the site is not included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b> ACOLH007	<b>Site name</b> Land to south east of Homefield Cottage	<b>Settlement</b> Coldingham	<b>SDA</b> Eastern	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 5	<b>Ha</b> 0.3	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designation constraint.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial, surface water and coastal 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> On site	<b>Current use/s</b> Other	<b>Planning history references</b> Local Plan: BCL8 (Larger site which extends to the north and west)
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Site is arable field adjacent road, hedgerow on boundary. Brown hare recorded. Protect hedgerow boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the south east of Coldingham. There is a bus stop at Lawfield, sited to the west of the proposed site. However, there are currently no footpaths from the settlement to the site. The nearest railway stations are Berwick-Upon-Tweed, located 13 miles away and Dunbar, located 19 miles away. Coldingham itself has a limited range of services, including; shops, café, primary school and hotel. Eyemouth is approximately 3 miles away, and offers a wide range of services and employment opportunities. Coldingham is sited relatively closely to the A1 running to Edinburgh in the north and Newcastle in the south.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Not applicable	<b>Open space</b> Not applicable	<b>Listed buildings</b> Not applicable	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> Not applicable
--------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

## Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: There are no known archaeological issues.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

On site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: Our advice on this site is based on prior knowledge and desktop assessment using GIS and streetview. We may provide further advice based on a site visit if the potential allocation is carried forward. This elongated site is in a prominent location next to the Berwickshire coastal path. It could present issues related to landscape and visual impact and perceived coalescence with St Abbs. Further details on the form and likely location of development may inform further consideration but at this stage we would be cautious about the potential impacts from this site. Seek reasonable alternative: The site is likely to present significant and/ or adverse impacts on the natural heritage. We advise that reasonable alternatives may present less significant impacts and therefore they should be considered in advance of these sites.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: This would be a linear extension of the development boundary of Coldingham, south eastwards outwith the development boundary. Coalescing groups of houses on the outskirts of Coldingham. This site could be sensitively developed without adverse effects on the Berwickshire Coast SLA - if the scale and height of the houses is in keeping with adjacent properties and existing vegetation is retained and augmented with hedgerow and trees on the northern boundary to mitigate. Recommend short lengths of path links to connect with network to Coldingham as no pavement on A1107 roadside. 5no. Properties at scale and height in keeping with adjacent. Retain existing vegetation, augment with hedgerow and trees on northern boundary to contain. Footpath links required to connect with Coldingham.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Further development and junction off an unrestricted (60 mph) road but still well short of criteria for a reduced limit. Lack of infrastructure linking to Coldingham.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding development on this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I am unable to recommend in favour of this site. The site is divorced from the main body of Coldingham and would offer little scope for integration with the existing street network. The detached nature of the site means it suffers from an absence of street lighting, pedestrian provision and a 30mph speed limit and so does not stack up well from a sustainable transport point of view.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Possible bus stop infrastructure (Served by schools and service buses).

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: This site is detached from the settlement, has a poor relationship to the village, and would be difficult to develop without adverse impact on the setting of Coldingham.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise concerns regarding the development of this site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Eyemouth WWTW has sufficient capacity, a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Rawburn WTW has sufficient capacity and sufficient capacity in the network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues regarding the capacity.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

### PP status

Excluded

### Overall assessment

Unacceptable

### Site capacity

5

### Conclusions

The site was submitted at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process for consideration. The site was previously assessed as part of a larger site, as part of the Local Plan (BCL8) and was not included. The site lies to the east of Coldingham, however is detached from the existing Development Boundary. The site lies on the northern side of the road and does not have a clear connection to the existing Development Boundary/development pattern. There is currently no development on the southern side of the road beyond the Development Boundary. This proposal would extend housing along the road eastwards away from the Development Boundary.

The site lies within the Berwickshire Coast SLA and there is the potential that any development on this site could impact the landscape and visual amenity of the wider area. The site would be a linear extension of the Development Boundary and have the potential to impact upon the landscape and visual amenity of the wider area.

The Roads Planning Officer is unable to support development on this site for the following reasons. The site is divorced from the main body of Coldingham and would offer little scope for integration with the existing street network. The detached nature of the site means it suffers from an absence of street lighting, pedestrian provision and a 30mph speed limit and so does not stack up well from a sustainable transport point of view.

There are a number of other constraints, identified as part of the consultation, which are outlined below:

- Sited within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Protection of hedgerow boundary features required;
- Mitigation for protected species and breeding birds required;
- Within the Special Landscape Area 'Berwickshire Coast'; and
- Drainage Impact Assessment required in respect of the WWTW.

The site was not included within the Main Issues Report as a preferred or alternative option for housing. In conclusion, taking the above development constraints into consideration, the site is not included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b> ACOLH008	<b>Site name</b> Land to south east of Law House	<b>Settlement</b> Coldingham	<b>SDA</b> Eastern	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 7	<b>Ha</b> 0.5	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designation constraint.

SEPA: No comments in respect of flood risk. Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial, surface water and coastal 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> On site	<b>Current use/s</b> Brownfield	<b>Planning history references</b> Local Plan: BCL8 (Included a much larger site to the north too) Local Development Plan: MCOLH002 (Included this site, plus an additional area to the north). The site was assessed for mixed use development.  Planning application (03/00572/COU): Change of use of land to form temporary storage compound (PERCI decision)
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response received.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the south east of Coldingham. There is a bus stop at Lawfield, sited to the west of the proposed site. However, there are currently no footpaths from the settlement to this site. The nearest railway stations are Berwick-Upon-Tweed, located 13 miles away and Dunbar, located 19 miles away. Coldingham itself has a limited range of services including; shops, café, primary school and hotel. Eyemouth is approximately 3 miles away, and offers a wider range of services and employment opportunities. Coldingham is sited relatively closely to the A1 running to Edinburgh in the north and Newcastle in the south.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Adjacent to site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER: Site lies to SE of Category C listed Law House. Care would be needed in any development to respect the scale and setting of the listed building.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: There are no known archaeological issues.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to the size of the site.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No response received.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Further development and junction off an unrestricted (60 mph) road but still well short of criteria for a reduced limit. Lack of infrastructure linking to Coldingham.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I am unable to recommend in favour of this site. The site is divorced from the main body of Coldingham and would offer little scope for integration with the existing street network. The detached nature of the site means it suffers from an absence of street lighting, pedestrian provision and a 30mph speed limit and so does not stack up well from a sustainable transport point of view.

PASSEGER TRANSPORT: Possible bus stop infrastructure (Served by schools and service buses).

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: This site is detached from the settlement, has a poor relationship to the village, and, sitting in generally open countryside, would be difficult to develop without an adverse impact on the setting of Coldingham.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Eyemouth WWTW has sufficient capacity and a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, is any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Rawburn WTW has sufficient capacity and sufficient capacity at the network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may

present development constraints.  
NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.  
ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.  
PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.  
EDUCATION OFFICER: No capacity issues.  
NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	7

### Conclusions

The site was submitted at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process for consideration. A slightly larger site than this was considered as part of the Local Development Plan for mixed use development (MCOLH002) and was not included. The site is detached from the edge of the existing Development Boundary at Coldingham. Development on this site would change the character at the edge of the settlement and it may be possible that screen planting would compensate. However, there are a number of constraints to development on the site, which are listed below;

- The site is on Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) would be required in respect of the WWTW;
- Any development would need to ensure that it respects the C listed building 'Law House'; and
- The Roads Planning Officer cannot support the development of this site, given that the site is divorced from the main body of the settlement and would offer limited scope for integration with the existing street network.

It should be noted that the Roads Planning Officer could not support this site when previously considered as part of the LDP (MCOLH002) either. Therefore, there has been no change in circumstances since that time. The site was not included within the MIR as a preferred or alternative option for housing. In conclusion, taking the above into consideration, the site is not included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

---

# Coldstream

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
ACOLD012	Land to south of Former Cottage Hospital	Coldstream	Rest of Borders	Housing	100	6.0	Excluded

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

The site falls is just over 100m north from the River Tweed, which is a SAC and SSSI. Furthermore, there are areas of surface water hazard adjacent to the site, located to the south.

SEPA: Review of LiDAR shows the lowest point of the site as 26mAOD and the adjacent River Tweed is 15mAOD. As such we are satisfied there is sufficient height between the site and the River Tweed. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within/adjacent to site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. There is potential that development of the allocation could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. Surface water hazard has been identified within the site.

Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. For a development of this scale there may be issues with the pumping station capacity/STW capacity. SW should confirm.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site lies within the surface water 1 in 200 year flood extent and in close proximity to the fluvial flood extent. I would require that surface water runoff is considered and that any flows are routed around any development. Drainage Assessment/SUDS.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	On/Adjacent to site	Greenfield	Local Plan: (PBCS4), slightly different site boundary Local Plan Amendment: (ACOLD005), same site boundary

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Good	Good	Good	Minor	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response received. However, the same site boundary was submitted and considered for housing, as part of the Local Plan Amendment. The Ecology Officer's comments as part of the LPA have been attached below;

'Interim Phase 1 habitat data comprises of Arable J 1.1, dense scrub A2.1 on southern margin. Field boundaries incorporate scrub/ trees on southern boundary, hedgerows, mature trees on eastern boundary. River Tweed SAC/SSSI 100m to south. No obvious drainage connection. Mitigation measures include the protection of trees/scrub on boundaries and include extended hedges in design. Timing of

works should not interfere with breeding birds. Appropriate mitigation to avoid significant impacts on River Tweed SAC/SSS'.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the south west of Coldstream. There is a bus stop opposite the health centre, which is a close distance to the site in question. The nearest railway station is Berwick-Upon-Tweed, located approximately 15 miles away. Coldstream itself has a good range of public services and employment opportunities. However, is close to Kelso (9 miles away) and Berwick-Upon-Tweed, where there are more services and employment opportunities within a close drive. This site is some distance from the Town Centre and High Street and there is no existing footpath connecting the site to the settlement.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area	Open space	Listed buildings	Scheduled Monument	Ancient woodland inventory	Archaeology	Garden and designed landscape
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	On site	Not applicable	On site	Adjacent to site

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Did not raise any concerns to the development of this site.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Development of this site may raise issues of national significance. The site boundary includes (SM12356), settlement 250m south of Cottage Hospital, a semi-circular enclosed settlement overlooking the Tweed Valley. Any development within the proposed site boundary would need to avoid the monument entirely and retain it in an appropriate setting. We consider it unlikely that proposed number of units could be delivered without significant adverse impacts on the setting of the monument. Whilst some, more limited, development may be possible within the site boundary, this would require careful consideration of issues of design, massing and density. There may be the potential for significant impact on unscheduled archaeological remains on this site, for advice on which you should consult your archaeological adviser.

ARCHAEOLOGY: There is a Scheduled Monument in the south-eastern quarter of the field. This a Scheduled, likely prehistoric, settlement visible as cropmarks. There are other un-designated cropmarks in the western half of the field that may be related. There should be no development within the Scheduled Monument or an area of at least 50 metres around it. All development will need to respect the setting of the monument per SPP and the LDP. Archaeological evaluation, and further mitigation in needed, within the undesignated areas will be required. I recommend this site is not taken forward given the significant constraints.

---

## Landscape assessment

NSA	SLA	Over 200 metres?	Over 12 degree slope	Wild Land
Not applicable	Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No response received.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No response received.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity	Near a trunk road?
	<input type="checkbox"/>

NETWORK MANAGER: Somewhat dis-connected to main settlement. Would need to consider junction onto A698 carefully, and likely to impact on existing speed limit location.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: Technical standards for vehicular access to the A698 can be met; therefore satisfactory means of access to this site is achievable. I am concerned however that this site is somewhat detached from the main body of Coldstream and I would suggest only the easterly portion of this site be considered for development, but only if and when the intervening land between the site and the town is developed first.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Possible bus laybys required both directions.

<b>Right of way</b>	<b>TPOs</b>	<b>Contaminated land</b>	<b>Water supply</b>	<b>Sewerage</b>	<b>Gas Supply</b>	<b>Education provision</b>
Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	Limited	Limited	Yes	Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Quite distant from the centre, Prime Quality Agricultural land, site is part of an SBC Designed Landscape and could work in placemaking & design terms.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Coldstream WWTW has sufficient capacity, a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Rawburn WTW has sufficient capacity and a Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Potential opportunity to link area to Core Path that runs along the River Tweed to the south.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No capacity issues.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

<b>PP status</b>	<b>Overall assessment</b>	<b>Site capacity</b>
Excluded	Doubtful	100

### Conclusions

The site was submitted at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process for consideration. The site lies to the south west of Coldstream. There is an existing strong woodland belt on the western edge of Coldstream, which forms a pronounced finish to the town. There is a large intervening open field, between the site and the aforesaid woodland belt. Therefore, the site is too remote from the well defined Development Boundary of Coldstream to the west and does not relate well to the existing Coldstream Development Boundary. There are a number of constraints regarding the development of this site, which are outlined below;

- Site lies adjacent to the River Tweed SSSI and SPA;
- Protect and enhance the existing boundary features, where possible;
- Potential flooding constraint, further investigation required;
- Prime Quality Agricultural Land on and adjacent to the site;
- SBC Designed Landscapes adjacent to the site (Hirsel to the north and Lees to the east);
- Hirsel Garden and Designed Landscape lies to the north;
- Drainage Impact Assessment required for WWTW & Water Impact Assessment required for WTW;
- Archaeology record within the site for the Cottage Hospital; and
- Historic Scotland Scheduled Monument within the site for the Cottage Hospital in the south west corner.

Historic Environment Scotland state that the development of this site may raise issues of national significance, given the proximity to the enclosed settlement Cottage Hospital. Any development would need to avoid the monument entirely. The Archaeology Officer has advised that there should be no development within the Scheduled Monument or an area of at least 50m around it and recommends that the site is not taken forward.

The Roads Planning Officer advises that although there is a satisfactory access, they raise concerns regarding the detachment of the site from Coldstream. The Officer states that only the eastern portion of this site should be considered for development, but only if and when the intervening land is developed first.

The site was not included within the MIR as a preferred or alternative option for housing. In conclusion, taking the above into consideration, the site is not included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

---

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
ACOLD013	Hillview North II	Coldstream	Rest of Borders	Housing	200	10.2	Excluded

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable				

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designation. There are surface water hazards identified, however they are located to the north just outwith the proposed site boundary. It should be noted that the entire site forms part of a larger site identified for longer term housing, within the LDP. As part of the Housing SG (ACOLD011), the southern part of this site was allocated in November 2017 for housing (100 units). It should be noted that the Housing SG was not formally adopted at the time this site was submitted for consideration.

SEPA: Review of historic maps does not show the presence of any small watercourses on site. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues in this area. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. There is an identified Surface Water Hazard at the site.

Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. For a development of this scale, there may be issues with the pumping station capacity/STW capacity. SW should confirm.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site lies out with the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extent. I would require that surface water runoff is considered and that any flows are routed around any development. Drainage Assessment/SUDS.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	On/Adjacent to site	Greenfield	<p>Local Development Plan: This forms part of an area identified for longer term housing (SCOLD001)</p> <p>Housing SG: The entire longer term site was considered (ACOLD009) and was not included within the Housing SG</p> <p>Housing SG: Half of the currently proposed site was considered (ACOLD011) and allocated for housing within the Housing SG</p> <p>It should be noted that (ACOLD014) is also under consideration, as part of this process. This is the remainder of the longer term housing site, contained within the LDP.</p>

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Good	Good	Good	Minor	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response received, specifically for this site (ACOLD013). However, a consultation response was received for (ACOLD14) as part of this process. The response to that

consultation are outlined below;

'Biodiversity Risk: Low impact. Site appears to be an arable field hedgerow and on part of the boundary. No obvious connectivity to River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including badger and breeding birds. SEPA CAR construction site licence required'.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the north of Coldstream and the southern part is already allocated for housing, as part of the Housing SG. Coldstream has adequate services and employment opportunities. The settlement is also relatively close to Berwick-Upon-Tweed and Kelso, which provide further opportunities. There is public transport which links Coldstream with Berwick-Upon-Tweed, where a railway station is present.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: There is some potential within the site. Archaeological investigation may be required.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: SNH provided the following response; 'From our response on 3rd August 2017, this site lies outwith the current settlement boundary as shown in the LDP but is included as a longer term safeguarded (SCOLD001). This would form a significant addition to the existing settlement and would therefore need to ensure measures to deliver natural heritage mitigation and enhancement as part of any future site development'.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No response to date. However, a response was received as part of the Housing SG for (ACOLD009), which included this site. The Officer provided the following comments outlined below;

'There is a landscape argument to avoid extending development into this rural area which lies outwith existing Coldstream perimeter woodland, particularly given the anticipated access issues. Also the site is prime agricultural land. However the precedent for development has already been created at the adjoining industrial estate. Strengthening of perimeter woodland structure is recommended along the NW, N and NE sides together with a buffer zone to protect existing woodland on the SW side. This will help contain the visual impacts of new development. Further planting is required to separate housing from the adjoining business and industrial site to the SE, perhaps provided on the business site'.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Appears somewhat dis-connected from town. Additional pressure on sub-standard A6112/ A698 junction. Would need to extend 30 mph limit.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: Good opportunity for vehicular access and pedestrian/cycle linkage exists. I am therefore able to offer my support for housing on this site. Two main vehicular links are available; one via the existing industrial site served off the A6112 (though there is intervening land between the industrial development and this site) and another via Hill View. A further more minor link is possible via the westerly end of Priory Bank. Allowance would have to be made for future street connectivity and a Transport Assessment will be required as a prerequisite for the development of this site.  
PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Possible contribution towards bus service and infrastructure.

<b>Right of way</b>	<b>TPOs</b>	<b>Contaminated land</b>	<b>Water supply</b>	<b>Sewerage</b>	<b>Gas Supply</b>	<b>Education provision</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Limited	Limited	Yes	Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Would only be suitable in the longer term once the land to the south is developed; site is Prime Quality Agricultural land and site is part of SBC Designed Landscape.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Coldstream WWTW has sufficient capacity and a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Rawburn WTW has sufficient capacity and a Water Impact Assessment (WIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Improved path/cycle links into town are recommended (2016 HSG Consultation)

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns to the development of this site.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Whilst we have no objections to this allocation, which is already in the Local Plan as a future site, a preserved road link is required to allow access from the Hillview estate to link through to the employment site allocated BCOLD001. In addition it may be that some landscape buffer planting requirement should be included within the housing allocation rather than totally required within the employment allocation, in case this housing development is constructed earlier than the employment land.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No capacity issues.

NHS: No response received.

## Overall assessment

<b>PP status</b>	<b>Overall assessment</b>	<b>Site capacity</b>
Excluded	Doubtful	200

### Conclusions

The site was submitted at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process for consideration. The entire site forms part of the longer term housing site (SCOLD001), which is identified within the adopted LDP. The southern part of the site was allocated for housing as part of the Housing SG (ACOLD011) in November 2017, with an indicative site capacity for 100 units.

The site would integrate well into the settlement with appropriate landscaping and protection should be given to the existing boundary features, where possible. There are good infrastructure and connectivity opportunities, including road access from the adjacent employment allocation, existing housing allocation (ACOLD011) and Hill view, with a minor link from Priory Bank. A Transport Assessment would be required for the development of this site. The following must also be taken into consideration when developing this site; mitigation for breeding birds, archaeology, buffer protection zones along the southern boundary, landscaping along the western/northern boundary, open space provision, buffer zone between the site and allocated employment site and the future integration with the potential longer term housing site to the west. Consideration must be given to incorporating a pedestrian link to the Core Path which joins Duns Road to the west and A6112 to the east.

It should be noted that this site excludes a portion of (SCOLD001), along the northern and western boundary. Another site is also under consideration (ACOLD014) for housing, as part of the LDP2 process. The site boundary for (ACOLD014) includes the remaining part of (SCOLD001) which is not yet allocated. This site is smaller and excludes the indicative landscaped area. Although there are no constraints to developing this site, it is considered that any future allocation should include the full remainder of (SCOLD001).

The site was not included within the MIR as a preferred or alternative option for housing. In conclusion, the site will not be taken forward for inclusion within the Proposed Local Development Plan. However, it should be noted that the larger site (ACOLD014) is included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
<b>ACOLD014</b>	Hillview North 1 (Phase 2)	Coldstream	Rest of Borders	Housing	100	6.5	<b>Included</b>

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable				

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designations. The site is currently identified for longer term housing potential within the LDP. The site directly to the south was brought forward as part of the Housing SG (ACOLD011), for 100 units.

SEPA: Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. In addition, the surface water flood map indicates a potential flow path which can indicate a potential small watercourse. Review of Scottish Water information and historic maps does not indicate the presence of a small watercourse. This should be explored further during site investigations.

There is the potential that development on this site could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard within the site.

Foul drainage from the development must be connected to the existing SW foul sewer network. Std comments for SUDS.

SEPA (MIR Consultation additional comments): SEPA commented on the MIR Consultation, however provided no additional comments further to above.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with the fluvial (river) 1 in 200 year flood extents but there are small pockets of potential surface water impacts on the Eastern side of the site at a 1 in 200 year flood event.

I would have no objections on the grounds of flood risk. However, I would require that due to surface water risk and the capacity of the development that surface water flooding is considered and it is ensured that any water would be routed around the housing.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	On/Adjacent to site	Greenfield	Local Development Plan: This forms part of an area identified for longer term housing (SCOLD001) Housing SG: The entire longer term site was considered (ACOLD009) and was not identified within the Housing SG Housing SG: Half of the currently proposed site was considered (ACOLD011) and allocated for housing within the Housing SG. It should be noted that (ACOLD013) is also under consideration as part of this process. (ACOLD013) includes the already allocated southern part of the site and omits a northern section of this site (ACOLD014).

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

**Access to public transport**

Good

**Access to employment**

Good

**Access to services**

Good

**Wider biodiversity impacts**

Minor

**Site aspect**

Not applicable

**Accessibility and sustainability summary**

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Low biodiversity impact. Site appears to be an arable field hedgerow and on part of the boundary. No obvious connectivity to River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including badger and breeding birds. SEPA CAR construction site licence required.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the north of Coldstream and the area directly to the south is already allocated for housing, as part of the Housing SG. Coldstream has adequate services and employment opportunities. The settlement is also relatively close to Berwick-Upon-Tweed and Kelso, which provide further opportunities. There is public transport which links Coldstream with Berwick-Upon-Tweed, where a railway station is present.

**Local impact and integration assessment****Conservation area**

Not applicable

**Open space**

Not applicable

**Listed buildings**

Not applicable

**Scheduled Monument**

Not applicable

**Ancient woodland inventory**

Not applicable

**Archaeology**

Adjacent to site

**Garden and designed landscape**

Not applicable

**Local impact and integration summary**

HERITAGE AND DESIGN: No specific issues, need to consider a common approach to boundary treatments etc with the site to the south.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: This response relates to the consultation for site (ACOLD013), which is also under consideration. There is some potential within the site, archaeological investigation may be required.

**Landscape assessment****NSA**

Not applicable

**SLA**

Not applicable

**Over 200 metres?** **Over 12 degree slope** **Wild Land**

Not applicable

**Landscape summary**

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: Our previous advice on this site (in response to the Housing SG): 'This site lies outwith the current settlement boundary as shown in the LDP but is included as a longer term safeguard (SCOLD001). This would form a significant addition to the existing settlement and would therefore need to ensure measures to deliver natural heritage mitigation and enhancement as part of any future site development'. Expanding on this earlier advice, we recommend that:

- New structure planting/ landscaping, should be planned to improve the setting of the site and to establish a framework for delivery of the remainder of the long-term safeguard site (SCOLD001);
- Existing shelter belts should be retained and enhanced with additional planting. Suitability of locating active travel routes along these linear features should also be considered due to their potential role in providing setting and shelter for users; and
- Open space should provide multiple benefits and be linked into wider habitat and active travel networks.

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: (MIR Consultation additional comments): SNH commented on the MIR Consultation, however provided no additional comments further to above.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: Site has an arbitrary SW boundary not related to any landscape feature. It is effectively an extension of ACOLD13 and should not be developed until after ACOLD13 or it would be isolated and potentially intrusive. 20m wide structure planting belt is desirable along the NE and NW boundaries to form a new settlement edge to Coldstream. Otherwise no major concerns.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: No response received.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: Good opportunity for vehicular access and pedestrian/cycle linkage exists. I am therefore able to offer my support for housing on this site. Two main vehicular links are available; one via the existing industrial site served off the A6112 (though there is intervening land between the industrial development and this site) and another via Hill View. A further more minor link is possible via the westerly end of Priory Bank. Development of this site should not take place until such a time as the intervening area of land between the site and Hill View is developed. Allowance would have to be made for future street connectivity and a Transport Assessment will be required as a prerequisite for the development of this site.

PASSNEGER TRANSPORT: No response received.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No problem in principle with allocating this site. However, the current 2016 LDP shows the vast majority of this site as part of an existing allocation, and shows most of this site as a proposed structure landscaping area. The level of landscaping proposed did appear to me to be excessive. However, it was shown, and justifiable in part. The new allocation should still show/indicate some degree of landscaping to the boundary of the site, unless structure landscaping is no longer being indicated?

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): There is sufficient capacity at Coldstream WWTW. A Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): There is sufficient capacity at Rawburn WTW. A Water Impact Assessment (WIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Improved path/cycle links into town and the wider path network are recommended.

CONTAMINATED LAND: There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received. However, they were consulted on site (ACOLD013) which is also under consideration and raised no objections.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: I believe we previously responded to (ACOLD011) that the landscape separating strip between this site and the Coldstream Business Park should be split between the two sites rather than all be contained within the business park site to ensure sufficient separation, splitting the cost, and allowing this to be implemented early on, depending on which development commences first.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

### PP status

Included

### Overall assessment

Acceptable

### Site capacity

100

### Conclusions

The site was considered at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process. The site is currently identified as potential longer term housing land within the LDP (SCOLD001). The site immediately to the south was allocated for housing within the Housing SG (ACOLD011) for 100 units.

The site would integrate well into the settlement, respect the existing settlement pattern and have good connectivity with the adjacent allocations. The site would represent a natural extension to the existing settlement pattern of Coldstream. The site itself is well contained and development of the site will have little adverse impact upon the wider landscape. Further to consultation, the following constraints and mitigation were highlighted;

- Investigation of potential flood risk and surface water runoff and mitigation where required;
- Protect and enhance existing boundary features (hedgerows and trees) where possible;
- Mitigation for protected species;
- Consideration given to a common approach in respect of the boundary treatments, with the allocated site to the south (ACOLD011). New structure planting landscaping should be planned, to improve the setting of the site and to establish a framework for delivery alongside (ACOLD011) to the south. This should include structure planting along the north, east and west boundaries, which would provide a settlement edge. Appropriate planting should be carried out along the northern part of the site to give adequate screening from the working farm to the north and the access to it;
- Existing shelter belts should be retained and enhanced with additional planting;
- Open space should provide multiple benefits and be linked into the wider habitat and active travel networks;
- Drainage Impact Assessment required in respect of the water network capacity & Water Impact Assessment required, in respect of the waste network capacity;
- The site is located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Site lies within the 'Lenne' SBC Designed Landscape;
- Potential archaeology within the site;
- There are 2 main vehicular links into this site, 1 via the existing industrial estate served off the A6112 and another via Hillview. Allowance should be made for future street connectivity; and
- Improved path/cycle links into the town and the wider path network are recommended.

The site was included as an alternative option for housing within the MIR. Although the site to the south was recently allocated as part of the Housing SG, it is considered that there are advantages to developing this site and the existing allocation (ACOLD011) together. This would allow the development of the two sites to be considered together, in respect of any layout and connectivity, preventing a piecemeal development of the wider site. It is acknowledged that (ACOLD011) is a recent allocation for 100 units and there are a further three housing allocations within Coldstream. However, on balance taking into consideration the above comments regarding the two sites being considered together in terms of connectivity, the site will be included within the LDP. It is considered that the allocation will allow the wider northern area of Coldstream to be considered in terms of overall connectivity and layout. A site requirement will also be attached to the allocation stating that it is the intention of the Council to produce a planning brief for this site, alongside the adjacent site (ACOLD011).

---

<b>Site reference</b> BCS3A	<b>Site name</b> Guards Road	<b>Settlement</b> Coldstream	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 7	<b>Ha</b> 0.3	<b>PP status</b> Retain LDP Site
--------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------	----------------------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------

---

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b>	<b>SAC</b>	<b>SPA</b>	<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
------------------	------------	------------	-------------	---------------

### Initial assessment summary

This is an existing housing allocation within the LDP, which was subject to a review as part of the MIR process.

---

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b> Other	<b>Planning history references</b> No planning history on this site.
--------------------------	------------	--------------------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------

---

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b>	<b>Access to employment</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b>	<b>Site aspect</b>
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
--------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------------------	--------------------	------------------------------------------

### Local impact and integration summary

---

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
------------	------------	--------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	------------------

### Landscape summary

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

Right of way

TPOs

Contaminated land

Water supply

Sewerage

Gas Supply

Education provision

Planning & infrastructure summary

---

## Overall assessment

**PP status**

**Overall assessment**

**Site capacity**

Retain LDP Site

7

### Conclusions

The site is currently allocated for housing within the adopted LDP, with an indicative site capacity for 7 units. All the existing allocations were subject to review, as part of the MIR process. The site was allocated as part of the 1994 Berwickshire Local Plan and there has been no planning history on the site to date. The site is currently used as an area of open space. Given the length of time the site has been allocated, a letter was sent to the land owner requesting whether there is a realistic likelihood of the site being developed.

The landowner and developer responded to the letter, advising that they are currently marketing the site and have had discussions with Eildon Housing Association however no deal was possible to date. They requested that the site remains allocated within Proposed Plan.

The developer, J S Crawford Properties are a well known local developer, who have developed a vast number of housing sites within the Scottish Borders. It is acknowledged that this site is owned by a developer, is being actively marketed and that development rates have been slower since the recession. There are no constraints to the site being delivered. Therefore, it is considered that the site should remain allocated for housing within the Proposed Plan. Furthermore, the units are programmed as being effective within the HLA (2019).

Therefore, taking the above into consideration, it is considered that the allocation (BCS3A) will be retained within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

---

# Duns

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
ADUNS024	Land North of Peelrig Farm	Duns	Eastern	Housing	100	4.1	Excluded

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable				

### Initial assessment summary

There are a number of SEPA Flood Hazards (surface water) within the site. The site does not fall within any international/national designation constraint.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourses which flows through/adjacent to the site. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site. There would appear to be multiple Scottish water assets through the site which should be investigated further and may act as a constraint. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues at this site or immediately adjacent. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. The site does fall within an area where a surface water hazard has been identified. The potential development of this site could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere.

There is a waterbody within, forming part of the site boundary, or immediately adjacent to the site. Therefore, SEPA require that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

Co-location issues: There are 2 exempt scrapyards, a community recycling centre and a waste storage facility within the Industrial estate nearby.

Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. For a development of this size, it is likely that there would be sewer network/STW capacity issues. SW should confirm. There appears to be a culverted watercourse along the southern site boundary - this should be de-culverted as part of any development.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is within the surface water 1 in 200 year flood extent. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. I would, however, ask that due to the size of the development that surface water flooding is considered and it is ensured that any water would be routed around the housing. Drainage Impact Assessment/SUDS.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	On/Adjacent to site	Greenfield	Local Plan: (PBD3), same site boundary as the proposed site; (BD24D), same site boundary as the proposed site Local Plan Amendment: (ADUNS004), same site boundary as the proposed site Housing SG: (ADUNS024), exact same site boundary and site code as currently proposed

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

**Access to public transport**

Good

**Access to employment**

Good

**Access to services**

Good

**Wider biodiversity impacts**

Minor

**Site aspect**

Not applicable

**Accessibility and sustainability summary**

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response received.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the east of Duns adjacent to the existing settlement boundary. There is good access to public transport. There is also good access to services and employment within Duns, within walking distance. There are regular buses to Berwick-Upon-Tweed, where there is a main train line to Edinburgh and Newcastle. There are also employment opportunities within Eyemouth, which is 14 miles away.

**Local impact and integration assessment****Conservation area**

Not applicable

**Open space**

On site/adjacent to

**Listed buildings**

Not applicable

**Scheduled Monument**

Not applicable

**Ancient woodland inventory**

Not applicable

**Archaeology**

On/adjacent to site

**Garden and designed landscape**

Not applicable

**Local impact and integration summary**

HERITAGE &amp; DESIGN: Did not raise any concerns regarding development on this site.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding development on this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: No known archaeological issues.

**Landscape assessment****NSA**

Not applicable

**SLA**

Not applicable

**Over 200 metres?** **Over 12 degree slope** **Wild Land**

Not applicable

**Landscape summary**

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to the location of the site.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No response received.

**Planning and infrastructure assessment****Physical access/road capacity****Near a trunk road?** 

NETWORK MANAGER: Not clear how site would be accessed. Need to consider impact the additional traffic will have

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I am unable to offer my support for this allocation. The surrounding road network, including the junction of Trinity Park and Station Road, is not of a standard suitable for serving a significant level of development such as this. The industrial estate road to the south is not appropriate for shared use with residential traffic.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Currently no bus service provision.

**Right of way**

Adjacent to site

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

Not applicable

**Water supply**

Limited

**Sewerage**

Limited

**Gas Supply**

Yes

**Education provision**

Good

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT:** How would the site be accessed? If via the industrial estate, would have significant concerns. Consultation with EHO recommended (amenity due to the proximity to the industrial estate). Site is however well contained by surrounding landform.

**HOUSING STRATEGY:** Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

**SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW):** Duns WWTW has sufficient capacity and a DIA is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. There are major sewer assets running through this site.

**SCOTTISH WATER (WTW):** Rawburn WTW has sufficient capacity and a Water Impact Assessment is required, to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

**OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM:** Potential for path improvements along disused railway line that runs to sewage works to the east.

**CONTAMINATED LAND:** The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

**NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES:** No response received.

**ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH:** No response received.

**PROJECTS TEAM:** Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT:** We would prefer that this field may be better served as a future employment land expansion site. There is no obvious access for housing expansion, from within the existing housing estates, and will make any vehicular access lengthy and confusing. An access from within the existing industrial access road would not be supported for housing either. This site could be readily accessed for business use from within the industrial estate and have easy access to services already there. Whilst the current estate has some expansion capacity, it is unclear where the longer term future expansion will be directed, so this site should be protected for business use.

**EDUCATION OFFICER:** No capacity issues.

**NHS:** No response received.

**Overall assessment****PP status**

Excluded

**Overall assessment**

Unacceptable

**Site capacity**

100

**Conclusions**

The site was submitted at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process for consideration. The site was considered recently as part of the Housing SG, however was not included. Although the site is preferred in respect of the Landscape Capacity Study, there are a number of constraints associated with the development of this site. These constraints are outlined below;

- Flood Risk Assessment would be required for any development, to investigate flood risk and surface water runoff issues;
- Waterbody within the site, therefore maintenance buffer strip would be required;
- The site is located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Drainage Impact Assessment for WWTW and Water Impact Assessment for WTW;
- Historic Environment Record, 'Mill Dam' lies adjacent to the site; and
- The key greenspace (Duns Railway Line) lies adjacent to the site.

Economic Development have advised that this field may be better served as a future employment land expansion site. There is no obvious access for housing expansion, from within the existing housing estates, and will make any vehicular access lengthy and confusing. The Roads Planning Officer has also raised concerns regarding the access and are unable to support this development. The surrounding road network, including the junction of Trinity Park and Station Road, is not of a standard suitable for serving a significant level of development such as this. The industrial estate road to the south is not appropriate for shared use with residential traffic.

In conclusion, the site was not included within the MIR and is not included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

<b>Site reference</b> ADUNS027	<b>Site name</b> Land north of Preston Road	<b>Settlement</b> Duns	<b>SDA</b> Eastern	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 7	<b>Ha</b> 1.9	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	------------------------------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designation constraint.

SEPA: Due to steep topography through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff. There is the potential that the development could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. The site falls within surface water hazards. Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> On/Adjacent to site	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> Local Plan: (BD15), smaller than the proposed site (Inquiry: BD15 - Page 11-40) Housing SG: (ADUNS026), slightly smaller than the proposed site Local Plan Amendment: (ADUNS009), slightly smaller than the proposed site Local Development Plan: (ADUNS009), slightly smaller than the proposed site LDP2 (ADUNS027): The site was submitted at the 'Pre MIR' stage and the 'MIR Consultation' stage
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response received.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the north east of Duns, outwith the settlement boundary. There is a bus stop on Preston Road, close to the proposed site and there is an existing pavement, which provides a link from the proposed site to the settlement. Duns has good access to public transport, services and employment opportunities. There are regular buses to Berwick-Upon-Tweed, where there is a main train line to Edinburgh and Newcastle. There are also employment opportunities within Eyemouth, which is 14 miles away.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Adjacent to site

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On/adjacent to site

### Garden and designed landscape

On/adjacent to site

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: The proposed site lies adjacent to a series of larger category B listed Victorian house and Duns Episcopal Church. Any development should respect the scale and setting of these houses.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Prehistoric pits have been identified during a watching brief at the east end of the proposed development area. These contained cremated human remains. Further examples are likely in the development area. Archaeological investigation is required.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to the size and location of the site.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No response received.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Already development directly opposite. Need to consider impact of further direct frontage and vehicle access onto A6122 albeit within existing 30 mph limit.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: Whilst I would have no objections to the site being zoned for housing, there is a fairly significant level difference between the site and the public road which will dictate how this site can be developed. It is likely that a linear street frontage with either one or two private access to rear parking areas will have to be created. Alternatively, split level type houses would be an option and these could incorporate direct access to the main road, but car turning provision would be required and this would be difficult to achieve engineering wise. The existing roadside embankment combined with the site being part on the inside of the bend in the road will dictate precise locations for access points.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Consider bus stop provision.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Would this be a single row of housing along the roadside? A single row of housing would reflect existing housing opposite and adjacent; if this is to be the case, then based on OS, the depth of the allocation would appear excessive and should not allow for backland development here given what is in immediate surrounding area.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Duns WWTW has sufficient capacity and sufficient capacity in the network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Raeburn WTW has sufficient capacity and sufficient capacity in the network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No capacity concerns.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Doubtful	7

### Conclusions

The site was previously submitted for consideration as part of the Housing SG and was not taken forward. The site was then submitted at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process and was not included within the MIR for the reasons outlined below. The site was recently re-submitted at the 'MIR consultation' stage, as part of the LDP2 process. It is acknowledged that the agent has submitted a response to the points raised in the previous site assessment conclusion. However, it is not considered that any additional or new information was submitted which required a re-consultation. Therefore, the conclusion from the 'Pre MIR' stage remains valid and is outlined below.

Further to the site assessment, a number of constraints were identified which are outlined below;

- The site is located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Consideration to surface water runoff;
- The site is located within the Designed Landscape 'Duns Castle';
- The site is located within the SBC Designed Landscape 'Duns';
- The site is constrained within the Landscape Capacity Study;
- There are a number of Historic Environment Records identified within the site;
- The site lies adjacent to the Category C listed building, 'Wellfield Cottage'; and
- Archaeological investigations are required.

The additional information submitted by the agent at the 'MIR Consultation' stage, was in response to the above constraints and the previous site assessment conclusion. The points raised by the agent have been acknowledged. However, it is not considered that any additional information has been submitted, which would materially alter the previous conclusions, including the landscape capacity concerns.

Information was previously submitted by the agent, regarding the designed landscape, including photographs. In respect of landscape and visual impacts, the bank rises up steeply and therefore, any development would be quite a prominent addition to the settlement in terms of visual impact. It is therefore doubtful as to how well the site would integrate within the landscape. A slightly smaller site boundary was considered as part of the Local Plan Inquiry, where the Reporter endorsed the Council's assessment that its development would have an adverse impact on the views, character and setting of Duns and would unnecessarily elongate the town away from local services and facilities.

It is considered that the Proposed LDP includes sufficient housing, re-development and longer term mixed use sites within Duns. Furthermore, it is considered that there is limited capacity within the Proposed LDP, for an additional housing allocation within Duns, given the number of housing units currently within the housing land supply. In respect of the further information submitted regarding the deliverability of existing allocations, it should be noted that existing allocations were reviewed as part of the MIR process.

In conclusion the site was not included within the Main Issues Report and taking the above into consideration, the site has not been included within the Proposed Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b> MDUNS003	<b>Site name</b> Land South of Earlsmeadow	<b>Settlement</b> Duns	<b>SDA</b> Eastern	<b>Proposed Use</b> Mixed Use	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 180	<b>Ha</b> 11.2	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designation constraints.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the potentially culverted small watercourse which is identified as being located along the northern boundary. We do not support development over culverts that are to remain active. We would note that the OS Map identifies this area as boggy which may constrain development. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues at this site or immediately adjacent. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. There is the potential that the development of this allocation could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There are Surface Water Hazards within the site.

Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network however for a development of this scale it is likely that the foul network and STW will require upgrading. SW should confirm. There appears to be a marshy area in the northern corner of the site which may be drained to culverts under the site. Any such culverts should be deculverted as part of any development. Confirmation should be made that this is not a Groundwater Dependant Terrestrial Ecosystem.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is within the surface water 1 in 200 year flood extent. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. I would, however, ask that due to the size of the development that surface water flooding is considered and it is ensured that any water would be routed around the housing. Drainage Impact Assessment/SUDS.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> On/Adjacent to site	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> Local Development Plan: (SDUNS001) - identified within the LDP as a potential longer term mixed use site. Housing SG: (MDUNS003) - exact same site boundary as part of the Housing SG.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response to date. However, the Ecology Officer was consulted as part of the Housing SG and offered the following comments. Arable field hedgerow and occasional boundary tree. No significant biodiversity issues. Minor biodiversity impacts.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is good in terms of access to public transport, access to services and access to employment. It is relatively close to the centre of Duns and is good in terms of employment

potential. There are regular buses to Berwick Upon Tweed where there is a main train line to Edinburgh and Newcastle upon Tyne. There are employment opportunities within Duns and within nearby settlements. However, there is a lack of connectivity opportunities to the north and east of the site, with the existing housing allocations, given that the proposed site excludes a parcel of land to the east, which is identified within the longer term mixed use site (SDUNS001). The result is that there is a gap between the proposed site and the existing housing allocations to the east. Therefore, this will prove difficult to make linkages to the north and east from the site.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On/adjacent to site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE AND DESIGN: This is a significant development in terms of scale and issues about off site infrastructure may need to be considered (over and above education) to ensure that there is an active town centre. Boundary treatment, phasing and external colours will be important issues as well as physical and visual connections to Duns. Planning or development brief is required.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: There is cropmark evidence of an archaeological site within the LDP area. This increases the potential of the site overall. Archaeological investigation is likely. Preservation in situ of the known site is preferred.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: SNH provided the following response and advised that this site is part of the site MDUNS004 which is also under consideration. While this site lies outwith the current settlement boundary, we note that it is included in the LDP as a longer term safeguarded site (SDUNS001). If you are minded to support development of this site during the current plan period, further detailed assessment and a site brief will be required. However, we highlight the potential to ensure retention of existing paths in the northern section of the site and the potential to deliver an important green network connection between the Public Park and Duns High School.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No response to date. However, the Landscape Officer was consulted as part of the Housing SG, as part of (MDUNS003) and offered the following comments. This site has potential for development. However, it lacks adequate road connection and bears no particular relation to the settlement pattern of Duns. It could therefore look visually intrusive in the wider rural setting. (Structure planting could help mitigate this but would also create local shading issues for adjoining houses as the planting would need to be on the S and W sides thus tending to block light.) There may be other locations around Duns that are more suitable for development.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: Question the access to main road.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: This area is currently identified as an area for longer term development within the current Local Development Plan. I have no objection to this land being allocated for mixed use development, the main vehicular access being from the A6015 via the existing allocated site to the north west (ADUNS023). A minor access link is possible via the A6112 and Station Avenue. Good pedestrian and cycle linkage is critical in terms of sustainable transport. Allowance must be made for future street connectivity beyond this development and the possibility of a distributor/relief road linking the A6105 and the A6112 south of Cheeklaw needs to be considered for the longer term expansion of the town. A Transport Assessment will be a prerequisite for the development of this site.

### Near a trunk road?

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Bus infrastructure required.

<b>Right of way</b>	<b>TPOs</b>	<b>Contaminated land</b>	<b>Water supply</b>	<b>Sewerage</b>	<b>Gas Supply</b>	<b>Education provision</b>
On/adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	Limited	Limited	Yes	Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Logical direction of development given recent housing development in Duns, along with overlapping MDUNS004 & MDUNS005 would require master planning, to ascertain best areas for different uses. Strong landscaping framework required. Site would be appropriate.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Duns WWTW has sufficient capacity and a Drainage Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Raeburn WTW has sufficient capacity and a Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Vehicular access to the site needs further consideration with potential upgrading of the road network at Clockmill or potentially through the industrial estate required. The existing access path to the school and public park has recently been upgraded and therefore would provide good non-vehicular access to the site. The area is prone to flooding. (2016 HSG Consultation).

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development on this site.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: We have no objections but would appreciate some clarification of what is proposed as mixed use, beyond the planned events space, and the location and area proposed for non-housing use.

EDUCATION OFFICER: Extension or new school required. However, the response does not specify whether a primary or secondary school.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

<b>PP status</b>	<b>Overall assessment</b>	<b>Site capacity</b>
Excluded	Doubtful	180

## Conclusions

The site was submitted at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process for consideration. The site forms part of the longer term mixed use site (SDUNS001) which is currently identified within the adopted LDP. The entire mixed use site (MDUNS004) and a phase of the site (MDUNS005) were also being considered as part of the LDP2 process. It should be noted that all three of the sites were recently considered for inclusion within the Housing SG and none were taken forward.

The site has good access to public services, employment and public transport. Furthermore, the site would result in minimal visual impact from the entrance to Duns. The site has good integration and connectivity with the existing settlement. The following constraints and mitigation would be needed to be considered as part of any development;

- A Flood Risk Assessment would be required to assess any potential flood risk and mitigation as required;
- There is a lack of opportunities for connectivity and integration to the north east of the site, given the omission of the corner of the longer term mixed use site within the LDP;
- Drainage Impact Assessment (WWTW) and Water Impact Assessment (WIA);
- The site leaves a gap between the potential developable site and the existing housing allocation (ADUNS010) and (BD4B) to the east, therefore there is a lack of integration and connectivity;
- Potential archaeology within the site, HER record identified for 'Gruedykes', therefore appropriate investigations and mitigation would be required;
- Structure planting would be required along the southern and western boundary to mitigate any adverse visual impacts within the wider area;
- The opportunity to connect into the existing path network is restricted due to omitting the north east part of the larger site;
- The site is located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural Land; and
- There is a current requirement as part of the LDP for the provision for a tourism events area to facilitate tourism events which must be met.

In conclusion, it is considered that there are constraints with the site boundary proposed, with the omission of the north east/east part of the site, which results in a lack of integration and connectivity. This also presents issues in terms of connecting in with the existing path networks. The site was not included within the MIR. In conclusion, taking the above into consideration the site is not included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b> MDUNS004	<b>Site name</b> South of Earlsmeadow	<b>Settlement</b> Duns	<b>SDA</b> Eastern	<b>Proposed Use</b> Mixed Use	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 200	<b>Ha</b> 16.1	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	------------------------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designation constraints.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the potentially culverted small watercourse which is identified as being located along the northern boundary. We do not support development over culverts that are to remain active. We would note that the OS Map identifies this area as boggy which may constrain development. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues at this site or immediately adjacent. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. There is the potential that development on this site could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. A Surface Water Hazard has been identified at this site.

There are sewerage treatment capacity issues and network capacity issues. Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network however for a development of this scale it is likely that the foul network and STW will require upgrading. SW should confirm. There appears to be a marshy area in the northern corner of the site which may be drained to culverts under the site. Any such culverts should be de-culverted as part of any development. Confirmation should be made that this is not a Groundwater Dependant Terrestrial Ecosystem.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The site is within the surface water 1 in 200 year flood extent. I would have no objection to the proposal on the grounds of flood risk. I would however ask that due to the size of the development that surface water flooding is considered and it is ensured that water would be routed around housing. Drainage Impact Assessment/SUDS.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> On/Adjacent to site	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> Local Development Plan: (SDUNS001) - identified within the LDP as a potential longer term mixed use site Housing SG: (MDUNS004) - exact same site boundary considered as part of the Housing SG
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response to date. However, the Ecology Officer was consulted as part of the Housing SG and offered the following comments. Arable field and improved pastures. Hedgerow and occasional boundary tree. Wetland area of N of the site, need to safeguard as identified in LDP (real extent of wetland varies from LDP policy map). Moderate biodiversity impact.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is acceptable in terms of access to services and public transport. It is relatively close to the centre of Duns and has good employment potential. There are regular buses to

Berwick Upon Tweed where there is a main train line to Edinburgh and Newcastle upon Tyne. There are employment opportunities within Duns and within nearby settlements. The site might provide habitats for biodiversity. There is an area of marshy grassland/wet meadow which runs from the park across towards the new high school.

## Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area	Open space	Listed buildings	Scheduled Monument	Ancient woodland inventory	Archaeology	Garden and designed landscape
Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	On/adjacent to site	Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE AND DESIGN: This is a significant development in terms of scale and issues about off site infrastructure may need to be considered (over and above education) to ensure that there is an active town centre. Boundary treatment, phasing and external colours will be important issues as well as physical and visual connections to Duns. Planning or development brief is required.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: There is cropmark evidence of an archaeological site within the LDP area. This increases the potential of the site overall. Archaeological investigation is likely. Preservation in situ of the known site is preferred.

## Landscape assessment

NSA	SLA	Over 200 metres?	Over 12 degree slope	Wild Land
Not applicable	Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: While this site lies outwith the current settlement boundary, we note that it is included in the LDP as a longer-term safeguarded site (SDUNS001). If you are minded to support development of this site during the current plan period, further detailed assessment and a site brief will be required. However, we highlight the potential to ensure retention of existing paths in the northern section of the site and the potential to deliver an important green network connection between the Public Park and Duns High School.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: Significant issue with this one because it includes a large area of semi natural wetland on the north side. This should be excluded and the boundary re-drawn, possibly with a small separate area of developable land by the Earlsmeadow garages.

No major concerns about developing the arable land to the south other than loss to agriculture but site is also isolated and would require significant road infrastructure which might also create environmental issues! If this area is to be developed then 'permeable' structure planting (i.e. planting with gaps for views) should be provided along the western boundary.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Question the access onto the main road.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: This area is currently identified as an area for longer term development within the current Local Development Plan. I have no objection to this land being allocated for mixed use development, the main vehicular access being from the A6015 via the existing allocated site to the north west (ADUNS023). A minor access link is possible via the A6112 and Station Avenue. Good pedestrian and cycle linkage is critical in terms of sustainable transport. Allowance must be made for future street connectivity beyond this development and the possibility of a distributor/relief road linking the A6105 and the A6112 south of Cheeklaw needs to be considered for the longer term expansion of the town. A Transport Assessment will be a prerequisite for the development of this site.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Bus infrastructure required.

**Right of way**

On/adjacent to site

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

Not applicable

**Water supply**

Limited

**Sewerage**

Limited

**Gas Supply**

Yes

**Education provision****Planning & infrastructure summary**

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Logical direction of development given recent housing development in Duns, along with overlapping MDUNS003 and MDUNS005 would require master planning to ascertain best areas for different uses, strong landscaping framework needed and the site would be appropriate.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Duns WWTW has sufficient capacity and a Drainage Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Rawburn WTW has sufficient capacity and a Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Vehicular access to the site needs further consideration with potential upgrading of the road network at Clockmill or potentially through the industrial estate required. The existing access path to the school and public park has recently been upgraded and therefore would provide good non-vehicular access to the site. The area is prone to flooding. (2016 HSG Consultation).

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: We have no objections but would appreciate some clarification of what is proposed as mixed use, beyond the planned events space, and the location and area proposed for non-housing use.

EDUCATION: Extension or New School may need to be considered. However, the response does not specify whether the primary or secondary school.

NHS: No response received.

**Overall assessment****PP status**

Excluded

**Overall assessment**

Acceptable

**Site capacity**

200

**Conclusions**

The site was submitted at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process for consideration. The site is currently identified within the adopted LDP for longer term mixed use development potential (SDUNS001). A phase of this site is also being considered as part of this process (MDUNS005) to the north and (MDUNS003) which occupies an area to the west. It should be noted that all three of these sites were recently considered for inclusion within the Housing SG and none were taken forward as part of that process.

The site has good access to public services, employment and public transport. Furthermore, the site would result in minimal visual impact from the entrance to Duns. The site has good integration and connectivity with the existing settlement. The following constraints and mitigation would need to be considered as part of any development;

- Flood Risk Assessment would be required;
- There is an existing wetland area in the north east corner of the site, there would be a requirement to safeguard this;
- The site is located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Potential archaeology within the site, HER record identified for 'Grueldykes', therefore appropriate investigations and mitigation would be required;
- Structure planting and landscaping would be required along the southern and western boundaries of the site;
- Should this site be delivered, there would be school capacity constraints;
- There is a current requirement as part of the LDP for the provision for a tourism events area to facilitate tourism events which must be met;
- Drainage Impact Assessment for WWTW and Water Impact Assessment for WTW;
- Minor drainage issues which would need to be addressed and
- Respect the area of greenspace adjacent to the site, 'Duns Park'.

The Roads Planning Officer raised no objections to the development of this site, with the main access being taken from the A6015 through the existing housing allocation (ADUNS023), with a potential minor

link through Station Avenue to the south east. A Transport Assessment would be required for any development.

The smaller Phase 1 site (MDUNS005) was included as an alternative option within the Main Issues Report. The reason for this being, it was considered that the southern part of the site could be retained for potential future mixed use development and released in subsequent Local Plans.

However, further to the MIR consultation, it is considered that there is sufficient housing land supply within Duns for the Proposed LDP period. Therefore, the site (MDUNS004) is not included within the Proposed LDP. Likewise, the sites (MDUNS005) & (MDUNS006) are not included either.

---

<b>Site reference</b> MDUNS005	<b>Site name</b> South of Earlsmeadow (Phase 1)	<b>Settlement</b> Duns	<b>SDA</b> Eastern	<b>Proposed Use</b> Mixed Use	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 100	<b>Ha</b> 9.4	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designation constraint.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the potentially culverted small watercourse which is identified as being located along the northern boundary. We do not support development over culverts that are to remain active. We would note that the OS Map identifies this area as boggy which may constrain development. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues at this site or immediately adjacent. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. There is the potential that development of this site could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There are also identified surface water hazard within the site.

Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network however for a development of this scale it is likely that the foul network and STW will require upgrading. SW should confirm. There appears to be a marshy area in the northern corner of the site which may be drained to culverts under the site. Any such culverts should be removed as part of any development. Confirmation should be made that this is not a Groundwater Dependant Terrestrial Ecosystem.

SEPA (MIR Consultation additional comments): In addition to the comments above, SEPA offer the following comments. They advise that recent studies have not identified the exact location of the culvert. SEPA also understand that land-raising done as part of the high school development may have alter flooding and flow-paths.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The site is within the surface water 1 in 200 year flood extent. I would have no objection to the proposal on the grounds of flood risk. I would however ask that due to the size of the development that surface water flooding is considered and it is ensured that water would be routed around housing. DIA/SUDS.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> On/Adjacent to site	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> Local Development Plan: (SDUNS001) - identified within the LDP as a potential longer term mixed use site Housing SG: (MDUNS005) - exact same site boundary considered as part of the Housing SG
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response to date. However, the Ecology Officer was consulted on this site as part of the Housing SG and offered the following comments. 'Arable field and improved pastures.

Hedgerow and occasional boundary tree. Wetland area at north of the site, need to safeguard as identified in the LDP (real extent of wetland varies from LDP policy map). Moderate biodiversity impact'.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is acceptable in terms of access to services and public transport. It is relatively close to the centre of Duns and has good employment potential. There are regular buses to Berwick Upon Tweed where there is a main train line to Edinburgh and Newcastle upon Tyne. There are employment opportunities within Duns and within nearby settlements. The site might provide habitats for biodiversity. There is an area of marshy grassland/wet meadow which runs from the park across towards the new high school.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	On/adjacent to site	Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE AND DESIGN: Boundary treatment, phasing and external colours will be important issues as well as physical and visual connections to Duns.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding development on this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: There is cropmark evidence of an archaeological site within the LDP area. This increases the potential of the site overall. Archaeological investigation is likely. Preservation in situ of the known site is preferred.

---

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable			Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: As part of the longer term safeguarded site (SDUNS001), this site should be subject to the same consideration. If you are minded to support development of this site during the current plan period, further detailed assessment and a site brief will be required.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: Significant issue with this one because it includes a large area of semi natural wetland on the north side. This should be excluded and the boundary re-drawn, possibly with a small separate area of developable land by the Earlsmeadow garages.

No major concerns about developing the arable land to the south other than loss to agriculture but site is also isolated and would require significant road infrastructure which might also create environmental issues! If this area is to be developed then 'permeable' structure planting (i.e. planting with gaps for views) should be provided along the western boundary.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

<b>Physical access/road capacity</b>	<b>Near a trunk road?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------

NETWORK MANAGER: Access to main road?

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: This area is currently identified as an area for longer term development within the current Local Development Plan. I have no objection to this land being allocated for mixed use development, the main vehicular access being from the A6015 via the existing allocated site to the north west (ADUNS023). A minor access link is possible via the A6112 and Station Avenue. Good pedestrian and cycle linkage is critical in terms of sustainable transport. Allowance must be made for future street connectivity beyond this development and the possibility of a distributor/relief road linking the A6105 and the A6112 south of Cheeklaw needs to be considered for the longer term expansion of the town. A Transport Assessment will be a prerequisite for the development of this site.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Bus infrastructure required.

**Right of way**

On/adjacent to site

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

Not applicable

**Water supply**

Limited

**Sewerage**

Limited

**Gas Supply**

Yes

**Education provision**

Good

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Logical direction of development given the recent housing developments in Duns, along with overlapping MDUNS003 and MDUNS005, would require master planning, to ascertain best areas for different uses, strong landscaping framework needed and would be appropriate.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Duns WWTW has sufficient capacity and a Drainage Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Rawburn WTW has sufficient capacity and a Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Vehicular access to the site needs further consideration with potential upgrading of the road network at Clockmill or potentially through the industrial estate required. The existing access path to the school and public park has recently been upgraded and therefore would provide good non-vehicular access to the site. The area is prone to flooding. (2016 HSG Consultation).

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: We have no objections but would appreciate some clarification of what is proposed as mixed use, beyond the planned events space, and the location and area proposed for non-housing use.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

**Overall assessment****PP status**

Excluded

**Overall assessment**

Acceptable

**Site capacity**

100

**Conclusions**

The site was submitted at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process for consideration. The site is currently identified within the adopted LDP, as part of the longer term mixed use site (SDUNS001). The entire longer term mixed use site was also considered as part of this process (MDUNS004), along with (MDUNS003) which occupies an area to the west. It should be noted that all three of these sites were recently considered for inclusion within the Housing SG and none were taken forward as part of that process.

The site has good access to public services, employment and public transport. Furthermore, the site would result in minimal visual impact from the entrance to Duns. The site has good integration and connectivity with the existing settlement. The following constraints and mitigation would need to be considered as part of any development;

- Flood Risk Assessment would be required;
- There is an existing wetland area to the north east corner of the site, there would be a requirement to safeguard this;
- The Landscape Officer suggests removing the wetland area from any formal allocation;
- The site is located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Drainage Impact Assessment (WWTW) & Water Impact Assessment (WTW);
- Potential archaeology within the site and appropriate mitigation would be likely;
- Transport Assessment would be required;
- Structure planting and landscaping would be required in order to mitigate any visual impacts as a result of the development;
- There is a requirement for an events area to facilitate tourism events within this site and the larger mixed use longer term site;
- There is adequate access via the A6015 through the existing housing allocation (ADUNS023) and also a minor access through Station Avenue to the east. Access for this site would be required through the allocations (ADUNS023) and (ADUNS010);

- Minor drainage issues which would need to be addressed; and
- The development must respect the area of greenspace adjacent to the site, 'Duns Park'.

It was considered that the release of Phase 1 (MDUNS005) if any, would be sufficient for the Proposed Plan period and this site was included as an alternative option within the MIR. This would have allowed the southern part of the site to be retained for potential future mixed use development and released in subsequent Local Plans.

There were not considered to be any insurmountable reasons nor constraints to prevent the site from being included. However, in deciding which of the many MIR sites were ultimately included within the Proposed LDP, consideration was given to a range of factors. These include, for example, the housing land requirement, any developer interest in the site, provision of local facilities/services, comparison with other sites submitted. Further to the MIR consultation, it was considered that there is sufficient housing land supply within Duns for the Proposed LDP period. Therefore, the site (MDUNS005) is not included within the Proposed Plan, likewise the sites (MDUNS003) and (MDUNS004) are not included either. It is acknowledged that the site could be considered again for inclusion in a future LDP.

---

# Eyemouth

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
<b>AEYEM001</b>	Land West of Eyemouth	Eyemouth	Eastern	Housing	120	5.4	<b>Excluded</b>

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable				

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any International/National designation constraints.

SEPA: We require a FRA which assesses the risk from the Biglaw Burn (and tributary) which flows on the boundary of the site. Consideration should also be given to the interaction with the Eye Water as well as bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site which may exacerbate flood risk. Due to steep topography through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff. There are surface water hazards identified within the site. There is the potential that development on this site could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There are Surface Water Hazards within the site.

There is a water body within, forming part of the site boundary, or immediately adjacent to the site. Therefore, SEPA request that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

Foul must connect to the existing SW foul network. There is a small burn to the south of the development site that should be protected and enhanced as part of any development. This could include realigning what appears to be straightened channel around the site.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT OFFICER: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. Due to the size of the development I'd recommend surface water runoff, drainage and SUDS be considered. DIA/SUDS.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	On/Adjacent to site	Greenfield	Local Plan: (BEY8D), included the site currently under consideration. Local Plan Inquiry (Page 11-48) Housing SG: (AEYEM001), exact same site as currently under consideration. (Stage 1 RAG assessment only) LDP: (AEYEM010), included the site currently under consideration LPA: (AEYEM001), exact same site as currently under consideration

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Good	Good	Good	Minor	Not applicable

## Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response received.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the south of Eyemouth, along the southern fringe of the settlement. There are a number of bus stops within Eyemouth and there is a pavement into Eyemouth along the roadside, however pedestrian access would have to be improved to ensure safe walking into the town. The nearest railway station is Berwick-Upon-Tweed, located 9 miles away. The site would have good access to two employment sites within Eyemouth and the High School. Eyemouth overall has good access to public transport, access to services and access to employment. The site could potentially encourage car use due to its distance from the town centre.

## Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area	Open space	Listed buildings	Scheduled Monument	Ancient woodland inventory	Archaeology	Garden and designed landscape
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

## Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE AND DESIGN: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: No known archaeological issues.

## Landscape assessment

NSA	SLA	Over 200 metres?	Over 12 degree slope	Wild Land
Not applicable	Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not applicable

## Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No response received.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No response received.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity	Near a trunk road?
	<input type="checkbox"/>

NETWORK MANAGER: New access required onto B6355. Also need to ensure junction with A1107 could still operate without necessity for a right turn lane.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: There appears to be no suitable point of access and so I have to recommend against the allocation of the site for housing at this stage. The housing layout for Gillsland did not allow for integration with possible future development.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Possible bus stop infrastructure and contribution towards a bus service.

Right of way	TPOs	Contaminated land	Water supply	Sewerage	Gas Supply	Education provision
Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	Limited	Limited	Yes	

## Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No response to date.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Eyemouth WWTW has sufficient capacity and a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Rawburn WTW has sufficient capacity and a Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. It should be noted that there is a 180mm water main running through the site.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Enhancement to Core Path 59 to the east would be recommended linking into the wider path network.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

EDUCATION OFFICER: Extension or new school may need to be considered. However, the response does not specify whether a primary or secondary school.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	120

## Conclusions

The site was submitted at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process for consideration. This site was previously considered for inclusion as part of the Housing SG, however was not taken forward for inclusion. There are a number of constraints identified with the development of this site, which are highlighted below;

- A Flood Risk Assessment would be required;
- There is a water body within/adjacent to this site;
- Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) for WWTW and Water Impact Assessment (WIA) for WTW;
- Consideration would need to be given to the identified Surface Water Hazards within the site;
- The site is located within Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- The site would have limited visual impacts on the settlement itself, however would be prominent from the approach road which leads in from Ayton; and
- The Roads Planning Officer raised concerns with the site, on the grounds that there is not a suitable access point. Therefore, recommend that the site is not included as an option within the MIR.

The applicant submitted further supporting information since the Housing SG, in respect of existing undeveloped allocations within Eyemouth. It should be noted that all existing allocations within the LDP were subject to review as part of this MIR process. There is no suitable access point, therefore, this matter alone prohibits the development of housing on this site. The site was not included within the MIR. In conclusion, taking the above into consideration the site is not included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b> BEY1	<b>Site name</b> Barefoots	<b>Settlement</b> Eyemouth	<b>SDA</b> Eastern	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 20	<b>Ha</b> 1.3	<b>PP status</b> Remove LDP Site
-------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------

## Initial assessment

**Floodrisk**      **SAC**      **SPA**      **SSSI**      **Ramsar**

### Initial assessment summary

This an existing housing allocation within the LDP, which was subject to a review as part of the MIR process.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> Local Plan: (BEY1), housing allocation site (Inquiry Report Pages 11-45) LDP: (BEY1), housing allocation site LPA: (AEYEM002), larger housing site considered
--------------------------	------------	----------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

**Access to public transport**      **Access to employment**      **Access to services**      **Wider biodiversity impacts**      **Site aspect**

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
--------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------------

### Local impact and integration summary

## Landscape assessment

**NSA**      **SLA**      **Over 200 metres?**       **Over 12 degree slope**       **Wild Land**

## Landscape summary

---

### Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

Right of way

TPOs

Contaminated land

Water supply

Sewerage

Gas Supply

Education provision

### Planning & infrastructure summary

---

### Overall assessment

PP status

Overall assessment

Site capacity

Remove LDP Site

20

### Conclusions

The site is currently allocated for housing within the adopted Local Development Plan (BEY1), with an indicative site capacity of 20 units. The site was allocated within the 1994 Berwickshire Local Plan. The site was granted planning consent for 20 units (06/00611/OUT) and a renewal application was submitted in 2010 (10/00516/PPP). However, the renewal application was subsequently withdrawn. Further to this, planning application (14/01282/FUL) was submitted for the change of use of land to form an extension to the existing holiday park. The application was refused planning consent for the following reason: 'The proposal would be contrary to Policy H3 of the Consolidated Local Plan in that the proposed change of use of land would result in the loss of allocated housing land which is required to meet the housing land requirement for the Berwickshire Housing Market Area' and 'The proposal would be contrary to Policy Inf3 of the Consolidated Local Plan in that the proposed development would give rise to road safety concerns with additional traffic to the park requiring to access residential streets rather than utilising the existing park entrance and access route'. The application was subject to a Local Review Body appeal and was refused planning consent. A further planning application (16/01058/FUL) was submitted for a change of use of land to form an extension to the existing holiday park. The Local Authority declined to determine the application.

All the existing allocations within the LDP were subject to review, as part of the MIR process and a letter was sent to the landowner of the site. The landowner wrote back to the Council advising they have no objections to the site being removed from the LDP as a housing allocation. They support the removal of the allocated site as they consider that it could be more realistically developed in conjunction with their holiday park. The owner indicated they have tried for several years to develop the site for housing, actively marketed the site for 8 years, including a fresh market exercise when the original consent was renewed, and no interest has been received from developers to take the site forward.

Taking the above into consideration, it is the Council's intention to remove the housing allocation (BEY1). The site was included within the MIR for removal and has ultimately not been taken forward for inclusion within the Proposed Plan. However, it should be noted that the site will remain within the Development Boundary.

---

<b>Site reference</b> MEYEM002	<b>Site name</b> Land to North West of Eyemouth	<b>Settlement</b> Eyemouth	<b>SDA</b> Eastern	<b>Proposed Use</b> Mixed Use	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 200	<b>Ha</b> 10.5	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any International/National designation constraint.

SEPA: Part of adjacent site was built without SEPA consultation. For any further development we require a detailed FRA which assesses the risk from the North Burn. We would not support any further development which increases the flood risk to existing/proposed development. Any further development will likely be heavily constrained as a result of the current development. Due to steep topography through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff. There is the potential that the development of this site could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a Surface Water Hazard identified within the site.

There is a water body within, forming part of the site boundary, or immediately adjacent to the site. Therefore, SEPA request that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

Foul must connect to the existing SW foul network. There is a small burn to the south of the development site that should be protected and enhanced as part of any development. Any surface water discharging into the North burn should be carefully treated (enhanced SUDS) to ensure protection of the bathing water. (north burn discharges onto the bathing beach).

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The site is outwith both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to the proposal on the grounds of flood risk. Due to the size of the development, I would recommend that surface water runoff, drainage and SUDS are considered. We would request a Drainage Assessment for this site and also SUDS to be included.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> On site	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> Housing SG: (MEYEM002) - exact same settlement boundary as was considered Local Development Plan: (AEYEM009) - exact same settlement boundary as was considered, however proposed for housing
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response received.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located on the western edge of the settlement. Eyemouth has good access to public transport, employment and access to services. There is a bus stop on the A1147 and the nearest railway station is Berwick-Upon-Tweed, located 9 miles away. The site is located on the western edge, therefore the additional services and amenities may be slightly further away and may result in car journeys.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Currently the site appears to be detached from the settlement; boundary treatment and connections (both physical and visual) will be important issues. The site is also on high land and care will be needed with the selection of external colours.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: The proposed LDP site contains an archaeological site of likely regional, and potentially national, significance. The northern 1/3 of the area contains cropmarks comprising a prehistoric enclosure, buildings and field systems. Preservation in situ is preferred mitigation for this site, and on this basis I recommend that this site not be taken forward for the LDP.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No response received.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No response received.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Likely to impact on existing location of 30 mph limit.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I have concern over extending development westwards out of Eyemouth as there appears to be no defendable boundary to limit the extent of development in this direction. I also have concerns about the speed of traffic approaching Eyemouth along the A1107 due to the straight downhill nature of the road. I may be able to support some residential development, preferably on an easterly portion of the site only, but only if development is well integrated with development site BEY2B to the south east which would have to be developed first. The street lighting and footway infrastructure would have to be extended along the A1107 as would the 30 mph speed limit. A strong street frontage onto the A1107 would be required to create a sense of arrival into the town and to justify the extension of the 30 mph speed limit. A Transport Assessment would be required to address accessibility and sustainable transport.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Possible bus stop infrastructure and contribution towards a bus service.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Limited

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Berwickshire HMA

Eyemouth

MEYEM002

## Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No response to date.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Eyemouth WWTW has sufficient capacity and a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. It should be noted that there is a rising sewer running through the site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Rawburn WTW has sufficient capacity and a Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: This would appear to be creating an over allocation of zoned housing land in terms of the current allocations available and existing demand in the town. However, should the site be allocated we would support any mixed use proposals which create employment opportunities. This, however, should be determined early on in terms of best location size of site specified and the form of the mixed use.

EDUCATION OFFICER: An extension or new school may need to be considered. However, the response does not specify whether a primary or secondary school.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Doubtful	200

## Conclusions

The site was submitted at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process for consideration as mixed use. This site was considered as part of the Housing SG and was not included. It is considered that there is a sufficient housing land supply within the Proposed LDP for Eyemouth, given the slow take up of sites recently due to the market conditions.

There are a number of constraints with the development of this site, including;

- Requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment;
- Surface Water Hazards within the site;
- There is a water body within/adjacent to the site;
- The site is located in an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Drainage Impact Assessment for WWTW and Water Impact Assessment for WTW;
- There is archaeological constraints within the site. As a result, the Archaeology Officer has advised that the site is not taken forward for inclusion within the MIR as an option;
- The site is constrained within the Landscape Capacity Study. The LCS states that development on this site would be visually prominent and exposed. The site is constrained by the lack of shelter and likely visual impact of development, which would breach the ridges and skyline which provides strategic containment for the settlement;
- The Roads Planning Service raised concerns regarding the extension of the development westwards; and
- A Transport Assessment would be required for any development.

The applicant submitted further supporting information since the Housing SG, in respect of existing undeveloped allocations within Eyemouth. It should be noted that all existing allocations within the LDP were subject to review as part of the LDP2 process. It is considered that development in such a location has the potential to result in adverse impacts upon the wider landscape and visual context of the area. The site was not included within the MIR as an option. In conclusion, taking the above into consideration the site is not included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

<b>Site reference</b> REYEM007	<b>Site name</b> Former Town Hall	<b>Settlement</b> Eyemouth	<b>SDA</b> Eastern	<b>Proposed Use</b> Redevelopment	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> N/A	<b>Ha</b> 0.1	<b>PP status</b> Included
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any identified International/National designation constraint.

SEPA: We require a FRA which assesses the risk from coastal still water as well as overtopping processes and any interactions with the Eye Water. Redevelopment to a similar or less sensitive use would be supported by SEPA. An increase in vulnerability would only be supported if a detailed FRA can demonstrate the site is free from flood risk and there is safe access/egress available. Sewer flooding will also require consideration. Site may be constrained due to flood risk. There is a surface water hazard within the site. There is fluvial/coastal risk of flooding adjacent to the site. Potential development of the allocation could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere.

SEPA advise that flooding along Church Street in 2009, 2013 and 2015 due to inadequate sewer capacity. There is a photo of flooding to Church Street in the Borders Advertiser (<https://www.berwick-advertiser.co.uk/news/flood-investigation-works-in-eyemouth-1-4794741>). Albert Road affected as well. There has been a coastal overtopping study for Eyemouth commissioned by SBC and undertaken by Royal Haskoning. The 1:200 year coastal flood outline has flooding along Church Street. There was an extreme fluvial event which affected large areas of the Borders in 1948. There is mention of flood waters reaching the second floor of Dundee House which is at the very end of Church Street.

Foul water must connect to the public foul sewer.

SEPA (MIR Consultation comments): SEPA commented on the MIR Consultation, however provided no additional comments further to above.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site does not lie within the SEPA 1 in 200 year fluvial (river) or pluvial (surface water) flood extent. I would have no objections on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Combination	<b>Planning history references</b> There have been a variety of planning applications in the past which related to the listed building and the use of the buildings.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Town hall building may support bats and breeding birds. Local habitat is of low suitability for foraging and commuting bats. Mitigation for protected species potentially including bats and breeding birds. (earlier planning application 16/00694/FUL). Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located within the town centre. Eyemouth has good access to public transport, employment and access to services. There is a bus stop on the A1147 and the nearest railway station is Berwick-Upon-Tweed, located 9 miles away.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
On/adjacent to site	Not applicable	On/adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	On/adjacent to site	Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: The whole of the town hall, including the rear hall is listed category B. The primary architectural interest lies in the front building. A scheme was approved some years ago to retain the front building and demolish and redevelop the rear part. Sensitive redevelopment of the site would be welcomed.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: HES would be supportive of redevelopment that retains the special interest of the B-listed building. We are content with the removal of the rear hall.

(MIR Consultation comments): Redevelopment of the site has potential for positive and negative effects on our statutory interests, dependent on detailed proposals in each case. In general, we are supportive of regeneration proposals which seek to protect and enhance the special characteristics of historic environment assets, and to secure a sustainable use for them, and would be content with the allocation of the preferred sites on this basis.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Within the medieval town core. Lands around the site may contain medieval and post-medieval archaeology. Mitigation may be required.

---

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable			Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to size, location and nature of site.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No response received.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

<b>Physical access/road capacity</b>	<b>Near a trunk road?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------

NETWORK MANAGER: Junction sight lines not ideal. Private road?

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I have no objection to the redevelopment of this site. The site benefits from its town centre location meaning it has good access to local services including town centre parking and public transport provision. Parking provision will have to be carefully considered for any development which would create more traffic than the building in its previous use.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

**Right of way**

Adjacent to site

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

Not applicable

**Water supply**

Yes

**Sewerage**

Yes

**Gas Supply**

Yes

**Education provision**

Good

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT:** My interpretation of the listing for the former Town Hall is that the entire building is listed, including the hall, which is presumably located at the rear. Impacts on the character and integrity of the listed building will be a key consideration and any development proposals coming forward must conserve, protect, and enhance the character, integrity and setting of the listed building. The special interest of the building is undoubtedly the Scot's Baronial frontage on Church Street, turning onto Renton Terrace. Whilst this part of the building would need to be protected, there may be opportunities for wholesale redevelopment further to the rear. Alongside protecting the historic and architectural interest of the building, any development proposals must also address potential residential amenity impacts (chiefly, loss of light and sunlight, and privacy) to the properties to the north, and in the vicinity of the site. Parking is likely to be a key consideration at this site and ecological surveys may be required. Notwithstanding the above, I would support the principle of allocating this site for redevelopment to help promote the site and ensure a suitable future use is found for it.

**HOUSING STRATEGY:** Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

**SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW):** There is sufficient capacity at the Eyemouth WWTW. No surface water into the combined sewer. Scottish Water surface water policy should be adhered to and a solution required for this site.

**SCOTTISH WATER (WTW):** There is sufficient capacity at the Rawburn WTW. There are no real concerns however it would depend on anticipated water consumption.

**OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM:** No comment required.

**CONTAMINATED LAND:** The site appears to have been developed as a bank and town hall. There is no evidence to indicate that the historic uses may present development constraints.

**NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES:** No response received.

**ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH:** Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

**PROJECTS TEAM:** Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT:** We fully support the redevelopment and regeneration of this site. The current building is in poor condition and does not meet modern standards for business use.

**EDUCATION OFFICER:** Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

**NHS:** Did not provide any site specific comments.

**Overall assessment****PP status**

Included

**Overall assessment**

Acceptable

**Site capacity**

N/A

**Conclusions**

This site was identified at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process, via consultation working groups. The site was subsequently included within the MIR as a potential redevelopment site. However, the site assessment and consultation were not undertaken at that time. Further to the 'MIR Consultation' process, a full consultation, site assessment and SEA has now been undertaken for the site.

The site comprises the former vacant Eyemouth Town Hall building and associated surrounding land to the rear. The site is located within the Eyemouth Town Centre and fronts onto Church Street. The site is located within the Eyemouth Conservation Area and the building is Category B listed. There have been a number of extensions and additions to the original property, which are located to the rear of the building. Further to the site assessment, the following constraints were identified;

- Flood Risk Assessment is required;
- There is potential for breeding birds and bats within the existing building, appropriate mitigation required;
- The site is located within the Conservation Area;
- The building is Category C listed; and
- Potential archaeology within the site, mitigation may be required

It is not considered that there are any insurmountable issues, which cannot be addressed through appropriate mitigation measures. It is noted that a number of consultees, including; Heritage & Design Officer, Economic Development and Historic Environment Scotland are supportive of the redevelopment allocation. Historic Environment Scotland have advised that they are supportive of the removal of the rear hall. Given the location within the Conservation Area and the Category C listing of the building, careful consideration and thought will need to be given for any alterations to the external appearance of the building, to ensure that they respect the wider Conservation Area and townscape setting. The Council welcomes the re-use of long term vacant buildings within such locations. The redevelopment of

such buildings can help ensure that the character and appearance of Town Centres are retained and enhanced, whilst bringing buildings back into use again. It is considered that the redevelopment of this site would have a positive impact upon the wider area.

In conclusion, the redevelopment site will be included within the Proposed LDP.

---

# Gavinton

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
<b>AGAVI002</b>	Land at Langton Glebe	Gavinton	Eastern	Housing	30	3.0	<b>Excluded</b>

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable				

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any identified International/National designation constraint. There are identified flood hazards within the southern part of the site (Surface Water Flood Extents).

SEPA: There is surface water in a small part of the site. There is a watercourse catchment less than 3km<sup>2</sup> on the boundary. We require a FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourse along the southern boundary. Consideration should be given to any culverts/bridges which may exacerbate flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. There is a water body, within, forming part of the site boundary, or immediately adjacent to the site. SEPA recommend that a development requirement is attached to the site to ensure that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6m wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

There are potential de-culverting opportunities.

Waste water drainage from the site would exacerbate an existing point source sewerage, sewerage network in this instance. The site is just adjacent to the area served by the public foul sewer and thus the site must connect to the public foul sewer network. There is a small burn to the south of the development site which must be protected as part of any development.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site does not lie within the SEPA 1 in 200 year fluvial (river) flood extent. SEPA's 1:200 year surface water flood map indicates there is a risk of surface water flooding at the south east boundary of the site. I would have no objections on the grounds of flood risk. However, I would ask that due to surface water risk and the capacity of the development that surface water flooding is considered in a drainage & SUDS assessment and it is ensured that any water would be routed around the housing.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	Local Development Plan: The exact site was previously considered as part of the LDP process (AGAVI002)

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Limited	Good	Good	Minor	South

## Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response was received. However, the same site was assessed as part of the LDP and the Ecology Officer advised that there was a minor wider biodiversity impact.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the south east of Gavinton. The site is located within close proximity to Duns and has two bus services travelling to Duns. It is a 5 minute drive away. Gavinton only has a limited opening hours post office, however Duns caters for most services as well as providing potential employment options. There would be minor biodiversity impact from the development of this site.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Adjacent to site

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

## Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific H&D issues.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Prehistoric burials found nearby, may require mitigation or evaluation.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: Note that the settlement profile states that: 'The preferred area for longer-term development will be the area to the north of the settlement. The area to the south of the settlement should be protected from further development. The surrounds of Gavinton are designated as prime agricultural land.'

Our brief appraisal of this site suggests that development to the south of Gavinton, at this site, could be accommodated without significant landscape impacts. The site appears generally well contained but accommodating development here would require a careful approach to massing and layout to ensure that it ties in with the existing settlement. In particular, we note that while there are some two storey buildings the majority of existing dwellings in Gavinton are 1.5 storeys or lower.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No response received.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: State they have no observations.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: Whilst there are three possible means of access to serve this site, all are constrained in nature. Both access points via The Glebe are difficult due to the lack of off-street parking, resulting in traffic movements being hindered by on-street parking on a relatively narrow carriageway. This is a particular issue at the bend in the road where cars are parked part on the footway. A further concern with The Glebe is the absence of any functional turning provision at the end of the road. Means of access via South Street entails an awkward site access off the 90 degree bend in the road. Using both South Street and The Glebe for access will provide good street connectivity though the extent of site to be developed should be limited to reflect the constraints. My support for the development of

this site is conditional on the existing parking and vehicle turning issues in The Glebe being suitably addressed. This could be by way of using a northerly part of (AGAV1002) to help address these concerns. A Transport Statement may be required depending on the extent of development.  
 PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Improved bus infrastructure at Gavinton required on A6105 or bus turning circle at west end of village.

<b>Right of way</b>	<b>TPOs</b>	<b>Contaminated land</b>	<b>Water supply</b>	<b>Sewerage</b>	<b>Gas Supply</b>	<b>Education provision</b>
Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No response received.  
 HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.  
 SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): There is sufficient capacity at the Duns WWTW. It will require SPS to be upsized.  
 SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): There is sufficient capacity at the Rawburn WTW. A Water Impact Assessment would probably be required.  
 OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: No comment required.  
 CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.  
 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.  
 NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.  
 PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.  
 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.  
 EDUCATION OFFICER: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.  
 NHS: Did not provide any site specific comments.

## Overall assessment

<b>PP status</b>	<b>Overall assessment</b>	<b>Site capacity</b>
Excluded	Doubtful	30

### Conclusions

The site was considered at the 'MIR consultation' stage of the LDP2 process. The site (AGAV1002) was previously considered as part of the LDP and was not taken forward. The exact same site was re-submitted for consideration, at the 'MIR Consultation' stage. The site lies to the south east of the Development Boundary and the proposed access is from three existing access points from 'The Glebe' and 'South Street'. There are existing residential properties to the north and north west of the site. The adopted LDP states that the preferred area for long term development will be the area to the north of the settlement and that the area to the south should be protected from further development. Further to the site assessment and consultation, a number of constraints were identified, which are outlined below;

- Flood Risk Assessment would be required;
- Waterbody within and forming part of the site boundary, therefore maintenance buffer strip required;
- Surface Water Hazard identified at the site;
- Archaeology mitigation or evaluation likely;
- The Roads Planning Officer has raised concerns regarding the access into the site, stating that whilst there are three possible means of access to serve this site, all are constrained in nature. Their support for this proposal is conditional on the existing parking and vehicle turning issues in 'The Glebe' being suitably addressed.
- Transport Statement would be required;
- WWTW: SPS will require to be upsized; and
- Water Impact Assessment likely required.

Gavinton is a small planned estate village and it is considered that the site in question is incongruous to the character and size of Gavinton, due to its scale and location. It is considered that the scale and layout of the site would be at odds with the planned linear layout of the village and would significantly alter the character. Furthermore, there is the potential that the scale of the site may make Gavinton visible from the road to the east.

Gavinton already has a sizeable housing allocation (BGA1), with an indicative site capacity for 45 units. The site has planning consent for 54 units, however it is not yet developed. Taking the above into consideration, the site is not included within the Proposed LDP. Furthermore, it is considered that Gavinton has sufficient housing land supply for the LDP2 period.

---

# Gordon

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
AGORD004	Land at Eden Road	Gordon	Rest of Borders	Housing	25	1.5	Included

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable				

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any identified International/National designation constraint.

SEPA: The site is next to Gordon STW. May be likely to give rise to odour issues. Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network.

SEPA (MIR Consultation additional comments): In addition to the comments above, SEPA offer the following comments. The site is next to Gordon STW. May be likely to give rise to odour issues, however any issues would be dealt with by SBC Environmental Health.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. Due to the size of the development I'd recommend surface water runoff be considered.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	On/Adjacent to site	Greenfield	Local Plan: (BGO11D) - southern part of the site currently under consideration Housing SG: (AGORD004) - exact same site boundary as currently under consideration

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Good	Good	Good	Minor	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Site is improved grassland tree-lined boundary and drystone dykes on boundary. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds. Low biodiversity impact.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the east of the settlement boundary and the proposed access is from Eden Road to the south. There is good access to public transport, employment and service within Gordon. These are limited within Gordon itself, however the site is well connected to the settlement and within walking distance of the local amenities within Gordon. Furthermore, Gordon is located close to Kelso (8 miles away), Earlston (6 miles away) and Duns (12 miles away), where there is a wider range of local services and employment opportunities available. Gordon has a bus service

which runs to Berwick-Upon-Tweed and Galashiels.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Adjacent to site

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Adjacent to site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

## Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: No known archaeological issues.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to the size and location.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: The site links well with the village. Footpath connections required. Protect existing trees on verge/fence line. Adequate space between for access. Existing blocks of trees provide containment and backdrop for new houses. Additional tree planting and hedges within the site will assist in integrating the development into the location. 25no units with continuation of village streetscape along Eden Road. Protect street trees.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: New junction onto A6105 but should not be any issues.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I have no objection to this land being zoned for housing. This is a logical extension to the settlement and would provide an opportunity for a strong street frontage onto the A6105 which would enhance the sense of arrival into the village and help reinforce the 30mph speed limit. The existing footway infrastructure will have to be extended along the frontage of the site to tie in with existing and any layout should allow for future street connectivity. A Transport Statement would be required.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Bus stop infrastructure required.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Prime Quality Agricultural Land; if units are required in Gordon, this looks to be a strong site; we would need to be very careful with the frontage to the south; a hard edge, with housing onto pavement/roadside (no front gardens) would be desirable and landscaping to the north and particularly to the east would be needed.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns to the development of this site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. Please note that there is an rising sewer within the site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Howden WTW has sufficient capacity and sufficient capacity in the network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No capacity issues.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Included	Acceptable	25

### Conclusions

The site was considered at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process. This site was recently assessed as part of the Housing SG and was not taken forward for inclusion, primarily as it was considered there were more preferable options at that time. Only an initial stage 1 RAG assessment was undertaken as part of the Housing SG. However, the agent provided a supporting statement in response to the RAG assessment, since the Housing SG. Therefore, this has been taken into consideration and a full site assessment/consultation has been undertaken as part of the MIR process.

Following consultation with key stakeholders, there are no insurmountable constraints for the development of this site. The site itself appears to be a logical extension to the Development Boundary and relates well to Gordon. Albeit careful consideration would need to be given to the treatment of the site boundaries and the frontage to the south onto the main road. Following consultation, the following constraints/mitigation were identified;

- The proximity to the Gordon Sewage Treatment Works;
- Foul water must connect to the existing foul network;
- Assessment of ecology impacts and provision of mitigation, as appropriate;
- Protection of existing boundary features, where possible, including existing trees on the verge/fence lines;
- Extension of existing footway infrastructure along the frontage of the site;
- Landscaping to assist in integrating the development into the location;
- A Transport Statement would be required;
- Early engagement with Scottish Water, in respect of the WWTW; and
- The site is located within Prime Quality Agricultural land.

The adopted LDP states that the preferred area for future expansion is to the east of Gordon, north of Eden Road and that development to the north of the settlement will be resisted. The site is also well related to Gordon itself. Overall, there are no insurmountable constraints to the development of this site for housing. In conclusion, taking the above into consideration, the site was put forward as a preferred option for housing within the MIR, for 25 units. Following the MIR consultation, the site has been included within the Proposed Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b> AGORD005	<b>Site name</b> Land to west of Station Road	<b>Settlement</b> Gordon	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 20	<b>Ha</b> 1.2	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any International/National designation constraint.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. Due to the size of the development I'd recommend surface water runoff be considered.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> On/Adjacent to site	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> Local Plan: (BGO1) - larger site which extends to the north of this one also
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Major	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Site is on the list of potential Local Biodiversity sites (not yet assessed) Gordon station plantation meadow. Site included in SNH grassland survey (NVC U4b) and Berwickshire BSBI site register (Gordon meadow, habitat moderately good). Areas of scrub within site and tree-lined eastern boundary. On a precautionary basis I would predict a major impact. Potentially unsuitable site. Major impact on the wider biodiversity.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the north of Gordon. There are limited services and employment opportunities within Gordon itself, however Gordon is within close proximity to a number of other settlements, providing such opportunities. Kelso is located 8 miles away, Earlston is 6 miles and Duns is 12 miles. Gordon has a bus service which runs to Berwick-Upon-Tweed and Galashiels, where there are railway services. The site lies within an area identified as a 'Local Biodiversity Site - Gordon Station Plantation Meadow', which the Ecology Officer identifies as a major biodiversity impact.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: No known archaeological issues.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to the size and location.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: Mature trees provide established structure planting within which to construct a development of high amenity value but low density housing in order to prevent damage to them. Adequate space required around to protect these significant parkland trees during the works and for the long term. Trees could be a great asset to the setting of new development, creating an attractive site within high amenity value. The mature oak tree should be retained and worked into any proposals as a centre piece to the design and for public open space. Fully detailed tree survey required at outset. Issue of creating access without damage to existing avenue trees or from narrow Manse Lane to the south, could prove difficult. Option to being developable area south of mature beech and pine trees, more or less in line with boundary of adjacent site BGO9D in adopted LDP - to protect trees.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Existing, albeit low used junction, onto A6089.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: Initial response: No objection to this land being zoned for housing. Access is possible directly from Station Road and an access onto Manse Road coupled with the upgrading of Manse Road is desirable. The existing footway and street lighting will have to be extended along Station Road. There would be an opportunity for a strong street frontage onto Station Road which would enhance the sense of arrival into the village and help reinforce the 30mph speed limit. A Transport Statement would be required. Additional verbal response after discussions regarding the trees: The site could be served solely by upgrading Manse Road. This would result in some tree loss on the corner, however this would be required anyway as a result of the existing housing allocation. However, their preference is to have an additional access from Station Road.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

On site

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Loss of plantation woodland, cannot support this proposal and landscape reply would be required.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Howden WTW has sufficient capacity and sufficient capacity in the network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response to date.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response to date.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

EDUCATION OFFICER: Did not raise any concerns.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Doubtful	20

## Conclusions

The site was submitted at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process for housing, with an indicative site capacity for 20 units. The site is located to the north of the existing Development Boundary and to the north of Manse Road. There is an existing housing allocation (BGO9D) directly adjacent to the west of this site. Manse Road lies to the south and Station Road to the east. The following constraints are identified within the site;

- The site is on the list of potential Local Biodiversity sites (not yet assessed), Gordon Station Plantation Meadow. The site is included within the SNH grassland survey and Berwickshire BSBI site register. The SBC Ecology Officer predicts that development on this site would result in a major biodiversity impact and the site is potentially unsuitable;
- The site is located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- There are mature trees located within the site and along Station Road, a number of which have Tree Preservation Orders 'Coronation Trees';
- The Roads Planning Officer advised that access is possible solely from Manse Road serving the site, however the preference would be to have an additional access from Station Road;
- The formation of an access from Station Road may result in the loss of some trees. An access served from Manse Road would require the loss of trees on the corner of the road for road widening; and
- A Transport Statement would be required for any development.

There are a number of constraints identified within this site including; access, TPO's and Gordon Station Plantation Meadow. There is also an existing housing allocation (BGO9D) within Gordon adjacent to this site, for 18 units. It should be noted that another site (AGORD004) was also considered as part of the LDP2 process. The site (AGORD004) was considered to be a more suitable site for housing, without constraints. Therefore, the proposed site (AGORD005) was not included within the Main Issues Report, however (AGORD004) was included as a preferred option. Taking the above into consideration, the site is not included within the Proposed LDP.

---

# Grantshouse

<b>Site reference</b> AGRAN004	<b>Site name</b> Land north of Mansefield	<b>Settlement</b> Grantshouse	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 8	<b>Ha</b> 0.4	<b>PP status</b> Included
-----------------------------------	----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any International/National designation constraint.

SEPA: Based on OS Map there is sufficient height difference between site and the Eye Water. Due to steep topography through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff.

There is the potential that development on this site could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. A Surface Water Hazard has been identified within the site. Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network.

SEPA (MIR Consultation additional comments): SEPA commented on the MIR Consultation, however provided no additional comments further to above.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> On/Adjacent to site	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> Local Plan: (BGH3), this site formed part of a much larger site which was considered Local Plan: (BGH16), this site formed part of a much larger site which was considered Local Development Plan: (AGRAN001), this site formed the corner of a site to the west  Planning applications (12/01272/PPP): Erection of 12 dwellinghouses - refused planning consent. (11/01464/FUL): Construction of 15 turbines up to 100m in height. The proposed site is located within the site boundary for the approved wind farm development.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Limited	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Limited	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Minor biodiversity risk. Site is arable field with hedgerow and tree-lined boundary. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the north of Grantshouse, to the north of Mansfield. Half of the site is located within the existing settlement boundary and is infill land, whereas the area to the west and north is outwith the settlement boundary. There is a bus stop located within Grantshouse, which connects to Edinburgh and Berwick-Upon-Tweed, however this provides limited service to other settlements within Berwickshire. There are limited public services and employment opportunities within Grantshouse itself, however there are opportunities within a number of nearby settlements although they may rely on car for access. Eyemouth is located 11 miles away, while Duns is located 9 miles away.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Adjacent to site

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

## Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: No known archaeological interests.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to the size and location.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: Based on desk assessment – no major constraints. Shape of allocation will dictate direct access off Mansfield street to each property as there is not enough room for an access road. Part of field at the north east corner will also be awkward to manage because of acute angle formed.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Did not raise any concerns regarding the proposed development.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the proposed development.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: Grantshouse has no notable services/amenities to justify supporting any significant new development, but a modest scale of housing would be acceptable in principle. The public road along Mansfield is a cul-de-sac with extensive on-street parking restricting traffic flow and there is a significant level difference between the public road and the site. Direct access to the public road is acceptable in principle, but will be difficult to achieve engineering wise and any development will have to address traffic flow and site access issues imposed by existing on-street parking.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the proposed development.

**Right of way**

On site

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

Not applicable

**Water supply**

Yes

**Sewerage**

Yes

**Gas Supply**

No

**Education provision**

Good

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No response received.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the proposed development.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with SW is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW and there is sufficient capacity in the network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Rawburn WTW has sufficient capacity and there is sufficient capacity in the network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Enhancement to Core Path 100 (Right of Way BB1) to the east would be recommended.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

**Overall assessment****PP status**

Included

**Overall assessment**

Acceptable

**Site capacity**

8

**Conclusions**

The site was considered at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process. The proposal is for a housing allocation, with an indicative site capacity for 8 units. The site is located to the north of Grantshouse on the northern side of Mansefield. Part of the site is already located within the Development Boundary for Grantshouse. The western part and a small area to the north are outwith the Development Boundary. As a result, it is considered that the site relates well to the existing Development Boundary and the expansion to the west would be a logical extension to the Development Boundary.

Following consultation, the following constraints and mitigation were identified;

- Any development must give consideration to potential surface water runoff within the site;
- The site is located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Protect the existing boundary features;
- Mitigation for protected species including breeding birds;
- The Roads Planning Officer has no objections to the proposal, however direct access to the public road is acceptable in principle, but will be difficult to achieve engineering wise and any development will have to address traffic flow and site access issues imposed by existing on-street parking; and
- Contact Scottish Water regarding WWTW capacity.

There is existing housing on the south side of Mansefield, therefore the proposal for housing would be compatible with the surrounding land uses. There are no insurmountable planning constraints which would prevent the development of this site. The part of the site which is currently included within the Development Boundary, appears quite small to allow any housing development with current parking/access standards. Therefore, increasing the Development Boundary to the north and west, will allow the site to be developed, whilst ensuring that there is sufficient space to accommodate a new access and parking for the development. Overall, the site is considered acceptable for a housing development. The site was included within the MIR as a preferred option for housing and is included within the Proposed Plan.

# Greenlaw

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
BGREE005	Land South of Edinburgh Road	Greenlaw	Rest of Borders	Business and Industrial	N/A	1.2	Included

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable				

### Initial assessment summary

The site is not located within any international/national designation constraint.

SEPA: Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at increased risk of flooding.

There is a surface water hazard identified within the site.

Foul drainage from the site must be connected to the existing public foul sewer. Std comments for SUDS. Depending on the use of the proposed units there may be a requirement for permissions to be sought for certain activities from SEPA.

SEPA (MIR Consultation additional comments): SEPA commented on the MIR Consultation, however provided no additional comments further to the above.

SBC COASTAL AND MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	On/Adjacent to site	Greenfield	LDP: MGREE001 - The site is allocated for mixed use development within the current LDP. The site currently has an indicative site capacity for 6 units. LPA & LDP: BGREE003 - Part of the this site was considered for business use previously, however not allocated as such.

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Limited	Limited	Limited	Minor	South

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Low biodiversity risk. Site appears to be an arable field with hedgerow and garden ground on part of the boundary. No obvious connectivity to River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including badger and breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site lies to the south west of Greenlaw and is currently allocated for mixed use development (MGREE001) within the Local Development Plan. There are bus services within Greenlaw, providing buses to Galashiels and Berwick-Upon-Tweed, both of which have Railway connections. There are limited services located within Greenlaw itself and it would be necessary to drive or take the bus to access a wider choice and range of these services. There is some employment land in Greenlaw to the north. Duns, Eyemouth and Coldstream currently provide greater employment opportunities. Duns is located 7 miles away and Kelso is located 9 miles away. The site is within walking distance of the centre of Greenlaw and is located on the edge of the settlement, opposite an allocated housing site.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area	Open space	Listed buildings	Scheduled Monument	Ancient woodland inventory	Archaeology	Garden and designed landscape
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No comment on the proposed change of use.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: No response received. However, the site is an existing mixed use allocation and there are currently no site requirements proposed for archaeology mitigation at present.

---

## Landscape assessment

NSA	SLA	Over 200 metres?	Over 12 degree slope	Wild Land
Not applicable	Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: This is a change of use of an existing allocation and we have no comment to make.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: Because of its very high visibility from the A6105 Earlston and the B6364 Kelso roads and from the A697 at the western gateway to Greenlaw, I would not be particularly comfortable with a housing allocation but I am very uneasy with the proposed allocation because of its potential to create highly visible 'industrial' character in an otherwise open rural area. There is little potential for effective screening too.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: No response received.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I have no objections in principle to this land being zoned for business and industrial development. The junction arrangement with the A697 will have to allow for future upgrading to a more substantial junction if and when the land to the south of this site is developed. Similarly the development layout will need to allow for future street connectivity with the adjacent land. All of this can be covered in a Transport Statement. The existing street lighting, footway and 30 mph speed limit will have to be extended out from the village as appropriate.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No response received.

**Right of way**

Not applicable

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

Not applicable

**Water supply**

Yes

**Sewerage**

Yes

**Gas Supply**

No

**Education provision**

Good

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT:** No real problems with the proposed change from mixed use to employment use. Adjoining uses are primarily residential in character and proposed use may have unacceptable adverse impacts on residential amenity. Access would appear to be achievable. There is a wider history to this proposal, principally in that this was the subject of a planning application a few years ago in relation to a housing proposal that was ultimately refused – I can supply details if necessary. The success of the appeal re the poultry farm site on Marchmont Road, has reduced the land that might otherwise have gone forward for business use, so this one is probably now in a stronger position.

**HOUSING STRATEGY:** Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.

**SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW):** Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. Depending on the flow demand for this development, will determine if a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required.

**SCOTTISH WATER (WTW):** Sufficient capacity at Rawburn WTW. Please note there is an existing 180mm water main running through the North edge of site. Depending on flow demand for this development, will determine if a Water Impact Assessment (WIA) is required.

**OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM:** Did not raise any concerns regarding the proposed development.

**CONTAMINATED LAND:** There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

**NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES:** No response received.

**ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH:** No response received.

**PROJECTS TEAM:** No response received.

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT:** It would be helpful to know whether there are longer term plans for additional housing to the south and south east of this site, to ensure a shared access road could be constructed and designed, to also allow further expansion of this business site in a sensible and planned way.

**EDUCATION OFFICER:** n/a

**Overall assessment****PP status**

Included

**Overall assessment**

Acceptable

**Site capacity**

N/A

**Conclusions**

The site was considered as part of the 'Pre MIR' LDP2 process. The site is currently allocated for mixed use development, within the adopted Local Development Plan. The site is located within the defined Development Boundary for Greenlaw and has an indicative site capacity for 6 units. The proposal currently under consideration is to change the allocation to business & industrial. This would result in the removal of the indicative site capacity for 6 units. It is considered that the site is prominent on the entrance to Greenlaw from the west, however this can be mitigated through landscaping and planting. Following consultation on this site, the following constraints were identified;

- Consideration must be given to surface water runoff;
- Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Protect and enhance existing boundary features;
- Assessment of ecology impacts and provision of mitigation, as appropriate;
- Potential Drainage Impact Assessment and Water Impact Assessment required;
- Transport Statement required; and
- Landscape Officer states the site is visible and would not be comfortable with such an allocation.

As part of the employment land working group, which feeds into the MIR process, a demand for business and industrial land within Greenlaw and the surrounding towns was identified. It is acknowledged that the site has an indicative site capacity for 6 units and this would be removed from the housing land supply. However, there is a plentiful housing land supply within Greenlaw through the housing allocations being carried forward from the adopted LDP and the site (AGREE009) being taken forward as part of the Proposed Plan. Furthermore, due to the restricted size of the site, it was considered that the site would be better developed for business and industrial purposes.

It is important to have a business and industrial allocation within the settlement, to provide opportunities to local people within the surrounding Greenlaw. Although the Landscape Officer does not support the allocation, it should be noted that the site is already allocated for mixed use development. The site was included within the MIR as a preferred option for business and industrial use. Two site requirements are attached to the allocation requesting planting along the southern boundary to screen development from the entry to Greenlaw from the south on the A6105 and screen planting on the western boundary should be provided to define the settlement edge, screen the development from the entry to Greenlaw and provide shelter to the site. Further to the MIR consultation, the site is included within the Proposed Plan.

---

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
<b>SBGRE001</b>	Greenlaw Development Boundary Amendment	Greenlaw	Rest of Borders	Development Boundary	N/A	0.3	<b>Excluded</b>

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

The River Tweed SAC/SSSI lies to the south east of the site. There are no other International/National designation constraints.

SEPA: OS Map indicates a sufficient height difference between site and Blackadder Water. Due to steep topography adjacent/ through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff. Potential surface water/fluvial flood risk adjacent to the site.

A Surface Water Hazard has been identified within the site. Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. They are unclear what the proposed use for the site is and would require clarification (e.g. is it housing or industrial).

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk if this were to be a small-scale development.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	On/Adjacent to site	Greenfield	There is no planning history associated with this site.

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Good	Limited	Good	Moderate	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Site is improved grassland hedgerow and garden ground on boundary. Potential connectivity with River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the west of Greenlaw. The proposal is not for a formal housing allocation, rather an extension to the existing settlement boundary to incorporate the small strip of land. There are bus services within Greenlaw, providing buses to Galashiels and Berwick-Upon-Tweed, both of which have Railway connections. There are limited services and employment opportunities within Greenlaw itself, however there are opportunities within nearby settlements. Duns is located 7 miles awa and Kelso is located 9 miles away. There are moderate biodiversity risks, given the proximity to the SAC/SSSI and the fact this site is improved grassland hedgerow.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: There are no known archaeological issues.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to size and location.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: With the development of adjacent SBGRE003 (longer term housing) this small site between two existing properties should not be out of place although it will contribute to a further encroachment of development up the valley sides of Greenlaw. Containment with tree and hedge planting will go some way to assimilating this site into the wider landscape. SE facing aspect will allow for developer to take advantage of solar gain.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.  
TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.  
ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I have no objection to this settlement boundary alteration.  
PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

### Near a trunk road?

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Query whether the junction accommodate the additional traffic, if so would have no objection to the site.  
HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.  
SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with SW is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. Depending on how many units this site includes will determine if further investigation required. Please note there are sewers running through the site.  
SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. Depending on how many units this site includes will determine if further investigation required. Water main running through the site.  
OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.  
CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may

present development constraints.  
ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received  
NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received  
PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.  
EDUCATION OFFICER: N/A  
NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

<b>PP status</b>	<b>Overall assessment</b>	<b>Site capacity</b>
<b>Excluded</b>	Unacceptable	N/A

### Conclusions

The alteration to the Greenlaw Development Boundary was submitted at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process. It proposes to extend the Development Boundary northwards on the eastern side of Halliburton Road. The applicant indicates that the site could accommodate an infill opportunity for between 3 and 5 houses.

It is not considered appropriate to expand a Development Boundary merely in order to provide infill opportunities within the settlement itself, without a formal allocation. The number of units the site could accommodate would not be large enough for a formal housing allocation. The site was not included within the MIR.

It is considered that there is a sufficient housing land supply in Greenlaw from sites being carried over from the adopted LDP and those within the Proposed LDP. Therefore, in conclusion the Development Boundary amendment is not included within the Proposed Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b> AGREE006	<b>Site name</b> Marchmont Road II	<b>Settlement</b> Greenlaw	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 60	<b>Ha</b> 3.2	<b>PP status</b> Retain LDP Site
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------

---

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b>	<b>SAC</b>	<b>SPA</b>	<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
------------------	------------	------------	-------------	---------------

### Initial assessment summary

This is an existing housing allocation within the LDP, which was subject to a review as part of the MIR process.

---

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b>	<b>Planning history references</b>
--------------------------	------------	--------------------------------------------	----------------------	------------------------------------

---

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b>	<b>Access to employment</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b>	<b>Site aspect</b>
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
--------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------------------	--------------------	------------------------------------------

### Local impact and integration summary

---

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
------------	------------	--------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	------------------

### Landscape summary

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

Right of way

TPOs

Contaminated land

Water supply

Sewerage

Gas Supply

Education provision

Planning & infrastructure summary

---

## Overall assessment

**PP status**

**Overall assessment**

**Site capacity**

Retain LDP Site

60

### Conclusions

The site is currently allocated within the adopted Local Development Plan (AGREE006) for housing, with an indicative site capacity for 60 units. All the existing allocations were subject to review, as part of the MIR process. The eastern part of the site was allocated as part of the 2009 Local Plan Amendment, while the western part of the site allocated in the 1994 Berwickshire Local Plan.

It is acknowledged that the eastern part of the allocation (AGREE006) is a recent housing allocation and the economy experienced a downturn not long after the allocation. This affected the number of completions recorded throughout the whole of the Borders. It is therefore recommended that the existing housing allocation (AGREE006) is retained for inclusion within the Proposed Plan, with an indicative site capacity for 60 units.

---

<b>Site reference</b> AGREE008	<b>Site name</b> Halliburton Road	<b>Settlement</b> Greenlaw	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 40	<b>Ha</b> 3.4	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any International/National designation.

SEPA: Based on OS Map there is sufficient height difference between site and the Blackadder Water. Due to steep topography through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff. There is potential fluvial risk of flooding adjacent to the site. There is the potential that the development of this site could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a Surface Water Hazard within the site.

The foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network.

SEPA (MIR Consultation additional comments): SEPA commented on the MIR Consultation, however provided no additional comments further to above.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. Due to the size of the development the applicant should consider surface water runoff, drainage and SUDS. Drainage Impact Assessment/SUDS.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> On/Adjacent to site	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> Local Plan: (BG10D) - smaller site under consideration Local Plan Amendment: (AGREE002) - same site as under consideration Local Plan Amendment: (SGREE003) - same site as under consideration Local Development Plan: (SGREE003) - same site as under consideration Local Development Plan: (MGREE002) - same site as under consideration Housing SG: (AGREE008) - same site as under consideration
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Limited	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Limited	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> South-west
----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	----------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Low biodiversity impact. Site is arable field with hedgerow young plantation on boundary. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including badger and breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the west of Greenlaw and is currently identified as a longer term housing site, within the Local Development Plan. There are bus services within Greenlaw, providing buses to Galashiels and Berwick-Upon-Tweed, both of which have Railway connections. There are limited services located within Greenlaw and it would be necessary to drive or take the bus to access a wider choice and range of these services. There is some employment land in Greenlaw but this would be limited for providing local employment. Duns, Eyemouth and Coldstream would provide greater opportunities. Duns is located 7 miles away and Kelso is located 9 miles away. The site is within walking distance of the centre of Greenlaw and is located off a quiet road leading out of the settlement.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Adjacent to site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: There are no known implications, although the known site of a medieval and later farmstead lies immediately to the north. Some mitigation may be required.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: While the site is outwith the current settlement boundary as shown in the LDP, we note that it is included as a longer-term safeguard (SGREE003). If you are minded to support development of this site during the current plan period, further detailed assessment, particularly for the open space along the ridgeline, will be required.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No response received to date. However, the Landscape Officer was consulted on this site (AGREE008) as part of the Housing SG and offered the following comments. Due to the lack of fit with the existing settlement pattern of Greenlaw and the high visibility of this site in the view from several roads on approach, coupled with potential privacy issues to adjoining properties, it is recommended that this site is not taken forward.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Would need to extend existing 30mph limit.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding development of the site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: Direct vehicular access from the A697 (Edinburgh Road) is possible via the allocated housing site AGREE004. This will entail extending the footway out from the town on the north side of the A697 along with a slight extension of the 30 mph speed limit. This environmental change may have a positive influence on driver speeds on the main road. A right turn lane type junction may be required and visibility splays of 4.5m by 90m should be achievable. This can all be addressed in a supporting Transport Assessment.

The use of Halliburton Road as an additional means of vehicular access to the site, to help achieve good connectivity, should be explored. The junction of Halliburton Road with the A697 would ideally have to shift slightly to the west so that stacking traffic behind right turn traffic for Halliburton Road does not impact unduly on right turn traffic for Wester Row (A6105) and vice versa. The southerly boundary of the property known as '2 Edinburgh Road' would be directly affected by this, and by junction visibility requirements (4.5m by 90m). The carriageway of Halliburton Road would have to be widened and a footway provided as well as the extension of the 30 mph speed limit. Irrespective of vehicular connectivity with Halliburton Road, pedestrian/cycle linkage is essential.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

<b>Right of way</b>	<b>TPOs</b>	<b>Contaminated land</b>	<b>Water supply</b>	<b>Sewerage</b>	<b>Gas Supply</b>	<b>Education provision</b>
Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	Yes	Yes	No	Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. Further investigation such as Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Howden WTW has sufficient capacity and sufficient capacity in the network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Potential opportunity to improve pedestrian/cycle access into the village. Enhancement to existing path network would also be recommended. (2016 HSG Consultation).

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

<b>PP status</b>	<b>Overall assessment</b>	<b>Site capacity</b>
Excluded	Acceptable	40

### Conclusions

The site was submitted at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process. The site is currently identified as a longer term housing site (SGREE003) within the adopted LDP, therefore acceptable for housing. The site is close to the centre of Greenlaw and if sensitively designed would integrate well into the settlement. The site has limited access to public services and employment within Greenlaw, however there are employment and services available in nearby settlements, which can be accessed by car or bus. It is acknowledged that the site is quite prominent, however it is considered that the existing tree belt to the west screens the site on the approach road and additional landscaping would further mitigate visual impacts. Overall, there are no insurmountable planning constraints which would prevent development on this site. Through the consultation process, the following constraints and mitigation would be required for any development on the site;

- Surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue and require mitigation;
- The site is located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Potential for archaeology within the site, which would require appropriate mitigation;
- Careful design to ensure that the site is integrated into the rest of the settlement;
- Drainage Impact Assessment may be required in respect of WWTW;
- Protect and enhance existing boundary features;
- Assessment of ecology impacts and mitigation where appropriate;
- In respect of landscape capacity, there is an area of young woodland to the west of the site, with further arable land to the north;
- The site has potential to be prominent from certain angles, however the tree belt provides shelter from the western approach and the existing housing and planting screens part of the site from the south;
- The site provides opportunities for improved pedestrian/cycle access into the village and enhancement to the path network; and
- Transport Assessment would be required.

Overall, it is considered that the site would be acceptable for housing development, subject to mitigation in respect of the above constraints. Taking into consideration that there are no insurmountable

constraints on this site, the site was included as an alternative option for housing within the MIR. However, in deciding which of the many MIR sites were ultimately included within the Proposed LDP, consideration was given to a range of factors.

There are three housing sites being carried forward from the adopted LDP (BG200, AGREE004 & AGREE005). Furthermore, the housing site (AGREE009) is being taken forward as part of the Proposed LDP, which has extant planning consent. Further to the MIR consultation, it is not considered that there is a current need for an additional housing allocation as well as the aforementioned sites. In conclusion, the site (AGREE008) is not included within the Proposed Plan. However, it should be noted that the site could be considered again for inclusion in a future LDP.

---

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
<b>AGREE009</b>	Poultry Farm	Greenlaw	Rest of Borders	Housing	38	2.3	<b>Included</b>

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable				

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designations.

SEPA: Should planning application differ from what was previously agreed we would require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Blackadder Water which flows to the south of the site. In addition there is a small watercourse which flows along the eastern perimeter of the site. There are bridges/culverts along the small watercourse which could potentially exacerbate flooding. Surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage.

This site is next door to the Greenlaw STW. This may give rise to odour issues.

There is the potential that development of this site could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. Surface Water Hazard identified within the site. Foul waste must connect to SW foul network.

SEPA (MIR Consultation additional comments): In addition to the comments above, SEPA offer the following comments. The location next door to the STW is unlikely to be any issue from SEPA's perspective, but any odour complaints would be dealt with by SBC Environmental Health.

Should the layout or land-use differ from what was previously agreed we would require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Blackadder Water and small watercourse along the eastern boundary. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes they also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure that the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at increased risk of flooding.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The southern boundary of the site is at risk of flooding from the Blackadder Water at a 1 in 200 year flood event. The Officer would require that a Flood Risk Assessment is undertaken for this site.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	On/Adjacent to site	Brownfield	<p>Planning application (16/01360/PPP) for residential development was refused planning consent in 2017. The planning application was approved by the DPEA in October 2018, for housing.</p> <p>Housing SG: The site was considered for housing (AGREE007) and not included</p> <p>LDP: The site was considered for housing (AGREE007) and not included</p> <p>LDP2: The site is also being considered for mixed use development (MGREE004) as part of the MIR process</p> <p>LDP2 (AGREE009): The site was submitted at the 'Pre MIR' stage and the 'MIR Consultation' stage</p>

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

**Access to public transport**

Good

**Access to employment**

Limited

**Access to services**

Good

**Wider biodiversity impacts**

Moderate

**Site aspect**

South

**Accessibility and sustainability summary**

ECOLOGY OFFICER: The Ecology Officer did not respond to the consultation as part of the current MIR. However, the Officer provided comments for (MGREE004) which is also under consideration as part of the MIR process. The Officer provided the following comments; 'Moderate biodiversity impact. Site includes poultry sheds and improved grassland, tall ruderal and scrub habitat. On the southern boundary within SEPA 1 in 200 year indicative flood risk area. Potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC via drains. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats, otter (EPS), badger and breeding birds. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC/SSSI. See also Planning Application 16/01360/PPP'.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the east of Greenlaw and is located outwith the settlement boundary. The land is currently brownfield and the site is a series of former poultry units. There are bus services within Greenlaw, providing buses to Galashiels and Berwick-Upon-Tweed, both of which have Railway connections. There are limited services located within Greenlaw and it would be necessary to drive or take the bus to access a wider choice and range of these services. There is some employment land in Greenlaw but this would be limited for providing local employment. Duns, Eyemouth and Coldstream would provide greater opportunities. Duns is located 7 miles away and Kelso is located 9 miles away. The site is within walking distance of the centre of Greenlaw and is located off a quiet road leading out of the settlement.

**Local impact and integration assessment****Conservation area**

Not applicable

**Open space**

Not applicable

**Listed buildings**

Not applicable

**Scheduled Monument**

Not applicable

**Ancient woodland inventory**

Not applicable

**Archaeology**

Not applicable

**Garden and designed landscape**

Not applicable

**Local impact and integration summary**

HERITAGE AND DESIGN: No specific comment.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any objections.

ARCHAEOLOGY: There is low potential within the site.

**Landscape assessment****NSA**

Not applicable

**SLA**

Not applicable

**Over 200 metres?** **Over 12 degree slope** **Wild Land**

Not applicable

**Landscape summary**

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to the location.

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: (MIR Consultation additional comments): SNH commented on the MIR Consultation and provided the following comments. They note the proximity of the River Tweed SAC and advise that this site should be included in HRA of the plan. They advise that a site development brief should set out the site requirements for this prominent gateway site. Establishing an appropriately designed landscape edge, a co-ordinated approach to development frontages and exploring the potential for path connections to promote cycling and walking on off-site access routes (such as the use of the disused railway) should be explored and details closely set out in site requirements.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: The Landscape Officer did not respond to this site, however provided a response for (MGREE004) also under consideration and offered the following comments: 'This site could accommodate some level of mixed business and industrial use although would be equally good site for residential development. Perhaps the western end should be developed for housing and eastern half/third developed for small scale industrial use. The existing road and residential to the west preclude large scale business or industrial use'.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: May impact on location of 30 mph limit. Also need to consider existing access onto A697.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any objections to the proposed development.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: No objections in principle to this land being zoned for housing. Numerous access points are achievable along the northern boundary of the site. The existing public road will need widened to accommodate two-way traffic flow. Footways and street lighting infrastructure will also be required as part of the improvement works to the public road. A Transport Statement will be required.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comment.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

On/adjacent to site

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: The site has a complex history, and I note the appeal pending a decision. The refusal was on the basis of the unacceptability of the unallocated site, which was positioned beyond the development boundary. My own view, setting aside the timing of any application or appeal, and looking solely at the merits of the site in isolation, as a possible allocation, is that the site itself could acceptably accommodate residential development at some stage in the future.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any objections.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Rawburn WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment (WIA) or Flow and Pressure test will be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS OFFICER: Potential to improve access to disused railway.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site is developed with a poultry farm. The site is brownfield and its former use may present development constraints.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No objections.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: This is a large allocation; it already has a business use on it and is close to the sewage works. Whilst we know little about the site history and servicing information, perhaps the eastern part of the site, which is flat, may be appropriate for employment use and consider the site is allocated for mixed use, if the appeal is approved.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

### PP status

Included

### Overall assessment

Acceptable

### Site capacity

38

### Conclusions

The site was considered at the 'Pre MIR's stage of the LDP2 process. The site was previously considered for housing as part of the Housing SG (AGREE007), however was not included within the Finalised Housing SG. The site was submitted for mixed use development, as part of the LDP2 'Pre MIR' process (MGREE004). Further to this, a planning application (16/01360/PPP) was refused planning consent for housing in 2017 and subsequently granted at appeal. This site was originally coded as (RGREE001) and consulted on, however was changed to site code (AGREE009) throughout the process. Therefore, the consultation responses may refer to (RGREE001). The site was most recently re-submitted at the 'MIR Consultation' stage, for housing, as part of the LDP2 process.

The site is directly adjacent to the existing Development Boundary therefore the site provides a logical extension to Greenlaw and would integrate well with the existing settlement. There are no insurmountable planning constraints regarding the development of this site. The site is brownfield land (currently disused poultry units) and the re-use of the site would be a benefit. However, through the

consultation process, the following constraints were identified;

- Flood Risk Assessment is required;
- Potential surface water runoff;
- The site is located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC/SSSI;
- Protect boundary features;
- Mitigation for protected species;
- Potential for archaeology within the site;
- Transport Statement required;
- A number of access points are achievable along the northern boundary of the site;
- Potential for contamination, given the brownfield nature of the site;
- Early engagement with Scottish Water to ascertain whether a Drainage Impact Assessment in respect of WWTW; and
- Water Impact Assessment required, in respect of WTW.

The current proposal put forward by the land owner is for a residential development, with an indicative site capacity for 38 units. As stated above there are no insurmountable planning constraints to the development of this site. Furthermore, the site has extant planning consent for housing and was included within the 2019 HLA as a windfall approval for 38 units. Therefore, the principle of housing on this site has been established. The proposal was included within the MIR as a preferred option for housing, with an indicative site capacity for 38 units. Further to the MIR consultation, the site is included within the Proposed Plan for housing.

It should be noted that, as the site is already included within the 2019 HLA as a windfall approval, the indicative site capacity for this site cannot be included within the overall capacity for the new allocations being included within the Proposed Plan, to avoid double counting the site.

---

<b>Site reference</b> BG200	<b>Site name</b> Marchmont Road	<b>Settlement</b> Greenlaw	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 25	<b>Ha</b> 1.0	<b>PP status</b> Retain LDP Site
--------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------

---

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b>	<b>SAC</b>	<b>SPA</b>	<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
------------------	------------	------------	-------------	---------------

### Initial assessment summary

This is an existing housing allocation within the LDP, which was subject to a review as part of the MIR process.

---

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b>	<b>Planning history references</b>
--------------------------	------------	----------------------------------------	----------------------	------------------------------------

---

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b>	<b>Access to employment</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b>	<b>Site aspect</b>
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
--------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------------

### Local impact and integration summary

---

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
------------	------------	--------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	------------------

### Landscape summary

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

Right of way

TPOs

Contaminated land

Water supply

Sewerage

Gas Supply

Education provision

Planning & infrastructure summary

---

## Overall assessment

**PP status**

**Overall assessment**

**Site capacity**

Retain LDP Site

25

### Conclusions

The site is currently allocated within the adopted Local Development Plan (BG200) for housing, with an indicative site capacity for 25 units. All the existing allocations were subject to review, as part of the MIR process. The site was allocated as part of the 2008 Local Plan and there has been no planning history on the site to date.

During the review process the agent, acting on behalf of the landowner, wrote to advise that there remains a reasonable prospect of delivering residential development on the existing allocation (BG200) during the current Plan period, or failing that, during the next Local Plan period. They have drawn up draft layout plans, services are nearby and the affordable element has been traded to the housing site (AGREE004) in preparation for development. Therefore, they support the retention of the existing housing allocation (BG200).

It is acknowledged that (BG200) is a recent housing allocation and the economy experienced a downturn not long after the allocation. This affected the number of completions recorded throughout the whole of the Borders. It is therefore recommended that the existing housing allocation (BG200) is retained for inclusion within the Proposed Plan, with an indicative site capacity for 25 units.

---

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
<b>MGREE004</b>	Poultry Farm	Greenlaw	Rest of Borders	Mixed Use	N/A	2.3	<b>Excluded</b>

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable				

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designations.

SEPA: Should the layout or land-use differ from what was previously agreed we would require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Blackadder Water and small watercourse along the eastern boundary. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at increased risk of flooding.

There is the potential that development on this site could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard identified within the site.

Foul drainage from the development must be connected to the existing SW foul sewer network. Std comments for SUDS. Depending on the use of the proposed site (e.g. industrial units) there may be a requirement for permissions to be sought for certain activities from SEPA.

There are co-location issues regarding this site. This site is next door to the Greenlaw STW (Car license). Unlikely to be any issue from SEPA's perspective but any odour complaints would be dealt with by SBC Environmental health.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

I would, however, ask that potential surface water is considered during development due to the large capacity of the site.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	On/Adjacent to site	Brownfield	<p>Planning application (16/01360/PPP) for residential development was refused planning consent in 2017. There remains an outstanding appeal with the DPEA for this application at the time of the site assessment.</p> <p>Housing SG: The site was considered for housing (AGREE007) and not included.  LDP: The site was considered for housing (AGREE007) and not included.  LDP2: MIR: The site is also being considered for re-development, with an indicative site capacity (AGREE009).</p>

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

**Access to public transport**

Good

**Access to employment**

Limited

**Access to services**

Good

**Wider biodiversity impacts**

Minor

**Site aspect**

South

**Accessibility and sustainability summary**

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Moderate biodiversity impact. Site includes poultry sheds and improved grassland, tall ruderal and scrub habitat.

On the southern boundary within SEPA 1 in 200 year indicative flood risk area. Potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC via drains. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats, otter (EPS), badger and breeding birds. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC/SSSI. See also Planning Application 16/01360/PPP.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the east of Greenlaw and is located outwith the settlement boundary. The land is currently brownfield and the site is a series of former poultry units. There are bus services within Greenlaw, providing buses to Galashiels and Berwick-Upon-Tweed, both of which have Railway connections. There are limited services located within Greenlaw and it is currently necessary to drive or take the bus to access a wider choice and range of these services. There is some employment land in Greenlaw but this is limited for providing local employment. Duns, Eyemouth and Coldstream provide greater opportunities. Duns is located 7 miles away and Kelso located 9 miles away. The site is within walking distance to the centre of Greenlaw and is located off a quiet road leading out of the settlement.

**Local impact and integration assessment****Conservation area**

Not applicable

**Open space**

Not applicable

**Listed buildings**

Not applicable

**Scheduled Monument**

Not applicable

**Ancient woodland inventory**

Not applicable

**Archaeology**

Not applicable

**Garden and designed landscape**

On/adjacent to site

**Local impact and integration summary**

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: No specific comment.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: No response received.

**Landscape assessment****NSA**

Not applicable

**SLA**

Not applicable

**Over 200 metres?** **Over 12 degree slope** **Wild Land**

Not applicable

**Landscape summary**

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: While we have no comment on the proposed change of use, we advise that a site development brief should set out the site requirements for this prominent and gateway site. Establishing an appropriately designed landscape edge, development frontages and exploring the potential for connection to off-site access routes (such as the use of the dis-used railway) should be pursued.

We note the proximity of the River Tweed SAC and advise that the established approach to Habitats Regulations Appraisal should apply to this site.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: The site could accommodate some level of mixed business and industrial use although would be equally good site for residential development. Perhaps the western end should be developed for housing and eastern half/third developed for small scale industrial use. The existing road and residential to the west preclude large scale business and industrial use.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: No response received.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: No objections in principle to this land being zoned for housing. Numerous access points are achievable along the northern boundary of the site. The existing public road will need widened to accommodate two-way traffic flow. Footways and street lighting infrastructure will also be required as part of the improvement works to the public road. A Transport Statement will be required.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No response received.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

On/adjacent to site

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Appeal now approved, so this would need to be a housing land in any event.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. Please note there is existing rising sewer running through the middle of site, this leads to the existing Greenlaw WWTW. As the site is in such close proximity to the existing treatment works odour and noise assessments must be carried out by the Developer to consider the impact. Depending on the flow demand for this development, will determine if a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Rawburn WTW has sufficient capacity. Please note there is an existing 3" water main running along North of site. Depending on flow demand for this development, will determine if a Water Impact assessment (WIA) is required.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: There is the potential to improve access to the disused railway.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site is brownfield land and its use may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: As this had an existing business use on the site, if somewhat agriculturally based, and since it is on the edge of the settlement a small development could easily be accommodated with some degree of separation from adjacent housing. The preferred site would be to the east as it may be less attractive for housing to be so close to the sewage works. Additionally the site is likely to be already serviced and connection to the foul drainage system easily achieved.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No response received. However, a response was received for the housing site (AGREE009) and no issues were raised.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

### PP status

Excluded

### Overall assessment

Acceptable

### Site capacity

N/A

### Conclusions

The site was considered at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process for mixed use development. The site was previously considered for housing as part of the Housing SG (AGREE007), however was not included. It should be noted that the site was also under consideration for housing as part of the LDP2 process (AGREE009). Further to this, a planning application (16/01360/PPP) was granted planning consent, subject to appeal by the Scottish Government. Therefore, the principle of housing on this site has been established through this consent.

The site is directly adjacent to the existing Development Boundary, therefore the site provides a logical extension to Greenlaw and would integrate well with the existing settlement. There are no insurmountable planning constraints regarding the development of this site. The site is brownfield land currently disused poultry units. Development on this site would be welcomed. However, through the consultation process, the following constraints/mitigation were identified:

- The site is brownfield land, therefore potential contamination should be investigated and mitigated;
- Floor Risk Assessment likely required;
- The site is located within Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Protection for boundary features;
- Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC/SSSI;
- Assessment of ecology impacts and provision of mitigation, where appropriate; and
- Early engagement with Scottish Water in respect of the waste water treatment works capacity and water treatment works.

In conclusion, there are no insurmountable planning constraints to the development of this site, subject to appropriate mitigation. However, given the recent approval by the DPEA for housing on this site, the mixed use proposal (MGREE004) was not included within the MIR. In conclusion, the site (MGREE004) is not included within the Proposed Plan. However, the housing site (AGREE009) was taken forward as a preferred option within the MIR and has been included within the Proposed Plan.

---

# Hutton

<b>Site reference</b> AHUTT003	<b>Site name</b> Land East of Hutton	<b>Settlement</b> Hutton	<b>SDA</b> Eastern	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 15	<b>Ha</b> 1.7	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any International/National designation constraints.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. There maybe capacity issues at the STW. SW should confirm the position.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> On/Adjacent to site	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no planning history for this site.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Limited	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Limited	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Site is an arable field with hedgerow, grass-margin, stone wall and garden ground on the boundary. No obvious connectivity with River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds. Biodiversity risk - low impact.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the east of Hutton. Hutton does not contain any amenities or services that are assessed, it is therefore likely that Berwick-Upon-Tweed would be used, which would be a 15 minute drive. Public transport links are poor and therefore increased private car use is likely. Access to employment is also limited, it is therefore likely people will rely on travelling to other nearby settlements and that a car would be necessary. Berwick-Upon-Tweed is approximately 7 miles away, Eyemouth is 9 miles away and Duns is 10 miles away, where there are a variety of employment opportunities and services.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Adjacent to site

### Listed buildings

Adjacent to site

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Adjacent to site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER: Site lies to the east of the category B listed church (1403-017); any development should respect the setting of the church.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: The site has some potential to contain medieval and prehistoric archaeology. The size and location of medieval Hutton is unknown, with some 18th century mapping suggesting it extending near the site. In addition the site is within 200 metres of a known prehistoric settlement which raises potential for unknown archaeology to exist. Some mitigation maybe required.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to size and location.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: Village of 2 halves, retain element of separation by creating green open space (village green/play area/park) on low point of site adjacent to road to create 'sense of place', setting for church and for public amenity. Houses on West boundary could face 'the green' with views towards the church. Stone walling reused along property frontages. Properties on east and south boundary should take advantage of open views across the landscape with hedge and tree boundary to define eastern edge of settlement.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: May have some impact on location of existing 30 mph limit.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding development on this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I have no objection to this site being zoned for development. Access should be taken from both the C Class public road on the southern boundary of the site and the unclassified public road on the western boundary. The footway system will require to be extended to both access points and the 30mph limit will require to be extended east on the C Class road. The unclassified road will require some carriageway widening. A strong street frontage onto the unclassified road is recommended.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Did not raise any concerns regarding development on this site.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No response received.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding development on this site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Rawburn WTW has sufficient capacity and sufficient capacity in the network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding development on this site.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding development on this site.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No concerns.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Acceptable	15

### Conclusions

The site was submitted at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process for housing. Further to a site assessment and consultation, the following constraints were identified;

- Site is located within Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Protection for boundary features;
- Mitigation for protected species;
- Potential archaeology within the site; and
- Adjacent to a listed building.

The proposal is for 15 units on a large site to the east of Hutton. It is not considered that there are insurmountable planning constraints to this site being developed. However, the LDP currently identifies a housing allocation within Hutton (BHU2B) for 11 units, which has not been developed to date. The site was only allocated within the Local Plan 2008, therefore is considered to be a relatively recent allocation and will be carried forward into the Proposed LDP.

It is considered that the existing allocation is sufficient for the LDP2 period. In conclusion, the site was not taken forward within the MIR and is not included within the Proposed LDP.

---

<b>Site reference</b> AHUTT004	<b>Site name</b> Land to South of Hutton	<b>Settlement</b> Hutton	<b>SDA</b> Eastern	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 7	<b>Ha</b> 1.0	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not lie within any International/National designations. However, there are a number of identified Surface Water Hazards within the site.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Netherlough Burn which would appear to be culverted through the site. Site may be constrained due to flood risk. We do not support development over any culverted watercourses. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues adjacent to site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. There is the potential that development of this site could increase probability of flooding elsewhere. There are identified Surface Water Hazards within the site.

There is a water body within, forming part of the site boundary, or immediately adjacent to the site. Therefore, SEPA have requested a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

Foul drainage must connect to the existing SW foul network. There maybe capacity issues at the STW. SW should confirm the position. The Netherlough burn appears to be culverted through this site. Opportunities should be taken to de-culvert this during any development.

Co-location issues: Hutton STW (CAR licenced site) is opposite this development site and may give rise to odours (not regulated by SEPA)

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site in places within the 1 in 200 year surface water flood extent. There also appears to be a drain/small watercourse running through the site. I would require a Flood Risk Assessment to be undertaken for this site. FRA required.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> On/Adjacent to site	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no planning history.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Limited	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Limited	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Site is recorded as semi-natural neutral grassland (Phase 1 inventory) with hedgerow and tress on boundary. Potential for connectivity with River Tweed SAC/SSSI via Netherlough burn (undesigned). Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the south of Hutton. Hutton does not contain any amenities or services that are assessed, it is therefore likely that Berwick-Upon-Tweed would be used, which would be a 15 minute drive. Public transport links are poor and therefore increased private car use is likely. Access to employment is also limited, it is therefore likely people will rely on travelling to other nearby settlements and that a car would be necessary. Berwick-Upon-Tweed is approximately 7 miles away, Eyemouth is 9 miles away and Duns is 10 miles away, where there are a variety of employment opportunities and services.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

## Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: The OS 1st edition shows a building of unknown date or function at the north end of the field. Some mitigation may be needed.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to size and location.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: Site location is a further linear extension of the settlement southwards. I would prefer to see AHUTT003 and BHU2B developed in the first instance which in my opinion relate better to the existing settlement. However if site is selected I recommend retaining valuable existing trees and hedges where possible and augmenting to help contain the site. Provide structure planting throughout site and along southern boundary, to provide enclosure and define the settlement boundary. Take advantage of open views to West between trees.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: May have some impact on location of existing 30 mph limit.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding development on this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I am unable to support this proposal. The site is somewhat detached from the rest of the village and does not allow for proper integration into the surrounding street network.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Did not raise any concerns regarding development of this site.

### Near a trunk road?

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No response received.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. It is noted that this site is close to the Hutton WWTW. There is sufficient capacity in the network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Rawburn WTW has sufficient capacity and sufficient capacity in the network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	7

## Conclusions

The site was submitted at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process. The site is under consideration for 7 units and is located to the south of the Hutton Development Boundary. Further to the site assessment and consultation process, the following constraints were identified;

- The site is located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Flood Risk Assessment would be required, in respect of flood risk and surface water runoff;
- There is a water body within/adjacent to the site, therefore maintenance buffer strip would be required;
- Potential co-location issues with the site and Hutton STW;
- The Ecology Officer states that the site is recorded as semi-neutral grassland with hedgerow and trees on the boundary. There is the potential for connectivity with the River Tweed SAC/SSSI and appropriate mitigation would be required;
- Protect the boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds;
- The site is not well related to the existing properties within Hutton and the site appears detached from them;
- Potential archaeology mitigation required;
- Site location is a further linear extension of the settlement southwards; and
- The Roads Planning Officer is unable to support this proposal, advising the site is somewhat detached from the rest of the village and does not allow for proper integration into the surrounding street network.

The LDP currently identifies a housing allocation within Hutton (BHU2B) for 11 units, which has not been developed to date. The site was only allocated within the Local Plan 2008, therefore is considered to be a recent allocation and will be carried forward into the Proposed Plan. It is considered that the existing allocation is sufficient for the LDP2 period. Furthermore, there are a number of identified constraints on the site, including the Roads Planning Officer who is unable to support the proposal. In conclusion, the site was not taken forward within the MIR and is not included within the Proposed Plan.

# Preston

<b>Site reference</b> APRES004	<b>Site name</b> Land north east of Preston	<b>Settlement</b> Preston	<b>SDA</b> Eastern	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 5	<b>Ha</b> 0.5	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any International/National designation constraints.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network however it is likely that this would require upsizing for any new development.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> On/Adjacent to site	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no planning history.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Site appears to be improved grassland trees, hedgerow and garden ground on the boundary. No obvious connectivity with River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds. Low biodiversity impact.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Preston does not have any services/employment opportunities, however Duns is only a 5 minute drive away. Preston has a bus service although it is likely that there would be a heavy reliance of car. There are a range of public services and employment opportunities available within Duns.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER: Preston Cottages and the pair of cottages over the road to the south are listed category C. Any development in the proposed site should respect their setting and not be overly dominant in terms of height.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: There are no known archaeological issues.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: SITE BRIEF - We wish to ensure that if this site is to be allocated a site brief is produced to identify the key natural heritage assets of the site to be protected and the key opportunities for the integration of green infrastructure within future development. Our advice on this site is based on prior knowledge and desktop assessment using GIS and streetview. We may provide further advice based on a site visit if the potential allocation is carried forward. This site sits east of (APRES005), if both are allocated it will appear as part of the same site. We therefore recommend they are considered together.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: Positioned behind current linear development of village. Mitigated by existing development and mature trees to west. 5/7 properties based on density of adjacent existing development. Tree belts and hedgerows to boundaries, recommended to link with wider landscape.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Access via existing junction with B6355.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I have no objection to the land being zoned for residential development. Vehicular access can be taken from The Forge. The existing access track to the west of the site is not suitable as a means of vehicular access but may be used as a pedestrian/cycle route.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Preston is a small village with limited infrastructure and transport links. Given the existing development pattern within the village this site is not particularly logical and it is not clear how the site would be accessed. A landscaping buffer to the north, east and potentially to the west would be required if this site was to go forward.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Rawburn WTW has sufficient capacity and sufficient capacity in the network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Potential to improve path to west.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Doubtful	5

### Conclusions

The site was submitted at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process. The proposal is for the allocation of the site for housing, with an indicative site capacity for 5 units. The site is located to the north of 'The Forge' in Preston. Further to the site assessment and consultation process, the following constraints were identified during the consultation process;

- Site is located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural Land;
- Protect boundary features and provide mitigation for protected species including breeding birds;
- Preston has a linear settlement. The site would not respect the existing settlement pattern or character of Preston; and
- Any development must ensure that it protects the natural heritage assets and links in with the wider biodiversity;

The Roads Planning Officer advises that access must be taken from 'The Forge', given that the access to the west is not a suitable means of vehicular access. This would require access via the field to the east of 'The Forge', which is currently outwith the proposed site boundary.

There is an existing re-development site (zRO16) allocated within Preston for 45 units. However, that site is being removed as part of the Proposed Plan, given that it is currently an operational farm. It is proposed that the site remains within the Development Boundary of Preston. Although the site is being removed, Berwickshire has a healthy housing land supply going forward into the LDP2. Therefore, it is not considered that a replacement site within Preston itself is needed to meet the housing land requirements for the next Plan.

The proposed site, currently under consideration, is owned by the same land owner as the site being removed (zRO16). However, it is not considered that the allocation of (APRES004) would respect the existing settlement pattern or character of Preston itself. Therefore, notwithstanding the potential access constraint which requires the field to the east of 'The Forge', it is not considered that housing on this site would respect the existing settlement pattern or character of Preston, given it's linear nature.

In conclusion, the site was not included within the MIR and is not included within the Proposed Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b> APRES005	<b>Site name</b> Land north of Preston	<b>Settlement</b> Preston	<b>SDA</b> Eastern	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 21	<b>Ha</b> 2.1	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any International/National designation constraints.

SEPA: Site is elevated above adjacent small watercourse. Due to steep topography adjacent/ through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and the proposed development is not affected by surface runoff. Surface Water Hazard identified within the site.

Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network however it is likely that this would require upsizing for any new development.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk but considering "APRES004" is next to the site and likely to be the same developer I would look for an assessment to be undertaken to ensure that surface water flooding is managed.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> On/Adjacent to site	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> Local Plan: (SBP6), a much larger site was assessed, which included this smaller site Local Plan: (TP13D), a larger site was assessed, which included the eastern part of this site
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Site appears to be arable field with hedgerow and garden ground on the boundary. No obvious connectivity with River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Preston does not have any services/employment opportunities, however Duns is only a 5 minute drive away. Preston has a bus service although it is likely that there would be a heavy reliance of car. There are a range of public services and employment opportunities available within Duns.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: There are no known archaeological issues.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: SITE BRIEF - We wish to ensure that if this site is to be allocated a site brief is produced to identify the key natural heritage assets of the site to be protected and the key opportunities for the integration of green infrastructure within future development.

Our advice on this site is based on prior knowledge and desktop assessment using GIS and streetview. We may provide further advice based on a site visit if the potential allocation is carried forward. The potential allocation (on its own and when considered alongside APRES004) represents a significant extension to Preston. We note that the current settlement statement in LDP1 states that "The fields surrounding Preston are prime agricultural land". While the indicative capacity is low, it is for approximately half the size of the existing settlement. In that context, we note that the potential allocation does not follow an existing boundary along its north edge. Further expansion of the site in future seems likely, we therefore that the site brief should set out appropriate conditions to either integrate such further expansion or to establish a strong boundary in support of informing or shaping further settlement expansion.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: 20 no. reflecting density of adjacent existing development. Tree belts and hedgerows to boundaries recommended to link with wider landscape. Positioned behind current linear development of village. Mitigated by existing development and mature trees to west.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Access via existing junction with B6355

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding development on this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I am only able to support this land being allocated if site APRES004 to the east is also allocated, as vehicular access to the site will have to be taken from that site and also from a new access to the B6355 to the west. The existing access track to the east of the site is not suitable as a means of vehicular access but may be used as a pedestrian/cycle route. A footway will be required in the B5355 from the A6112 and a marginal extension of the street lighting along the B6355 and possible extension of the 30 mph limit are matters for addressing. A Transport Statement may be required depending on the scale of development.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Possible bus stop infrastructure on main road.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Limited

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Preston is a small village with limited infrastructure and transport links. It is not clear how this site would be accessed. The settlement has a strong edge to the west. A landscaping buffer to the north would be required if this site was to go forward.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Rawburn WTW has sufficient capacity. A flow and pressure test is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS OFFICER: Potential to improve path to the east.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding development on this site.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Doubtful	21

## Conclusions

This site was submitted at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process. The proposal is for the allocation of the site for housing, with an indicative site capacity for 21 units. The site is located to the north of existing residential properties along the B6355, Law View and The Anvil. The following constraints were identified through the consultation process;

- The site is located within Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Consideration must be given to surface water runoff within the site;
- Protection should be given to the existing boundary features and mitigation provided for protected species including breeding birds;
- The site would appear to be backland development and would not respect the existing pattern of development or the character of Preston, given the linear nature;
- Any development must consider linkages with the wider surrounding landscape and features;
- A Transport Statement would be required for any development; and
- The Roads Planning Officer is only able to support this site, if the adjacent site (APRES004) to the east is also allocated, as vehicular access to the site will have to be taken via (APRES004). It should be noted that the existing access track to the east of the site is not suitable as a means of vehicular access.

There is an existing re-development site (zRO16) allocated within Preston for 45 units. However, that site is being removed as part of the Proposed Plan process, given that it is currently an operational farm. It is proposed that the site remains within the Development Boundary. Although the site is being removed, Berwickshire has a healthy housing land supply going forward into LDP2. Therefore, it is not considered that a replacement site within Preston itself is needed to meet the housing land requirements for the next Plan.

The proposed site, currently under consideration, is owned by the same land owner as the site being removed (zRO16). However, it is not considered that the allocation of (APRES005) would respect the existing settlement pattern or character of Preston itself. It is noted that there are also potential access constraints regarding the delivery of (APRES004) to the east, which is also under consideration. Furthermore, (APRES005) relies on the delivery of (APRES004) before it can be delivered.

In conclusion, it is not considered that housing on this site would respect the existing settlement pattern or character of Preston, given its linear nature. Furthermore, taking the above into consideration, the site was not included within the MIR or the Proposed Plan.

<b>Site reference</b> zRO16	<b>Site name</b> Preston Farm	<b>Settlement</b> Preston	<b>SDA</b> Eastern	<b>Proposed Use</b> Redevelopment	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 45	<b>Ha</b> 2.0	<b>PP status</b> Remove LDP Site
--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------

## Initial assessment

**Floodrisk**      **SAC**      **SPA**      **SSSI**      **Ramsar**

### Initial assessment summary

This an existing housing allocation within the LDP, which was subject to a review as part of the MIR process.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b> Combination	<b>Planning history references</b> Local Development Plan: Current allocation for re-development, with an indicative site capacity of 45 units. Planning applications 12/01309/FUL: Erection of agricultural buildings 12/00021/FUL: Installation of ground mounted solar array 08/01672/FUL: Erection of agricultural buildings
--------------------------	------------	----------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

**Access to public transport**      **Access to employment**      **Access to services**      **Wider biodiversity impacts**      **Site aspect**

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

## Local impact and integration assessment

**Conservation area**      **Open space**      **Listed buildings**      **Scheduled Monument**      **Ancient woodland inventory**      **Archaeology**      **Garden and designed landscape**

### Local impact and integration summary

## Landscape assessment

NSA

SLA

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

Wild Land

## Landscape summary

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

Right of way

TPOs

Contaminated land

Water supply

Sewerage

Gas Supply

Education provision

## Planning & infrastructure summary

---

## Overall assessment

PP status

Overall assessment

Site capacity

Remove LDP Site

45

### Conclusions

The site is currently allocated for re-development within the adopted Local Development Plan (zRO16), with an indicative site capacity for 45 units. All the existing allocations within the LDP were subject to review, as part of the MIR process and a letter was sent to the landowner of this site. The site was allocated for re-development within the Local Plan, however has not been subject to any planning applications for residential use since the allocation. It should be noted that there have been a number of planning applications consented in recent years for works associated with a working farm. These include; the erection of agricultural buildings in 2012 and the installation of ground mounted solar array in 2012. It is evident that the site remains an operational working farm and is not redundant.

The landowner, Mr Forrest, has subsequently responded and confirmed in writing, that he owns the re-development site (zRO16). He believes that the site should be retained for re-development within the Proposed Plan. The majority of the re-development site is the current base for Mr Forrest's farming operations, however there are elements of the site which could be developed/re-developed and the land owner advised he is now considering these options.

It is possible that the farming operations could cease operating within the re-development allocation and re-locate elsewhere. However, currently they will remain within the existing allocation. The land owner has submitted two alternative sites within Preston for consideration, to compensate the loss of the current re-development allocation. However, these will be assessed on their own merits as part of the site assessment process.

In conclusion, given that there is strong evidence to show that this site is still a working farm and is not redundant, a re-development allocation is no longer considered to be appropriate. It is evident that the site is not effective and given the working operations of the farm, there are no immediate plans for the re-development of this site. Furthermore, a recent planning application (18/00627/FUL) was granted planning consent along the northern boundary of the site, for the erection of agricultural buildings. Therefore, taking the above into consideration, it is proposed that the allocation (zRO16) is removed and not included within the Proposed Plan. It is acknowledged that the agent indicates there may be a change of circumstances in the future surrounding the operation of the farm, however this is no different to any working farm. The site will remain included within the Development Boundary for Preston, as 'white land'. As a result, any smaller proposals within the site could be tested through the development management process subject to a planning application.

---

# Reston

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
AREST005	Land east of West Reston	Reston	Eastern	Housing	5	0.4	Included

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable				

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any International/National designation constraints.

SEPA: Sufficient height difference between the site and the Eye Water and lade. There is potential fluvial flood risk adjacent to the site.

Foul water must be connected to the existing sewer network. SW should confirm any capacity issues.

SEPA (MIR Consultation additional comments): SEPA commented on the MIR Consultation, however provided no additional comments further to above.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	Local Plan: (BR10D) - formed part of a much larger site which was considered Housing SG: (AREST002) - formed part of a much larger site which was considered

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Good	Limited	Good	Minor	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Site is an arable field with field margins, broad-leaved trees on eastern boundary. Possible connectivity with Eye water via surface water run-off. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds and protect waterbodies.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site has good access to the few local services provided within the settlement and the services located within Eyemouth nearby. It has good access to the public transport network and limited access to employment in Eyemouth and Berwick-Upon-Tweed.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On/adjacent to site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: The site is within a field of high archaeological potential. Investigation will be required.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment, existing allocation.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No constraints identified but site shape bears no relation to existing site features and is simply a diagonal strip within an existing arable field. It appears to be an extension to the existing allocation at BR5 although it does not exactly match? Recommend coordination with BR5 and allocation of a 10m planting strip along the north east (i.e. Mill House) boundary to retain separation from the existing track and provide, potentially some screening and shelter from the north east.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I have no objection to the extension to the existing allocation BR5 to include this land.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: I have no objection to the extension to the existing allocation BR5 to include this land.

### Near a trunk road?

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No response received.

HOUSING STRATEGY: I have no objection to the extension to the existing allocation BR5 to include this land.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Reston WWTW has sufficient capacity and sufficient capacity in the network. Note that there are sewers slightly within site boundary.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Rawburn WTW has sufficient capacity and sufficient capacity in the network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS OFFICER: I have no objection to the extension to the existing allocation BR5 to include this land.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.  
NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.  
PROJECTS TEAM: I have no objection to the extension to the existing allocation BR5 to include this land.  
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.  
EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.  
NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Included	Acceptable	5

### Conclusions

The site was considered at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process. This proposal is for 5 units, which would effectively extend the existing housing allocation (BR5) to the east. The proposal would allow an additional 25 metres to the existing housing allocation (BR5) which would allow an improved layout for development. There are three existing housing allocations within Reston, contained within the adopted LDP, these are (BR5 for 20 units; BR6 for 16 units and AREST004 for 38 units). The latter was most recently taken forward as part of the Housing SG in November 2017. There is an additional area for longer term housing identified within the LDP (SREST001). Furthermore there is an allocated mixed use allocation (MREST001) within the LDP, with an indicative capacity for 100 units. It is considered that there is sufficient un-developed land available within Reston for the Proposed Plan period.

Further to the site assessment, the site does not have any insurmountable constraints to development. It should be noted that the following constraints were highlighted throughout the site assessment and would require suitable mitigation measures;

- Potential fluvial flooding risk adjacent to the site;
- Protect existing boundary features;
- Protect existing species including breeding birds and protected waterbodies; and
- There is potential archaeology within the site.

The development of this site would respect the existing settlement pattern, landscape setting and would not be highly visible from any of the approach roads. Therefore, taking the above into consideration, the site was included within the MIR, as an alternative option. Although it is not considered that any additional units are required within Reston for the Proposed Plan period, the allocation would aid the delivery of the adjacent housing allocation (BR5). Further to the MIR consultation, the site is included within the Proposed Plan.

---

# St Abbs

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
ASTAB001	Land to east of Northfield Farm Buildings	St Abbs	Eastern	Housing	9	0.9	Excluded

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable				

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any International/National designation constraints.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Starney Burn which flows adjacent to site. Consideration will need to be given to any culverts/ bridges which may exacerbate flood risk. Due to steep topography adjacent/ through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and the proposed development is not affected by surface runoff. There is the potential that the allocation of this development could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. Surface Water Hazard identified within the site.

There is a water body immediately adjacent to the site. Therefore SEPA request that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres is provided between the watercourses and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

Private foul drainage would be required as no SW foul network in vicinity. This may be problematic as the Starney burn is the only available watercourse and it appears to have a small catchment and thus likely low flows. The site appears to be very close to the Starney burn at the east side and hence opportunities to protect and enhance the watercourse should be taken as part of any development.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: Site is adjacent to the Starney Burn which is not included within SEPA's Flood Maps. I would expect the applicant to consider this and an FRA may be requested.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	On/Adjacent to site	Greenfield	Planning applications: 06/01911/OUT: Erection of dwellinghouse 11/00418/PPP: Erection of dwellinghouse (renewal of planning consent)

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Limited	Good	Good	Minor	Not applicable

## Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Site appears to be rank improved pasture with stone dyke and felled small coniferous plantation on the boundary. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds. Biodiversity risk: low impact.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the North West of St Abbs. There is a bus stop within St Abbs and to the south west at Northfield Farm, which provides a bus service to Coldingham, Eyemouth and Berwick-Upon-Tweed. However, these buses are limited throughout the day. Therefore, there is a heavy reliance of cars for transport to and from St Abbs. There is a pathway linking the site to St Abbs itself, adjacent to the roadside. There are limited employment opportunities within St Abbs itself, however Eyemouth is located 5 miles away and Berwick-Upon-Tweed is 14 miles away, which have a wider range of opportunities. In terms of services, there is a primary school, limited shops and hotel/restaurant within St Abbs. There are a wider range of services within Eyemouth and Berwick-Upon-Tweed. There are minor biodiversity issues.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area	Open space	Listed buildings	Scheduled Monument	Ancient woodland inventory	Archaeology	Garden and designed landscape
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	On/adjacent to site	Not applicable

## Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: While there is no evidence of archaeological features or deposits, there is in the surrounding area suggesting in particular a heavily settled prehistoric landscape. Some mitigation may be required.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: While there is no evidence of archaeological features or deposits, there is in the surrounding area suggesting in particular a heavily settled prehistoric landscape. Some mitigation may be required.

---

## Landscape assessment

NSA	SLA	Over 200 metres? <input type="checkbox"/>	Over 12 degree slope <input type="checkbox"/>	Wild Land
Not applicable	On/adjacent to site			Not applicable

## Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: SITE BRIEF - We wish to ensure that if this site is to be allocated a site brief is produced to identify the key natural heritage assets of the site to be protected and the key opportunities for the integration of green infrastructure within future development.

Our advice on this site is based on prior knowledge and desktop assessment using GIS and streetview. We may provide further advice based on a site visit if the potential allocation is carried forward.

On the main approach to St Abbs this is a sensitive site in terms of landscape and visual issues. Due to its location the site will also need handled with care in terms of the positioning of new development in relation to local built features. We would at this stage be cautious about the appropriateness of this site in terms of our interests but consider our concerns may be appropriately addressed through a well considered site brief.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: This site is out with the St. Abbs development boundary and would extend the development of St. Abbs in a linear direction. I therefore do not recommend it for development.

This site will be very visible on the approach road to St. Abbs and from the coastal path to the north, with little to contain it within the landscape. Unless developed very carefully to associate well with the existing adjacent farm and cottage buildings it risks having an adverse impact on the setting of the Berwickshire Coastal SLA and the important tourist vehicle and pedestrian routes approaching St. Abbs and the St. Abbs Head National Nature Reserve. I would prefer to see other areas closer to St. Abbs developed in the first instance.

(An alternative development could be considered on the agricultural field immediately north of Northfield farm buildings and south of the farm cottages. This site would be more contained by the existing buildings to the south and woodland to the north with rising land to the west.)

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Divorced from main settlement, albeit existing footway link. Would not qualify for reduced speed limit but expectation might be for one.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I am not opposed to this land being zoned for residential development. The existing street lighting network will have to be extended out from St Abbs to this site and the existing informal footway will have to be upgraded to an adoptable standard. The existing 30mph limit will also have to be extended to encompass this site.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Limited

### Sewerage

No

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: This site is located outwith any designated settlement boundary and has a very poor relationship to the nearest settlement, St Abbs.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Over 200 m from the sewer zone.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Rawburn WTW has sufficient capacity. A flow and pressure test is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Potential opportunity to improve pedestrian/cycle access into the village. Enhancement to existing path network would also be recommended.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

## Overall assessment

### PP status

Excluded

### Overall assessment

Doubtful

### Site capacity

9

### Conclusions

The site was considered at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process. The site under consideration is for housing, with an indicative site capacity of 9 units. The following constraints were identified as part of the consultation;

- There is the potential for archaeology within the site and therefore mitigation may be required;
- Waterbody adjacent to the site, therefore maintenance buffer strip required;
- Private foul drainage would be required;
- The site is detached from St Abb's and offers high amenity value on the approach to the Conservation Area;
- The proposed site does not respect the existing settlement pattern of St Abb's, the Conservation Area and would not integrate well with the existing village;
- The site is located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;

- The site falls within the Berwickshire Coast SLA;
- Protection must be given to the existing boundary features;
- Mitigation for protected species including breeding birds;
- Flood Risk Assessment would be required;
- The site is very sensitive in respect of landscape and visual impacts; and
- The Landscape Officer does not support the development of this site, as the site is very visible on the approach to St Abb's and coastal path to the north.

Overall, taking into consideration the above, it is re-iterated that the site is visually sensitive and detached from St Abb's. The development of this site has the potential to result in landscape and visual impacts. In conclusion, the site was not included within the MIR and is not included within the Proposed Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b> ASTAB002	<b>Site name</b> Land to west of St Abbs	<b>Settlement</b> St Abbs	<b>SDA</b> Eastern	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 5	<b>Ha</b> 0.5	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any International/National designation constraints.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial, surface water and coastal 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> No planning history
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Limited	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
----------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Site appears to be arable field with stone dyke and garden ground on the boundary. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds. Biodiversity Risk: Low impact.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site lies to the west of St Abb's, to the west of Briery Law. There is a minor biodiversity risk on the site. There is a bus stop within St Abbs, which provides a bus service to Coldingham, Eyemouth and Berwick-Upon-Tweed. However, these buses are limited throughout the day. Therefore, there is a heavy reliance of cars for transport to and from St Abbs. There are limited employment opportunities within St Abbs itself, however Eyemouth is located 5 miles away and Berwick-Upon-Tweed is 14 miles away, which have a wider range of opportunities. In terms of services, there is a primary school, limited shops and hotel/restaurant within St Abbs. There are a wider range of services within Eyemouth and Berwick-Upon-Tweed.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Adjacent to site

### Open space

Adjacent to site

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Site lies immediately to the west of the conservation area boundary; any development should respect the character of the conservation area.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: While there is no evidence of archaeological features or deposits, there is in the surrounding area suggesting in particular a heavily settled prehistoric landscape. Some mitigation may be required.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

On/adjacent to site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: SITE BRIEF - We wish to ensure that if this site is to be allocated a site brief is produced to identify the key natural heritage assets of the site to be protected and the key opportunities for the integration of green infrastructure within future development. Our advice on this site is based on prior knowledge and desktop assessment using GIS and streetview. We may provide further advice based on a site visit if the potential allocation is carried forward.

This site is on the western edge of the existing settlement could adversely affect the existing landscape setting of the village, particularly as appreciated on approaching the village by the road or Berwickshire Coastal Path. Careful siting and design could seek to provide a well-designed edge, including details of the form and massing of development, along with landscape treatment.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: This site is out with the St.Abbs development boundary. However, if road width and access can be accommodated this site would be a logical development of the village and could reflect the existing pattern of development within St.Abbs. Without having adverse impact on the SLA. A wider strip would be preferable to prevent overlooking of adjacent properties, allow for garden space and road width and provide a better relationship with the existing building group. Could access be gained through the Old School grounds? – current ownership of Old School?

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: Existing road access limited.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I am unable to support this land being allocated for housing given the inability of Creel Road to cater for additional traffic movements.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

### Near a trunk road?

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: This site adjoins St Abbs at the settlement boundary on the west which also forms the western boundary to the conservation area which covers most of the village. There is not generally a strong boundary on this side of the village but the surrounding landform provides containment. This site slopes up to the west, meaning new housing would likely require to be platformed/ elevated above the adjoining conservation area and potentially above the adjoining field ridge to the west. There may also be roads/ access issues.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Eyemouth WWTW has sufficient capacity and sufficient capacity in the network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Rawburn WTW has sufficient capacity and sufficient capacity in the network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	5

## Conclusions

The site was considered at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process. The site lies to the west of St Abb's and is currently being considered for a housing allocation, with an indicative site capacity for 5 units. The site has limited access to public transport and good access to services and employment, given the proximity of Eyemouth and other nearby settlements. Following the consultation process, the following constraints were identified on the site;

- Protection would be required for the existing boundary features;
- Mitigation for protected species, including breeding birds;
- Site is adjacent to the St Abb's Conservation Area and any development must take cognisance of this;
- Site is adjacent to the identified key greenspace 'The Briery', sited to the east and any development must take cognisance of this;
- There is potential archaeological mitigation required;
- The site lies within the 'Berwickshire Coast' SLA; and
- The Roads Planning Officer cannot support the proposal, given the inability of Creel Road to cater for the additional traffic movements.

It is noted that the site relates well to the existing Development Boundary and it is not considered that any development would be readily visible from the majority of St Abb's. Given the rolling nature of the hills, St Abb's being set down into the cliff, the site would not be visible from the approach road from the west either.

In conclusion, taking the above into consideration, given the fact that the Roads Planning Officer cannot support such a proposal, the site was not included within the MIR. Ultimately, the site is not included within the Proposed Plan.

<b>Site reference</b> ASTAB003	<b>Site name</b> Land to south of St Abbs	<b>Settlement</b> St Abbs	<b>SDA</b> Eastern	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 10	<b>Ha</b> 1.4	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	----------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Adjacent to site	<b>SPA</b> Adjacent to site	<b>SSSI</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site lies adjacent to the Berwickshire Coast SSSI, Berwickshire and North Northumberland Coast SAC and St Abb's Head to Fast Castle SPA. Therefore, there are potential moderate designation constraints.

SEPA: OS Map indicates site is above 10mAOD. Council should be satisfied there is no erosion issues along the cliff in St Abbs.

Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial, surface water and coastal 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk but would require that surface water management is considered.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> No planning history.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Limited	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
----------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Site appears to be arable field with stone dyke and garden ground on the boundary. On cliff-top above Berwickshire Coast (Intertidal) SSSI and Berwickshire & North Northumberland SAC. Protect designated sites from run-off. Protect boundary features and mitigation to ensure no significant adverse effects on designated sites and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site lies adjacent to the Coldingham Bay and St Abbs Local Biodiversity Sites. There is a moderate biodiversity risk on the site. The site is located to the South of St Abbs. There is a bus stop within St Abbs, which provides a bus service to Coldingham, Eyemouth and Berwick-Upon-Tweed. However, these buses are limited throughout the day. Therefore, there is a heavy reliance of cars for transport to and from St Abbs. There are limited employment opportunities within St Abbs itself, however Eyemouth is located 5 miles away and Berwick-Upon-Tweed is 14 miles away, which have a wider range of opportunities. In terms of services, there is a primary school, limited shops and hotel/restaurant within St Abbs. There are a wider range of services within Eyemouth and Berwick-Upon-Tweed. There are minor biodiversity issues.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Adjacent to site

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On/adjacent to site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Site lies in a very prominent position; development on the headland, development in this location would impact on the overall setting of the village and would begin to coalesce with existing development at Coldingham Bay.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: While there is no evidence of archaeological features or deposits, there is in the surrounding area suggesting in particular a heavily settled prehistoric landscape. Some mitigation may be required.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

On/adjacent to site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: (Seek a reasonable alternative) - The site is likely to present significant and/ or adverse impacts on the natural heritage. We advise that reasonable alternatives may present less significant impacts and therefore they should be considered in advance of these sites. Our advice on this site is based on prior knowledge and desktop assessment using GIS and streetview. We may provide further advice based on a site visit if the potential allocation is carried forward. This elongated site lies in a prominent location next to the coastal path. It would present issues related to landscape and visual impact and also in relation.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: Do not recommend – risks coalescence of St Abbs and Coldingham. Do not recommend for development for the following reasons:

- Coastal Policy EP4: Protection of 'undeveloped coast'
- Site is out with the settlement boundary
- To prevent settlement coalescence of Coldingham Bay and St Abbs
- To prevent adverse impacts on the Berwickshire Coast SLA and visual amenity of receptors using both the coastal path and the Creel Road - both popular tourist routes
- Vehicle access and road capacity, possibly restricted.

(Although out with the settlement boundary, the Officer would consider developmetn of the site ASTAB002 would be a preferable way of addressing housing shortfall at St Abbs. However the site would need to be widened to form a more meaningful relationship with the existing building group and allow sufficient space for access, gardens etc).

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: Existing road access limited.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I am unable to support this land being allocated for housing given the inability of Creel Road to cater for additional traffic movements.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

### Near a trunk road?

**Right of way**

Adjacent to site

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

Not applicable

**Water supply**

Yes

**Sewerage**

Yes

**Gas Supply**

No

**Education provision**

Good

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT:** This site can be considered in two parts. The cliff-top extension to the south west lacks any clear reasoning or logic as an extension to the village, would result in ribbon development across the cliff-top, and would risk eventually leading to coalescence with Coldingham Sands in one of the most sensitive parts of the SLA. The impact on the SLA, as well as the core path, and the setting of the village and conservation area when viewed from numerous key receptor points including many across the wider bay area (e.g. the Homeli Knoll) would be significant. The part of the site which adjoins the rest of the village does so at a prominent and exposed location when viewed from across the bay and in a particularly sensitive part of the wider SLA. There may also be roads/ access issues and the site adjoins designated sites.

**HOUSING STRATEGY:** Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

**SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW):** Eyemouth WWTW has sufficient capacity and sufficient capacity in the network.

**SCOTTISH WATER (WTW):** Rawburn WTW has sufficient capacity and sufficient capacity in the network.

**OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM:** Potential opportunity to improve pedestrian/cycle access along coastal path (core path2) to Coldingham. Enhancement to existing path network would also be recommended.

**CONTAMINATED LAND:** The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

**ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH:** No response received.

**NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES:** No response received.

**PROJECTS TEAM:** Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT:** Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

**EDUCATION OFFICER:** No issues.

**NHS:** No response received.

**Overall assessment****PP status**

Excluded

**Overall assessment**

Unacceptable

**Site capacity**

10

**Conclusions**

The site was considered at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process. The proposal is for a housing allocation, with an indicative site capacity for 10 units. The site is located outwith the Development Boundary of St Abb's. The site is located adjacent to the Berwickshire Coast SSSI, Berwickshire and North Northumberland Coast SAC and St Abb's Head to Fast Castle SPA. The site has moderate biodiversity risk. The site has limited access to public transport and good access to services and employment, given the proximity of Eyemouth and other nearby settlements. Any development would need to ensure that the boundary features are protected and mitigation would be required where necessary, in respect of breeding birds and bats. There is the potential for archaeological mitigation within the site. Furthermore, the site lies within the Berwickshire Coast SLA.

The proposed site does not respect the existing settlement pattern of St Abb's and would not integrate well into the settlement. The proposal would extend the settlement further along the coastline, within close proximity to the SSSI, SAC and SPA. The site also occupies a very prominent position along the headland, impacting upon the setting of St Abb's. It is further considered that the development of this site would impact upon the landscape and visual amenity of the area. The Landscape Officer recommended that the site was not included within the MIR, the reasons included the potential impacts upon the SLA and coalescence between Coldingham Bay and St Abb's.

In addition to this, the Roads Planning Officer is unable to support this proposal, given the inability of Creel Road to cater for additional traffic movements. Therefore, taking all of this into consideration, the site was not included within the MIR and ultimately is not included within the Proposed Plan.

<b>Site reference</b> RSTAB001	<b>Site name</b> Northfield Farm Buildings	<b>Settlement</b> St Abbs	<b>SDA</b> Eastern	<b>Proposed Use</b> Redevelopment	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 9	<b>Ha</b> 0.9	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any International/National designations.

SEPA: Due to steep topography adjacent/ through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and the proposed development is not affected by surface runoff.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial, surface water and coastal 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Brownfield	<b>Planning history references</b> Planning applications: All assessed under the housing in the countryside policy 06/01910/FUL: Change of use to 6 dwellinghouses (granted consent) 06/01911/OUT: Erection of dwellinghouse (granted consent) 06/01912/OUT: Erection of dwellinghouse (granted consent) 06/01913/OUT: Erection of dwellinghouse (granted consent) 11/00418/PPP, 11/00419/PPP, 11/00420/PPP: Erection of dwellings to renew above consent (all withdrawn)
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Limited	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
----------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Site includes stone-built steading buildings and modern agricultural barns with potential for bats (EPS) and breeding birds. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including bats (EPS) and breeding birds. Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the North West of St Abbs. There is a bus stop within St Abbs and to the south west at Northfield Farm, which provides a bus service to Coldingham, Eyemouth and Berwick-Upon-Tweed. However, these buses are limited throughout the day. Therefore, there is a heavy reliance of cars for transport to and from St Abbs. There is a pathway linking the site to St Abbs itself, adjacent to the roadside. There are limited employment opportunities within St Abbs itself, however Eyemouth is located 5 miles away and Berwick-Upon-Tweed is 14 miles away, which

have a wider range of opportunities. In terms of services, there is a primary school, limited shops and hotel/restaurant within St Abbs. There are a wider range of services within Eyemouth and Berwick-Upon-Tweed. There are moderate biodiversity issues.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	On/adjacent to site	Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: I consider there is potential for conversion to residential.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: The core of the steading dates from the late 18th or early 19th century, while Northfield appears on maps from the later 16th century. Mitigation including archaeological investigation and historic building recording is likely.

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
Not applicable	On/adjacent to site			Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: SITE BRIEF - We wish to ensure that if this site is to be allocated a site brief is produced to identify the key natural heritage assets of the site to be protected and the key opportunities for the integration of green infrastructure within future development. This should be considered with ASTAB001.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: Restoration of some farm buildings and associated development of new units reflecting style and scale of those to be retained and adjacent cottages would be appropriate in this location.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

**Near a trunk road?**

NETWORK MANAGER: Divorced from main settlement, albeit existing footway link. Would not qualify for reduced speed limit but expectation might be for one.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding development on this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I have no objections to the redevelopment of this farm steading. Access options are available from both the B class road and the minor public road to the west of the site.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Did not raise any concerns regarding development on this site.

<b>Right of way</b>	<b>TPOs</b>	<b>Contaminated land</b>	<b>Water supply</b>	<b>Sewerage</b>	<b>Gas Supply</b>	<b>Education provision</b>
Adjacent to site	Not applicable	On site	Limited	No	No	Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: This site is outwith St Abbs settlement boundary. Any redevelopment proposal for this site would be better tested through a planning application.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding development on this site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): The site is over 20m away from the sewer zone.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Rawburn WTW has sufficient capacity. A flow and pressure test is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS OFFICER: Potential opportunity to improve pedestrian/cycle access into the village.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have been developed as an agricultural steading. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: We consider that this site may be more appropriately considered as mixed use. There is potential to undertake a conversion to provide holiday accommodation linked to St. Abb's Head visitor attraction and perhaps allow weddings or other events using the rented accommodation.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

### PP status

Excluded

### Overall assessment

Doubtful

### Site capacity

9

### Conclusions

The site was considered at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process. The site lies to the north west of St Abbs, outwith the Development Boundary. The site has limited access to public transport, however good access to services and employment opportunities given the proximity to Eyemouth and other nearby settlements. There are a number of existing agricultural steading buildings on site at present and the proposal is to convert these into dwellings. Given the existing buildings on site, there is the potential for breeding birds and bats, therefore appropriate mitigation would be required. The site is somewhat detached from St Abbs and does not relate well to the existing settlement boundary or integrate into the existing settlement pattern. There is also the potential for archaeological mitigation on the site. The site is located within the 'Berwickshire Coast' SLA and any development would need to ensure careful design, to ensure there is no significant impact upon the SLA. There is limited water supply and no connection to sewers available.

Overall, the site is detached from St Abbs and does not relate to the existing settlement or integrate into the existing settlement pattern. Therefore, the allocation for a re-development site at such a location would not comply with the principles of the Local Development Plan. It is therefore not appropriate to allocate this site for re-development. There is a planning history on this site for conversions and new build housing, which were assessed under the Housing in the Countryside policy at the time. Should the applicant wish to pursue the current proposal, this would be best pursued by a planning application for consideration against Policy HD2: Housing in the Countryside.

In conclusion, the site was not included within the MIR and ultimately is not included within the Proposed Plan.

---

# Swinton

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
ASWIN002	Land north east of Main Street	Swinton	Rest of Borders	Housing	30	2.4	Excluded

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
1:200	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within an International/National designation, however is located within an area of 1:200 flood risk and within an area of surface water hazards.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Leet Water. Consideration will need to be given to any culverts/ bridges which may exacerbate flood risk. Site may be constrained due to flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues in this area. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. There are surface water hazards identified within the site.

The site lies immediately adjacent to a waterbody. Therefore, SEPA request that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. There may be capacity issues for a development of this size. SW should confirm the position. The Leet water which is just beyond the site boundary to the north of the site should be protected as part of any development.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial, surface water and coastal 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	On/Adjacent to site	Greenfield	There is no planning history on the site.

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Limited	Good	Good	Moderate	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Site appears to be improved grassland with mature broadleaved trees on part of the boundary. Potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC/SSSI via run off (adjacent to Leet water-undesignated). Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including potentially bats (EPS) and breeding birds. Moderate

biodiversity risk.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the north of Swinton. Swinton is located 6 miles or a 15 minute drive from Duns, and the same distance from Coldstream to the south. The village itself has limited services and public transport links, so car usage would be required to reach Coldstream Duns and further afield. Given the proximity to the nearby settlements, the overall access to employment and services is good. Swinton is located 12 miles from Berwick-Upon-Tweed, where there are railway connections to Edinburgh and Newcastle and provides further employment opportunities and services.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Swinton Parish Church, listed category B, lies just to the SE of the site. The overall form of Swinton, which was a planned village, is pretty tight (the core is designated as a conservation area). The potential expansion of the village onto this site will impact on the overall setting of the village as it will break the strong plan form of the village being laid out around the central green and main street.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: The southern portion of the site is within the medieval core of Swinton. Historic mapping shows buildings and a walled garden occupying the site. Mitigation to evaluate the archaeology of the site will be required.

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable			Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to the size and location.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: Advised potential for 20-25 units avoiding the potential flood risk area.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

<b>Physical access/road capacity</b>	<b>Near a trunk road?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------

NETWORK MANAGER: Access required near to existing junction and right angled bend.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I have concerns with regards to this site. Visibility of vehicles waiting to turn right from the A6112 into the site is constrained by the vegetation on the inside of the bend in the A6112. Furthermore, the junction of the B6461 is in very close proximity to the proposed access to this site which means that a driver indicating to turn left into the site access may be wrongly assumed (by a following driver) to be about to make a left turn into the B6461. All matters considered, I am unable to support a development of this scale in this location.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

<b>Right of way</b>	<b>TPOs</b>	<b>Contaminated land</b>	<b>Water supply</b>	<b>Sewerage</b>	<b>Gas Supply</b>	<b>Education provision</b>
On/adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	Yes	Limited	No	Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT:** Swinton is a historic planned village with a generally linear development pattern, particularly to the north of Main Street. This proposal would require substantial works to achieve access and it is not clear how this would be achieved without demonstrable harm to the character and setting of the village. Other considerations would include a potential impact on the setting of the listed church, and there is flood risk associated with the north of the site.

**HOUSING STRATEGY:** Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

**SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW):** Swinton WWTW has sufficient capacity. It should be noted that there is a sewer running through the middle of the site. Investigation such as Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

**SCOTTISH WATER (WTW):** Rawburn WTW has sufficient capacity and sufficient capacity in the network.

**OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM:** Potential to improve local path network.

**CONTAMINATED LAND:** The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

**ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH:** No response received.

**NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES:** No response received.

**PROJECTS TEAM:** Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT:** Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

**EDUCATION OFFICER:** No issues regarding education capacity.

**NHS:** No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	30

## Conclusions

The site was submitted at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process for consideration. The proposal is for 30 units at the site, which is located to the north of Swinton. The site extends out northwards from the Development Boundary down towards the River Tweed. The following constraints were raised throughout the consultation process;

- Located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- There is potential connectivity to the River Tweed SAC/SSSI and mitigation would be required, to ensure there is no significant effect on the River Tweed SAC;
- Flood Risk Assessment would be required;
- Mitigation is likely to evaluate potential archaeology within the site;
- Drainage Impact Assessment for the WWTW;
- Boundary features should be protected and mitigation provided for protected species;
- Development on this site would break into a field to the rear of the existing settlement. It is not considered that the site would be well related or integrated with the existing settlement, given the extent that the site extends towards the north; and
- The Roads Planning Officer is unable to support this proposal, regarding visibility and the proximity of the proposed access to an existing junction.

It is acknowledged that the site would not be visible from the approach road to the north east, Coldstream Road or from the west along Main Street. However, given the sloping nature of the site, it may be visible from the northern approach road along Duns Road. As stated above, Swinton has an existing linear development pattern. The proposed site would not represent the existing development pattern. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site would be well related or integrated with the existing settlement, given the extent of the site towards the north. It is considered that the proposed access point currently provides an area of amenity value for the wider community and includes a seating area which is enclosed by mature trees.

Taking the above into consideration, the site was not included within the MIR and ultimately the site is not included within the Proposed Plan.

<b>Site reference</b> BSW2B	<b>Site name</b> Well Field	<b>Settlement</b> Swinton	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 25	<b>Ha</b> 1.4	<b>PP status</b> Retain LDP Site
--------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b>	<b>SAC</b>	<b>SPA</b>	<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
------------------	------------	------------	-------------	---------------

### Initial assessment summary

This is an existing housing allocation within the LDP, which was subject to a review as part of the MIR process.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> Planning applications: No approved applications on the site. Local Plan: Allocated for housing (BSW2B)
--------------------------	------------	----------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b>	<b>Access to employment</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b>	<b>Site aspect</b>
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
--------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------------

### Local impact and integration summary

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
------------	------------	--------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	------------------

## Landscape summary

---

### Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

Right of way

TPOs

Contaminated land

Water supply

Sewerage

Gas Supply

Education provision

### Planning & infrastructure summary

---

### Overall assessment

PP status

Overall assessment

Site capacity

Retain LDP Site

25

#### Conclusions

The site is currently allocated for housing within the adopted Local Development Plan (BSW2B), with an indicative site capacity for 25 units. The site was allocated for housing within the 1994 Berwickshire Local Plan. There have been a number of planning applications submitted for housing on the site, however no approvals to date. Planning applications (04/00004/OUT) and (04/00541/OUT) were both submitted and withdrawn for the erection of 25 units on the site.

The site is located within Swinton itself, on the Main Street and the principle of housing development is acceptable, subject to satisfying the criteria contained within the settlement profile for the allocation in the LDP. There is an allocated mixed use site (MSWIN002) located to the south of this housing site. The mixed use allocation relies on two access points, one from Coldstream Road and one through the housing allocation (BSW2B).

It is acknowledged that there has been no recent interest in the housing allocation, however there has been recent interest in the adjacent mixed use site to the south. Furthermore, there are no other housing allocations within Swinton. However, it should be acknowledged that the housing market has been slow since the recession and even more so in rural Berwickshire, in comparison to other areas. The development of this site for housing would ensure connectivity to the mixed use site to the south from Main Street, through the housing allocation, linking into (MSWIN002).

It is therefore considered in this instance that the housing site (BSW2B) should be retained for housing in Proposed Plan. Especially when it provides a linkage and future connectivity to any development to the south. It is envisaged that when the market starts to pick up, this would be a natural infill housing development, rather than breaking into currently un-developed fields on the edge of Swinton and expanding the existing settlement boundary.

---

# Westruther

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
BWESR001	Land south west of Mansefield House	Westruther	Rest of Borders	Business and Industrial	N/A	0.8	Included

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable				

### Initial assessment summary

The site is not located within any International/National designation constraint.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourse adjacent to the site. Site is relatively flat and hydrology would appear complicated at site. Consideration should be given to bridge and culvert structures which may exacerbate flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. There is the potential that the development of this site could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a Surface Water Hazard identified within the site.

Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. There appears to be a drain partially culverted running along the northern boundary of the site. This should be protected and de-culverted if possible.

SEPA (MIR Consultation additional comments): SEPA commented on the MIR Consultation, however provided no additional comments further to above.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Brownfield	No planning application history.  Local Plan: (BWE1) - this site formed part of a much larger site considered Local Plan: (BWE6) - this site formed a corner of a site previously considered LDP: (MWESR001) - this site formed part of a much larger site considered

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Limited	Limited	Limited	Minor	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Low biodiversity risk. Site appears to be rank improved with two metal roofed barns and broad-leaved trees on boundary. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the west of Westruther. There is limited public transport available within Westruther, however there is a local regular bus service to Duns. Therefore, car usage would likely be higher within Westruther. In terms of access to services and employment, these are currently limited within Westruther itself. Duns is located 11 miles away, where a greater selection of services and employment opportunities are available. Lauder is located 8 miles away and Coldstream 17 miles away.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Appears in part to be brown field land, appears to have some potential for redevelopment.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding development on this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: There is some archaeological potential within undisturbed areas of the site, but as it has been built on this potential is low. Some form of mitigation may be required.

---

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable			Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to the size and location.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: It is not clear that an adequate access road can be provided to this site without significant impacts on narrow village roads and roadside trees and hedges and potential loss of amenity to associated housing, both existing and proposed. Business use also implies potential need for screening some of which is currently provided by trees in AWESR011 which may be removed?

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

**Near a trunk road?**

NETWORK MANAGER: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I would observe on the 5 Westruther sites served by the road past the school collectively. These are Sites: AWESR002; AWESR010; AWESR011; AWESR012; and BWESR001. The standard of the road leading to these sites from the B6456 past the school is certainly not of a standard suitable for serving all of this development. I am happy to support some development, but the scale should be respectful of the village setting and the limitations of the road. Residential development should primarily front onto and focus on the main service road leading to the sites from the village centre and to a lesser extent Edgar Road. Employment land can be behind and to the west of any residential development and I would not expect any uses which would be HGV intensive. There is a real opportunity for creating a village street feel on the existing public road adjacent to Sites 002, 010 & 011. A strong street frontage will be required as will carriageway widening and footway provision. Existing drainage and street lighting infrastructure will likely need to be adjusted to suit. Development should also front onto Edgar Road and a footway will be required on the north side of Edgar Road as will proper vehicle turning provision for Edgar Road traffic. Provision for vehicles passing needs to be improved on the existing public road on the stretch adjacent to and west of the school. Consideration should be given to defining a pedestrian strip in the road between the school and the village pub. A Transport Assessment, or at least a Transport Statement, would be required to address accessibility and sustainable transport.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Did not raise any concerns regarding development on this site.

**Right of way**

Not applicable

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

On/adjacent to site

**Water supply**

Limited

**Sewerage**

Limited

**Gas Supply**

No

**Education provision**

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Questioned whether there is demand for such an allocation, who was proposing the allocation, is there an intended occupier.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with SW is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. There is a sewer within the site. There is sufficient capacity in the network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. A flow and pressure test is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have formed part of a site developed with structures understood to be associated with commercial poultry rearing. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: We believe small settlements, such as Westruther, can benefit from a small allocation of employment/business land for a mix of uses. The site appears to be currently, or previously, used for poultry production so has an existing business use. Any redevelopment may have a need to investigate improvements to the road network, which is not ideal for a more intense use, but this perhaps could be tied to any housing land approval on, say, the adjacent AWESR010, 011 or 002 housing allocations.

---

**Overall assessment**

**PP status**

Included

**Overall assessment**

Acceptable

**Site capacity**

N/A

**Conclusions**

The site was submitted for consideration, at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process, for a business and industrial allocation. The land is brownfield and was previously used for game rearing/sheds. Westruther has limited access to public transport, employment and services. However, there is a local regular bus service to Duns. Duns is located 11 miles away, where a greater selection of services and employment opportunities are available. There are currently no business and industrial allocations within Westruther. Further to the site assessment, the following constraints were highlighted, however are acceptable subject to appropriate mitigation measures;

- Flood Risk Assessment is required, to assess the potential for channel restoration and the risk the small watercourse adjacent to the site;
- There is potential for breeding birds and protected species within the site;
- Existing boundary features should be protected, where possible;
- The site is brownfield land, therefore potential contamination may be present;
- Early engagement with Scottish Water regarding the WWTW and WTW network capacities; and
- Potential archaeology within this site.

Further to the above, the Roads Planning Officer advised that a Transport Statement would be required for any development and raised no objections regarding the proposal.

There are currently no business and industrial allocations within Westruther. Economic Development stated in their response that small settlements, such as Westruther, can benefit from a small allocation of employment/business land for a mix of uses. There are no insurmountable constraints to the development of this site for business and industrial land. Furthermore, the allocation of such a use on brownfield land is considered to be a more sustainable approach, in comparison to allocating a greenfield site. In conclusion, the site was taken forward as a preferred option for business and industrial land within the MIR. Further to the MIR consultation, the site is included within the Proposed Plan.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
AWESR002	Edgar Road	Westruther	Rest of Borders	Housing	10	0.4	Included

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable				

### Initial assessment summary

The site is not located within any International/National designation constraints.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourse adjacent to the site. Site is relatively flat and hydrology would appear complicated at site. Consideration should be given to bridge and culvert structures which may exacerbate flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Potential development of allocation could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a Surface Water Hazard identified within the site.

Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network.

SEPA (MIR Consultation additional comments): SEPA commented on the MIR Consultation, however provided no additional comments further to above.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	<p>07/01957/OUT: Erection of 6 affordable houses (refused consent)</p> <p>14/01324/PPP: Demolition of derelict building and erection of dwellinghouse (approved) extant planning consent until June 2018. No detailed planning consent submitted to date.</p> <p>15/00576/AGN: Formation of agricultural access track (No objection)</p> <p>Local Plan: (BEW2), part of a much larger site which was considered</p> <p>Local Plan: (BEW9), a smaller corner of the current site under consideration</p> <p>LDP: (AWESR007), smaller part of the site currently under consideration</p> <p>LPA: (AWESR002), exact same site as currently under consideration</p>

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Limited	Limited	Limited	Moderate	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Site appears to be improved grassland with tree and hedgerow on the boundary. Existing stone-built, slate-roofed built structure has some potential to support bats (EPS) and breeding birds. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including potentially bats (EPS) and breeding birds

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the north of Westruther. There is limited public transport available within Westruther, however there is a local regular bus to Duns. Therefore, car usage would likely be higher within Westruther. In terms of access to services and employment, these are currently limited within Westruther itself. Duns is located 11 miles away, where a greater selection of services and employment opportunities are available. Lauder is only 8 miles away and Coldstream 17 miles away.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area	Open space	Listed buildings	Scheduled Monument	Ancient woodland inventory	Archaeology	Garden and designed landscape
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Some potential for redevelopment.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: While there are no known archaeological sites within the proposed LDP area, there are a number of records for prehistoric features in the surrounding area. Additionally, the site is within an area where evidence of medieval settlement is a possibility. A requirement for evaluation is likely.

---

## Landscape assessment

NSA	SLA	Over 200 metres?	Over 12 degree slope	Wild Land
Not applicable	Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to the size and location.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No major constraints identified but mature beech tree on southern, boundary beside Edgar Road looks worthy of retention (either by identifying in site brief or by TPO?). Also mature hedge along west boundary should be retained to give some separation between housing and the road.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity	Near a trunk road?
	<input type="checkbox"/>

NETWORK MANAGER: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I would observe on the 5 Westruther sites served by the road past the school collectively. These are Sites: AWESR002; AWESR010; AWESR011; AWESR012; and BWESR001. The standard of the road leading to these sites from the B6456 past the school is certainly not of a standard suitable for serving all of this development. I am happy to support some development, but the scale should be respectful of the village setting and the limitations of the road. Residential development should primarily front onto and focus on the main service road leading to the sites from the village centre and to a lesser extent Edgar Road. Employment land can be behind and to the west of any residential development and I would not expect any uses which would be HGV intensive. There is a real opportunity for creating a village street feel on the existing public road adjacent to Sites 002, 010 & 011. A strong street frontage will be required as will carriageway widening and footway provision. Existing drainage and street lighting infrastructure will likely need to be adjusted to suit. Development should also front onto Edgar Road and a footway will be required on the north side of Edgar Road as will proper vehicle turning provision for Edgar Road traffic. Provision for vehicles passing needs to be improved on the existing public road on the stretch adjacent to and west of the school. Consideration should be given to defining a pedestrian strip in the road between the school and the village pub. A Transport Assessment, or at least a Transport Statement, would be required to address

accessibility and sustainable transport.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

**Right of way**

Adjacent to site

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

Not applicable

**Water supply**

Yes

**Sewerage**

Yes

**Gas Supply**

No

**Education provision**

Good

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Could work well; mature trees to the south of the site should be accommodated and clarification on the access point.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with SW is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. It should be noted that there is a sewer within the site. Sufficient capacity in the network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. A flow and pressure test is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Potential to improve local path network.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped with the exception of apparent residential dwellings to the south of the subject site. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

EDUCATION OFFICER: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

NHS: No response received.

---

**Overall assessment**

**PP status**

Included

**Overall assessment**

Acceptable

**Site capacity**

10

**Conclusions**

The site was submitted for consideration, at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process for housing. Westruther has limited access to public transport, employment and services. However, there is a local regular bus service to Duns. Therefore, car usage would likely be higher within Westruther. Duns is located 11 miles away, where a greater selection of services and employment opportunities are available. Further to the site assessment, the following constraints were highlighted, however are acceptable subject to appropriate mitigation measures;

- Flood Risk Assessment is required, to ascertain the flood risk from the small watercourse adjacent to the site;
- There is potential for breeding birds and protected species within the site;
- Existing boundary features should be protected;
- Early engagement with Scottish Water regarding the WWTW and WTW network capacities;
- Potential archaeology within this site; and
- Mature beech tree on southern boundary and mature hedge along west boundary should be retained.

Further to the above, the Roads Planning Officer advised that a Transport Statement would be required for any development. Potential access would be from Edgar Road and/or from the minor road to the west. There is an opportunity to enhance turning, parking and pedestrian connectivity along Edgar Road.

There is currently one allocation for housing within Westruther for 5 units. Taking the above into consideration and the fact there are no insurmountable constraints to the development of housing on this site, it is considered that the proposal would provide an opportunity for an additional housing site. This would provide a range of housing opportunities within smaller settlements, such as Westruther. Therefore, the site was included within the MIR as a preferred option for housing.

It should be noted that there are a number of other housing allocations (AWESR010, AWESR011 & AWESR012) proposed by the landowner. However, it is considered that (AWESR002) would be sufficient

for the Proposed Plan period, along with the proposed business & industrial site, also put forward by the landowner (BWESR001). Together they provide housing and employment opportunities within a smaller settlement within Westruther. Further to the MIR consultation, the site is included within the Proposed Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b> AWESR009	<b>Site name</b> Land to south east of Kirkpark	<b>Settlement</b> Westruther	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 3	<b>Ha</b> 0.3	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site is not located within any International/National designation constraints.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> 07/01879/OUT: Erection of 13 affordable housing units (refused) 08/02124/OUT: Erection of 9 units (refused) 11/01691/FUL: Erection of 6 units on the adjacent site (approved) 16/01458/PPP: Erection of 6 units on the adjacent site (approved)
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Limited	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Limited	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response received.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the south of Westruther, to the south of the existing allocated site AWESR005). There is limited public transport available within Westruther, however there is a local regular bus service to Duns. Therefore, car usage would likely be higher within Westruther. In terms of access to services and employment, these are currently limited within Westruther itself. Duns is located 11 miles away, where a greater selection of services and employment opportunities are available. Lauder is located 8 miles away and Coldstream 17 miles away.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Not applicable	<b>Open space</b> Not applicable	<b>Listed buildings</b> Not applicable	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> On/adjacent to site	<b>Archaeology</b> Not applicable	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> Not applicable
--------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

## Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Did not raise any concerns regarding development on this site.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding development on this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: No known issues.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to the size and location.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No response received.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I have no objection to this site which is effectively an extension of the existing allocated site AWESR005.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Would be a logical expansion of the settlement boundary.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding development of this site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with SW is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. There is sufficient capacity in the network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Howden WTW has sufficient capacity and sufficient capacity in the network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Potential to improve local path network.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	3

### Conclusions

The site was submitted at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process for housing. The site lies to the south of Westruther, directly to the south of the existing housing allocation (AWESR005), which is allocated for 5 units. The proposal is to extend the housing allocation (AWESR009) to include an additional small area of land to the south. However, it is considered too small to formally allocate through this process and sites should be able to comfortably accommodate at least 5 units. Therefore the site was not included within the MIR or the Proposed Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b> AWESR010	<b>Site name</b> Land to north of Westruther	<b>Settlement</b> Westruther	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 5	<b>Ha</b> 0.5	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site is not located within any International/National designation constraints.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourse to the north of the site. Consideration will need to be given to any culverts/ bridges which may exacerbate flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues in this area. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. There is an identified Surface Water Hazard within the site. Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no planning application history on the site.  Local Plan: (BWE2), larger site than currently under consideration
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Limited	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Limited	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Site appears to be improved grassland with young tree cover and hedgerow on the boundary. Timber horse-stable in site, has some potential to support bats (EPS) and breeding birds. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including potentially bats (EPS) and breeding birds. Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the north of Westruther. There is limited public transport available within Westruther, however there is a local regular bus service to Duns. Therefore, car usage would likely be higher within Westruther. In terms of access to services and employment, these are currently limited within Westruther itself. Duns is located 11 miles away, where a greater selection of services and employment opportunities are available. Lauder is located 8 miles away and Coldstream 17 miles away.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: While there are no known archaeological sites within the proposed LDP area, there are a number of records for prehistoric features in the surrounding area. A requirement for evaluation is likely.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to the size and location.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No response received.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I would observe on the 5 Westruther sites served by the road past the school collectively. These are Sites: AWESR002; AWESR010; AWESR011; AWESR012; and BWESR001. The standard of the road leading to these sites from the B6456 past the school is certainly not of a standard suitable for serving all of this development. I am happy to support some development, but the scale should be respectful of the village setting and the limitations of the road. Residential development should primarily front onto and focus on the main service road leading to the sites from the village centre and to a lesser extent Edgar Road. Employment land can be behind and to the west of any residential development and I would not expect any uses which would be HGV intensive. There is a real opportunity for creating a village street feel on the existing public road adjacent to Sites 002, 010 & 011. A strong street frontage will be required as will carriageway widening and footway provision. Existing drainage and street lighting infrastructure will likely need to be adjusted to suit. Development should also front onto Edgar Road and a footway will be required on the north side of Edgar Road as will proper vehicle turning provision for Edgar Road traffic. Provision for vehicles passing needs to be improved on the existing public road on the stretch adjacent to and west of the school. Consideration should be given to defining a pedestrian strip in the road between the school and the village pub. A Transport Assessment, or at least a Transport Statement, would be required to address accessibility and sustainable transport.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Limited

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Did not raise any concerns regarding development on this site.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding development on this site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with SW is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. There is a sewer within this site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. A flow and pressure test is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Potential to improve local path network.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed with the exception of an apparent field shelter. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding development on this site.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Acceptable	5

## Conclusions

The site was put forward for housing at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process, with an indicative site capacity for 5 units. The landowner put forward 4 housing sites (AWESR002, AWESR010, AWESR011 & AWESR012) and 1 business/industrial site (BWESR001) for consideration. Further to a site assessment the following constraints were identified on the site;

- Flood Risk Assessment would be required;
- Potential for protected species, including breeding birds on the site, mitigation would be required;
- Existing boundary features should be protected and enhanced where possible;
- Potential for archaeology within the site;
- The allocation of this site would have a reliance on the delivery of the site to the south first, otherwise the site would be detached from the existing settlement boundary and Edgar Road;
- Transport Statement would be required; and
- Early engagement with Scottish Water in respect of the WWTW and WTW capacities.

It is acknowledged that there are no insurmountable planning constraints to the development of this site for housing. However, this site does rely on the site to the south (AWESR002) being developed first. The site is currently separated from the Development Boundary along Edgar Road, therefore without the development of the field to the south first (AWESR002), the site would not respect the existing development pattern. Therefore, it is proposed to take forward the site (AWESR002) within the LDP2 for housing. Once developed, this site could be taken forward in the future for housing and the site would form a logical extension to Westruther once (WESR002) is developed. Furthermore, it is not considered that an additional two sites are required as part of the LDP2 process within Westruther. Therefore, in conclusion, the site will not be taken forward within the Proposed Plan.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
<b>AWESR011</b>	Land to south of Mansefield House	Westruther	Rest of Borders	Housing	9	0.9	<b>Excluded</b>

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable	Not applicable	On/adjacent to sit	Not applicable	On/adjacent to site

### Initial assessment summary

The site is not located within any International/National designation constraint.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourse adjacent to the site. Site is relatively flat and hydrology would appear complicated at site. Consideration should be given to bridge and culvert structures which may exacerbate flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. There is the potential that development on this site could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There are Surface Water Hazards identified within the site.

Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. There may be a culverted drain running along the northern boundary of the site. This should be protected.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	Local Plan: (BEW1), part of a much larger site which was previously considered Local Plan: (BEW6), part of a much larger site which was previously considered LDP: (AWESR008), a corner of the site currently under consideration LDP: (MWESR001), covers the housing site and proposed employment site adjacent

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Limited	Limited	Limited	Minor	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response received.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the north of Westruther. There is limited public transport available within Westruther, however there is a local regular bus service to Duns. Therefore, car usage would likely be higher within Westruther. In terms of access to services and employment, these are currently limited within Westruther itself. Duns is located 11 miles away, where a greater selection of services and employment opportunities are available. Lauder is located 8 miles away and Coldstream 17 miles away.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On/adjacent to site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific comment.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding development on this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: While there are no known archaeological sites within the proposed LDP area, there are a number of records for prehistoric features in the surrounding area. Additionally, the site is within an area where evidence of medieval settlement is a possibility. A requirement for evaluation is likely.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to the size and location.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No response received.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I would observe on the 5 Westruther sites served by the road past the school collectively. These are Sites: AWESR002; AWESR010; AWESR011; AWESR012; and BWESR001. The standard of the road leading to these sites from the B6456 past the school is certainly not of a standard suitable for serving all of this development. I am happy to support some development, but the scale should be respectful of the village setting and the limitations of the road. Residential development should primarily front onto and focus on the main service road leading to the sites from the village centre and to a lesser extent Edgar Road. Employment land can be behind and to the west of any residential development and I would not expect any uses which would be HGV intensive. There is a real opportunity for creating a village street feel on the existing public road adjacent to Sites 002, 010 & 011. A strong street frontage will be required as will carriageway widening and footway provision. Existing drainage and street lighting infrastructure will likely need to be adjusted to suit. Development should also front onto Edgar Road and a footway will be required on the north side of Edgar Road as will proper vehicle turning provision for Edgar Road traffic. Provision for vehicles passing needs to be improved on the existing public road on the stretch adjacent to and west of the school. Consideration should be given to defining a pedestrian strip in the road between the school and the village pub. A Transport Assessment, or at least a Transport Statement, would be required to address accessibility and sustainable transport.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

On/adjacent to site

### Water supply

Limited

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Potential landscape concerns and whether conflicts with existing woodland.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. Note that there is a sewer within the site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. A flow and pressure test is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Potential to improve local path network.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have formed part of a wider site developed with structures understood to be associated with commercial poultry rearing. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Doubtful	9

## Conclusions

The site was submitted for consideration at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process. The site is being considered for housing with an indicative site capacity for 9 units. The land owner has put forward four housing sites (AWESR002, AWESR010, AWESR011 & AWESR012) and one business/industrial site (BWESR001) for consideration as part of the LDP process. Following consultation and site assessment, the following constraints have been identified on the site;

- Flood Risk Assessment required;
- Potential trees would need to be felled within the site;
- Potential archaeology within the site; and
- Early discussions with Scottish Water regarding the WWTW and WTW capacities.

Notwithstanding any constraints on the site, there is an existing housing allocation (AWESR005) within Westruther within the LDP. The housing site (AWESR002) under consideration is the preferred option for the first release of any additional sites out of the four submitted by the landowner. This is taking into consideration it's location adjacent to the existing Development Boundary, Edgar Road and lack of constraints within the site. Furthermore, it is not considered that an additional two sites are required as part of the LDP2 process within Westruther. (AWESR011) could be looked at again in the future and assessed at that point in time, should other sites within Westruther be developed. In conclusion, the site was not included within the MIR and is not included within the Proposed Plan.

---

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
AWESR012	Land to north of Westertown	Westruther	Rest of Borders	Housing	6	0.6	Excluded

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable				

### Initial assessment summary

The site is not located within any International/National designation constraints.

SEPA: Site is located >80 metres away from culverted small watercourse and no other evidence of nearby watercourses.

Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	07/00786/OUT: Erection of a dwellinghouse 11/00504/FUL: Erection of a dwellinghouse (same site as the above outline) 11/00755/FUL: Erection of a dwellinghouse (same site as the above full)  Local Plan: (BEW6), this forms part a much larger site which was considered

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Limited	Limited	Limited	Minor	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response received.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the west of Westruther. There is limited public transport available within Westruther, however there is a local regular bus service to Duns. Therefore, car usage would likely be higher within Westruther. In terms of access to services and employment, these are currently limited within Westruther itself. Duns is located 11 miles away, where a greater selection of services and employment opportunities are available. Lauder is located 8 miles away and Coldstream 17 miles away.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development on this site.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development on this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: While there are no known archaeological sites within the proposed LDP area, there are a number of records for prehistoric features in the surrounding area. Additionally, the site is within an area where evidence of medieval settlement is a possibility. A requirement for evaluation is likely.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment, due to the size and location.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No response received.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I would observe on the 5 Westruther sites served by the road past the school collectively. These are Sites: AWESR002; AWESR010; AWESR011; AWESR012; and BWESR001. The standard of the road leading to these sites from the B6456 past the school is certainly not of a standard suitable for serving all of this development. I am happy to support some development, but the scale should be respectful of the village setting and the limitations of the road. Residential development should primarily front onto and focus on the main service road leading to the sites from the village centre and to a lesser extent Edgar Road. Employment land can be behind and to the west of any residential development and I would not expect any uses which would be HGV intensive. There is a real opportunity for creating a village street feel on the existing public road adjacent to Sites 002, 010 & 011. A strong street frontage will be required as will carriageway widening and footway provision. Existing drainage and street lighting infrastructure will likely need to be adjusted to suit. Development should also front onto Edgar Road and a footway will be required on the north side of Edgar Road as will proper vehicle turning provision for Edgar Road traffic. Provision for vehicles passing needs to be improved on the existing public road on the stretch adjacent to and west of the school. Consideration should be given to defining a pedestrian strip in the road between the school and the village pub.

A Transport Assessment, or at least a Transport Statement, would be required to address accessibility and sustainable transport.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Did not raise any concerns regarding development on this site.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

On/adjacent to site

### Water supply

Limited

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: This site could work, with housing fronting the road. Could be scope for housing to the northern side of the site and could create a looped road.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding development on this site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTV): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTV. It should be noted that there is a sewer within the site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. A flow and pressure test is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Potential to improve local path network.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have formed part of a site developed with structures understood to be associated with commercial poultry rearing. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

### PP status

Excluded

### Overall assessment

Acceptable

### Site capacity

6

## Conclusions

The site was submitted for consideration at the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process. The site is being considered for housing with an indicative site capacity for 9 units. The land owner has put forward four housing sites (AWESR002, AWESR010, AWESR011 & AWESR012) and one business/industrial site (BWESR001) for consideration as part of the LDP process. Following consultation and site assessment, the following constraints have been identified on the site;

- Development of a former brownfield site;
- Site respects the visual pattern of Westruther;
- Potential archaeology within the site;
- Early discussions with Scottish Water regarding the WWTV and WTW capacities; and
- Potential contamination due to the former use of the site.

Notwithstanding any constraints on the site, there is an existing housing allocation (AWERS005) within Westruther within the LDP. The housing site (AWESR002) under consideration is the preferred option for the first release of any additional sites out of the four submitted by the landowner. This is taking into consideration it's location adjacent to the existing Development Boundary, Edgar Road and lack of constraints within the site. Furthermore, it is not considered that an additional two sites are required as part of the LDP2 process within Westruther. (AWESR012) could be looked at again in the future and assessed at that point in time, should other sites within Westruther be developed. In conclusion the site was not included within the MIR and is not included within the Proposed Plan.

---

# Whitsome

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
<b>AWHIT003</b>	Herriot Bank Farm	Whitsome	Rest of Borders	Housing	8	0.5	<b>Excluded</b>

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable				

### Initial assessment summary

The site is not located within any International/National designation constraints.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Brownfield	Housing SG: (AWHIT003) - Exact same site as was previously assessed LDP: (AWHIT002) - This site formed part of a larger site which was previously considered

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Limited	Limited	Limited	Minor	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response to date.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located on the south side of the B6437. The northern section of the site, is located within the settlement boundary, which currently has existing buildings on the site. There is a bus stop in Whitsome, however there is a limited service to Berwick-Upon-Tweed and other nearby settlements. The access to employment opportunities and services is also limited. Whitsome is located 7 miles away from Duns, where there are more employment opportunities and a wider range of services on offer. The limited bus services to Berwick, provide a connection to Edinburgh to the north and Newcastle to the south, via the Railway.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On/adjacent to site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Some scope to redevelop this site – there should be a frontage to the main street.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: There are potential implications for this proposal. The site is within the medieval core of Whitsome. Mitigation is likely depending on development proposals.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to the size and location.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No response to date.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: New junction onto B6437 but currently operates for farm traffic.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I would welcome residential development at this location as it would result in the removal of a working agricultural business from within the settlement boundary.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

On/adjacent to site

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: In principle, there may be a suitable infill redevelopment opportunity on part of this site, but that may best be tested through a planning application. The proposed site extends beyond the village boundary to the south which would, if developed for housing, conflict with the general development pattern within the village.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with SW is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Rawburn WTW has sufficient capacity and sufficient capacity in the network.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have been developed as an agricultural steading including a sheepwash and is understood to have subsequently operated as an agricultural contractors. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.  
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.  
EDUCATION OFFICER: Raised no issues regarding the capacity.  
NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Doubtful	8

### Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process. The site was previously assessed as part of the Housing SG for 8 units. An initial stage 1 RAG assessment was undertaken, however concluded that the site should not be taken forward as part of the Housing SG. The proposal currently under consideration has not altered since and is for the same proposal.

Whitsome is a linear settlement which follows an east to west direction and commands significant views over the Merse and Cheviots to the South. Therefore, given the linear nature, there is limited scope for further capacity within the settlement. The northern section of the site lies within the Development Boundary and could come forward through the development management process and considered against the infill policy. However the southern part of the site protrudes beyond the existing Development Boundary to the south and does not respect the existing settlement/development pattern evident within Whitsome. The site is brownfield land and there may be potential contamination within the site. Furthermore, there is potential archaeological mitigation on the site.

The site formed part of a larger site which was also considered as part of the Local Development Plan and it was concluded that there were other more suitable sites within the housing market area. There are limited services and amenities within Whitsome and there is a reliance on other nearby settlements to provide local services and amenities.

Therefore, taking the above into consideration, the site was not included within the MIR and ultimately not included within the Proposed Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b> AWHIT004	<b>Site name</b> Land at Whitsomehill	<b>Settlement</b> Whitsome	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 5	<b>Ha</b> 0.6	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	------------------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any International/National designation constraint.

SEPA: There is no SW foul sewer network in this location. There are however 2 private systems one serving the cottages and one serving the new housing development across the road. Unless this development is able to connect to one of these systems finding a private drainage option may be difficult.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> On/Adjacent to site	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> Housing SG: (AWHIT004) - exact same site as currently under consideration.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Poor	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Limited	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Site appears to be an arable field with hedgerow on the boundary. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds. Biodiversity Risk: Low impact.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located some distance away from Whitsome to the south, and is sited within a countryside location. The nearest settlement is Whitsome, however the site is located approximately 7 miles away from Duns. There is poor access to public transport at this location and there would be a heavy reliance of car usage. There are no employment opportunities or services located at this site, given the countryside location. However, there are a wider range of opportunities located within Duns.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Not applicable	<b>Open space</b> Not applicable	<b>Listed buildings</b> Not applicable	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> Not applicable
--------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

## Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: The row of farm cottage to the south is listed. There has already been a significant development adjacent to the proposed site. There is never the less some potential opportunity to develop alongside the road, but presumably this would be best addressed through the housing in the countryside policy.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: There are no known archaeological issues.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment, due to size and location.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No response to date.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Concern that appears to be ribbon development with direct access onto unrestricted road, with limited option to introduce a reduced speed limit in the future.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I am unable to support this proposal. Allocated housing sites should be in locations that allow accessibility to local amenities by sustainable transport modes such as walking and public transport. The site is detached from any settlement and so does not benefit from expected provision for pedestrians living adjacent to 'B' Class roads such as footways and street lighting or a 30 mph speed restriction. Scope for safe means of access to the B6437 is a further concern.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: This site sits outwith any designated settlement boundary, but there is a recognised building group at Whitsomehill. Consent has recently been granted for two houses between this site and the listed terrace of farm cottages to the south. The planning report for that application identified that the overall building group at Whitsomehill may be complete. A further five houses at the proposed location would represent ribbon development. There is considerable concern amongst local residents about the existing junction and this site sits further to the north, where visibility is poorest.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Rawburn WTW has sufficient capacity and sufficient capacity in the network. It should be noted that there are water mains within the site.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Opportunity to provide pedestrian path to Whitsome.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.  
EDUCATION OFFICER: No known issues.  
NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	5

### Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the 'Pre MIR' stage of the LDP2 process. This site was previously assessed as part of the Housing SG. An initial stage 1 RAG assessment was undertaken which ultimately concluded not to take the site forward as part of the Housing SG.

The site is located within a countryside location, outwith any defined Development Boundary. The site does not relate to any existing Development Boundary. The agent for the landowner has indicated that given the number of houses at Whitsomehill, it should now be treated as a settlement. However, there are other rural locations which have a number of dwellings within proximity to each other and it is considered to be a common characteristic of the rural nature of the Scottish Borders.

The allocation of a housing site at such a location would not comply with the principles of the Local Development Plan. It is therefore not appropriate to allocate this site for housing. Should the applicant wish to pursue the matter, a planning application could be submitted for consideration against the Council's Housing in the Countryside Policy.

Furthermore, the Roads Planning Officer has indicated that they cannot support a proposal for a housing allocation at this site. The following constraints were also identified through the consultation process;

- There is no SW foul sewer network, investigation into a private connection would be required;
- The site is located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Protection should be given to the existing boundary features; and
- Mitigation for protected species including breeding birds.

Overall, taking the above into consideration, the site was not taken forward within the MIR and ultimately not included within the Proposed Plan.

---

# Central HMA

## Ancrum

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
<b>AANCR002</b>	Dick's Croft II	Ancrum	Central	Housing	60	3.2	<b>Excluded</b>

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable				

### Initial assessment summary

There are no initial constraints on the site which would preclude it from being developed.

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is outwith both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. I would, however, ask that due to the size of the development that surface water flooding is considered and it is ensured that any water would be routed around the housing.

SEPA: Due to steep topography adjacent/ through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and the proposed development is not affected by surface runoff. There is a surface water hazard identified within the site.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	On site	Greenfield	There is no relevant planning application history on the site.  It should be noted that this site was considered as an 'alternative' option as part of the Draft Housing Supplementary Guidance and further to public consultation, the site was included within the Finalised SG on Housing. The site was later excluded from the adopted Housing SG 2017.

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Good	Limited	Good	Minor	South-west

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Low impact biodiversity risk. Site is improved pasture with hedgerow, trees and garden ground on boundary. No obvious connectivity to River Tweed SAC (Ale Water). Protect trees and boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: There are local village services in Ancrum. These include a primary school, pub, shop and post office, and local facilities including village hall, church, and bowling club. Other services and employment opportunities are located four miles away in Jedburgh. Four bus routes serve the village: 20 - Hawick - Jedburgh; 51 - Jedburgh - Edinburgh; 68 - Jedburgh - Galashiels.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY: In an area of archaeological potential. May require evaluation.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Lies just outwith the conservation area, development of the site should take account of the potential impact on the conservation area.

HES: No comments.

NHS: No comments received.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is currently a pasture field surrounded by hedgerows, with some deciduous trees to the north-west. C class roads envelop the site on its northern, eastern, and southern boundaries and would provide access, although widening would be required. It is located just south of the village primary school and just west of a very recent housing development which has taken quite some time to develop and has provided a relatively substantial increase in the size of the village. Given Ancrum's size and character, another allocation - particularly of 60 units - would have a substantial cumulative impact.

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
Not applicable	On site			Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: Relatively straight forward site for development without any major issues to be addressed. The character of existing detached houses at Dick's Croft might be best served by continuing this style of development along the northern end of the site (see plan) accessed separately from the lane at the Loaning with denser housing on the flatter lower ground on the main part of the site. Retention of existing hedgerows on boundaries supplemented by some new planting is desirable to relate development to its rural setting.

SNH: This site lies outwith the current settlement boundary as shown in the LDP and is within a Special Landscape Area. If you are minded to support development of this site during the current plan period, further detailed assessment will be required. Given the site's location within a Special Landscape Area we recommend that this assessment includes landscape capacity for development and careful consideration of the site boundary, the landscape and visual impact mitigation and the site design. Subject to the conclusions of any detailed capacity assessment we would advise that any proposed allocation in this location should be supported by a site development brief.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is affected by significant sloping and the northern half of the site would have a significant visual impact, in terms of views from the south and west, given its prominent position. Development would most likely require the widening of the C road running north-south on the western approach to Ancrum, this would also require the removal of hedgerows which currently provide a landscape buffer to the west of the village. This development would add to the very recent western expansion of Ancrum, and in landscape terms would have a detrimental cumulative impact.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Will impact on existing 30 mph limit.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: This site has been looked at previously and I have no objections in principle to this land being allocated for housing. The majority of traffic would access the site via South Myrescroft but the pinch point in the road at the north corner would require to be looked at in more detail in terms of localised widening to accommodate the increase in pedestrian footfall and vehicular movements. The existing roads bounding the site will need to be widened to cater for two way traffic flow and to provide footways as appropriate and street lighting and speed limits will have to extend accordingly. Pedestrian linkage to the footpath along the north western edge of the adjacent Myrescroft development should also be incorporated into any proposal. Vehicular access is acceptable from all existing roads adjacent to the site and a strong street frontage onto these roads is recommended. A Transport Assessment will be required for the site.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No concerns regarding the development of this site.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Connectivity footways are required to the school, village centres and path to Ale Water to the south of the site. Pedestrian linkage to the footpath along the north western edge of the new Myrescroft development should also be incorporated.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Eildon Housing Association 'potential pipeline' site for 12 houses.

EDUCATION: No issues.

SCOTTISH WATER: Waste: Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. Sufficient capacity in the network. Water: Robertson WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment will be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SEPA: Foul must connect to the existing SW foul network. It is likely that for a development of this size and upgrade may be required to the existing STW. SW should confirm.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Road widening would likely require the loss of hedgrows which at present provide quite a solid western boundary to the village. Would have an appreciable impact on the setting of the village.

---

## Overall assessment

### PP status

Excluded

### Overall assessment

Acceptable

### Site capacity

60

### Conclusions

Overall the site is assessed as acceptable however it should be noted the site is within a Special Landscape Area and careful consideration must be given to boundary treatments, the landscape and visual impact mitigation as well as the site design. Due to recent development within Ancrum consideration should be given to the scale of the proposal and its effect on the size of the settlement and the character

of the village and its Conservation Area. Allocation of this site would increase pressure on services since the previous housing allocation has only recently been completed and further discussions would need to be held with Scottish Water in relation to wastewater treatment as the development is required to connect to the existing Scottish Water foul network.

Structure planting to the south and west would be required to reduce visual impact from the countryside and create an edge to the settlement. Existing hedgerows would need to be retained or improved where possible. Mitigation measures are required to prevent any impact on the River Tweed SAC. Mitigation measures are also required in relation to the impact of surface water runoff from nearby hills and this should be considered during the design stage.

Vehicular access is acceptable from all existing roads adjacent to the site and a strong street frontage onto these roads is recommended. A pedestrian linkage to the footpath along the north western edge of the new Myrescroft development should also be incorporated into any proposal. It is also important that there is connectivity from the site to the village centre for both pedestrians and cyclists.

The development at Myrescroft to the north east of this site confirmed that there was a healthy market for house purchasers within Ancrum. Consequently this proposal could be considered to be effective and there is an interested developer associated with the site. However care must be taken to ensure any new development does not saturate the village within a relatively short period of time.

Scottish Water has confirmed that there is sufficient capacity. SG assessment raises the possibility that land will be required to safeguard for education provision, implying an education capacity problem.

The site was included within the Main Issues Report as an 'alternative' option for inclusion within the Proposed LDP, given the issue of cumulative impact on the character of the village. Consequently there were not considered to be any insurmountable reasons nor constraints to prevent it being included. However, in deciding which of the many MIR sites were ultimately included within the proposed LDP consideration was given to a range of factors. These included, for example, the housing land requirement based on the proposed SDP2 which was informed by HNDA2, any developer interest in the site, provision of local facilities / services, comparison with other submitted sites. Ultimately it was considered that there were more appropriate sites considered within the MIR to contribute towards the housing land requirement and the site was not included. At this point in time the village should be given time to adapt to the relatively recent large scale development of Myrescroft, however, it is acknowledged that the site could be considered again for inclusion in a future LDP.

---

# Charlesfield

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
ACHAR004	Charlesfield West II	Charlesfield	Central	Housing	50	6.2	Excluded

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
1:200	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

There are no initial constraints on the site which would preclude it from being developed.

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is within the surface water 1 in 200 year flood extent. No objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. Would, however, ask that due to the size of the development that drainage, SUDS and surface water flooding is considered and it is ensured that any water would be routed around the housing.

SEPA: Review of historic maps does not show the presence of any small watercourses on site. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues in this area. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	There is no relevant planning history on the site. The site has a history of development plan submissions namely the Housing SG ACHAR003 and MCHAR002 and the LDP (MCHAR001).

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Limited	Limited	Limited	Moderate	South-west

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: No comments received, however, the following comments applied to the larger site (ACHAR003) during the process of the Housing SG: Minor-moderate risk. Arable fields with fragmented hedgerows and trees on boundary of site. Mill pond south of Charlesfield features on OS 1st edition map and lies within known core range of great crested newt. Site is approximately 350m north of pond. Some connecting habitat but intensive agricultural land use surrounding pond. Habitat suitability of pond should be assessed. Protected species may include e.g. badger and breeding birds. Safeguard trees and hedgerows on boundary and ponds.

In terms of accessibility, the site is located 1.5km from St Boswells and slightly further from Newton St Boswells. Services and bus connections are located in these villages and train connections and more substantial services in Tweedbank and Galashiels. There are plans to expand Newtown St Boswells, but in any case site ACHAR004 would remain an isolated site for housing development with pedestrian connectivity to any nearby settlement and services remaining difficult.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY: No known archaeological issues.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No comments received, however, the following comments were received to the larger site (ACHAR003) during the process of the Housing SG: No heritage assets would be affected by this potential development site; there are no listed buildings in the vicinity and the nearest conservation area is over at St Boswells. The former munitions factory site has been redeveloped over the years and there is an established "ribbon" development of private housing along the road to the east of the site. Key design issues would include boundary treatments, how the steep slope of the site to the south would be accommodated and possible distant views of the development from example the Eildon Hills and what the "sense of place" would be. There is little local context in terms of significant architecture to consider and potentially there is an opportunity for a more contemporary design approach.

HES: No comments received, however, the following comments were received to the larger site (ACHAR003) during the process of the Housing SG: We have reviewed this site in relation to our main area of interest for the historic environment, and confirm that allocation of the site would not raise concerns for our statutory interests.

GENERAL COMMENTS: There are no local impact issues in terms of designations. However, a development on this site could not integrate with either St Boswells or Newton St Boswells. This would be a standalone settlement that would relate to the adjacent industrial estate rather than any settlement. It is difficult to see the principles for successful placemaking on this site.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No comment received, however, the following comments were received for the larger site (ACHA003) during the process of the Housing SG: This site is not considered an appropriate site for housing - it is detached from the nearest settlement by more than a 1km and has none of the facilities that should support a sustainable residential area. Sustainable travel and access to and from the nearest settlement is poor. In landscape terms a residential development at this location would be out of keeping with the adjacent land uses - industrial and agricultural.

SNH: Our advice from the 22nd March 2017 (based on the previous larger site), this site lies outwith the settlement boundary and appears likely to create a new village. If allocated, a planning brief would be required and due recognition of the open landscape context and the potential impacts from the National Scenic Area, integrated into the development approach.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Very significant increase to housing at this location. Implications for existing road layout and potential requirement for a new speed limit. Also need to consider impact on junction with trunk road.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Not on bus route or existing school transport routes. Possible bus stop infrastructure required on junction of A68 and pavements for access.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: Opposed to this site being allocated for housing development. The extensive road improvements required to the Charlesfield road (pedestrian provision, drainage, lighting etc.) and required to the A68 to better connect this area with St Boswells and the public transport network are such that they would be unreasonable for a development of this scale. Without such improvements

the site would be detached which would result in residents being heavily reliant on private cars for transport. Furthermore there is no real opportunity for integration with any existing street network. All matters considered, unable to offer support for this proposal.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No comments.

#### Right of way

Not applicable

#### TPOs

Not applicable

#### Contaminated land

Not applicable

#### Water supply

Yes

#### Sewerage

Yes

#### Gas Supply

No

#### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Railway corridor for a potential extension of Borders Rail is located to the west of the site and alongside adjacent areas. There is an opportunity to upgrade the existing path network, in particular alongside or parallel to the existing road.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Outwith any settlement; inappropriate scale for the countryside location and not sustainable. Potential conflict with industrial estate (traffic, noise, odours).

EDUCATION: Extension or new school may need to be considered.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: In respect of waste, St Boswells WwTW has sufficient capacity. A Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. In respect of water, Robertson WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network, however it is likely that some upgrading of pump stations and STW would be required for this size of development. SW should confirm. This site is next to the Industrial Estate and hence there may be issues with incompatible uses (eg. AD plant). There are a number of licensed sites within the industrial estate, however these are unlikely to impact the proposed development site. SEPA however receives complaints about unregulated activities in the industrial estate mainly relating to unregulated ELV sites and burning. However, consideration should be given by SBC as to whether it is appropriate to locate housing so close to one of the areas largest industrial estates as this may hinder future expansion and limit the range of uses. A Drainage Assessment and SUDS would be required for the site.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No comments received.

---

## Overall assessment

#### PP status

Excluded

#### Overall assessment

Doubtful

#### Site capacity

50

### Conclusions

An allocation of 50 units here would be undesirable. The problems with this site primarily arise from its detachment from any existing settlement and the neighbouring industrial uses. The Roads Planning Team have raised some serious concerns around the need to upgrade Charlesfield Road to connect the site with St Boswells. This is likely to be prohibitively expensive. In design and sustainability terms there are real issues with allocating what would be a new small settlement in an isolated location where a large industrial estate is the main neighbouring use which has a range of uses on-site that may be undesirable for new residents. Education have raised concerns around primary schools capacity constraints and the likely need for an extension or new school in the area. This site does not have the basic ingredients for placemaking principles and a marketability issue could possibly be associated with this. Therefore the site will not be included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

# Chesters

---

<b>Site reference</b>	<b>Site name</b>	<b>Settlement</b>	<b>SDA</b>	<b>Proposed Use</b>	<b>Indicative Capacity</b>	<b>Ha</b>	<b>PP status</b>
RC2B	Roundabout Farm	Chesters	Rest of Borders	Housing	5	0.5	Remove LDP Site

---

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b>	<b>SAC</b>	<b>SPA</b>	<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
------------------	------------	------------	-------------	---------------

### Initial assessment summary

This is an existing housing allocation within the LDP, which was subject to a review as part of the MIR process.

---

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b>	<b>Planning history references</b>
--------------------------	------------	----------------------------------------	----------------------	------------------------------------

---

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b>	<b>Access to employment</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b>	<b>Site aspect</b>
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
--------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------------

### Local impact and integration summary

---

## Landscape assessment

---

NSA

SLA

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

Wild Land

### Landscape summary

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

Right of way

TPOs

Contaminated land

Water supply

Sewerage

Gas Supply

Education provision

### Planning & infrastructure summary

---

## Overall assessment

**PP status**

**Overall assessment**

**Site capacity**

Remove LDP Site

5

### Conclusions

The site is currently allocated for housing within the LDP, with an indicative capacity of 5 units. All the existing allocations were subject to review, as part of the MIR process. The site was allocated for housing within the Roxburgh Village Plan (1996) up to the Local Development Plan 2016. Over this period, the size of the site has reduced due to piecemeal development. Given the length of time the site has been allocated, a letter was sent to the landowner requesting whether there is a realistic likelihood of the site being developed.

The landowner responded by telephone, advising that she was happy for the site to be removed. The landowner noted that there is a prominent tree within the site and it is doubtful whether the site could accommodate 5 new units. The site is also occupied by existing properties. It was agreed that the site would be removed and not included within the new Local Development Plan 2.

---

# Clovenfords

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
ACLOV004	Land west of Bowland Road	Clovenfords	Central	Housing	130	13.4	Excluded

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable				

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is outwith both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. It is required that due to the size of the development that surface water flooding is considered and it is ensured that any water would be routed around the housing. A Drainage Assessment and information in respect of SUDS would be required.

SEPA: Require a FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourse which flows through the site. There would appear to be a reservoir within/ adjacent to the site. Consideration will need to be given to any culverts/ bridges which may exacerbate flood risk. Due to steep topography adjacent/ through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and the proposed development is not affected by surface runoff. Site may be constrained due to flood risk.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	Assessed through the process of the Local Development Plan 2016 and the Local Plan Amendment 2009 (ACLOV001).

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Good	Good	Good	Minor	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGICAL OFFICER: No response received. Although the Ecology Officer noted that for ACLOV001 (a smaller site excluded through the process of the LDP 2016) there would be a minor impact on biodiversity, field boundaries are hedgerow and gardens and there is no obvious drainage to the Caddon Water (River Tweed SAC). Southern part of site in shadow of mature trees on southern boundary. Mitigation measures would be required to protect trees and boundary features. Protect stone dyke feature and incorporate into design.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: No comments.

HES: No comments.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is within walking distance from the village centre although up the Bowland Road. The site is located on higher ground than the existing residential area and would be visible from the surrounding hills. There are no immediate archaeological implications. Scale of site allocation for housing is incongruous, it is considered that the visual character and setting of the village would be affected.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: Strongly recommend that for landscape and visual reasons only the lower part of the site should be developed for housing. It is suggested that development is limited to areas below the 200m contour but that the site could be extended westward to take in a block of land to the west and NW of Whytbank row and north of Caddon Mill.

SNH: No comments.

GENERAL COMMENTS: There are stone walls that follow existing field boundaries within the site and a burn that runs along the most eastern part of the site. The site would be clearly visible from the surrounding hills and the valley below and would be visually prominent on the skyline.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: Significant development. May impact on existing road layout and location of speed limit.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: It is recommended against this site being zoned for development. The main point of access is remote from the village and would be onto a relatively steep section of the B710 (Bowland Road). There does not appear to be any opportunity for integration with the existing street network to the south and so the site seems somewhat detached from the rest of the village. Expect a development of this size to provide adequate pedestrian access to the village centre. This would require a substantial length of footway along the B710. Some concern regarding the substandard junction of the B710 and the A7 and whilst this applies to any site in Clovenfords; it seems particularly apt for this site with the vehicular access points so remote from the rest of the village. In summary, the main concern with this site is its detached nature from the rest of the village and inability to integrate with the existing street network.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No comments.

### Near a trunk road?

**Right of way**

Adjacent to site

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

Not applicable

**Water supply**

Yes

**Sewerage**

Yes

**Gas Supply**

Yes

**Education provision**

Good

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: While this site requires safe non-vehicular access down to existing pavements this will be difficult to achieve as the existing houses to the east create a barrier.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: This site is considerable in size, on a rising, elevated site. It presents a significant landscape challenge since development will breach the skyline from key views, and would dramatically increase the size of the village. The size and topography of the site present considerable challenges in terms of achieving a development that will sympathetically relate to the village. If development is to be considered here, it is suggested a much more modest expansion on the lower end of the site. The capacity of the village to absorb this many houses in terms of school, infrastructure, amenities etc, would also have to be established. Despite its size, it also appears to have a weak connection with the existing village in terms of access, with no obvious scope to connect internally with the existing streets, relying on new accesses off the main road. It would then comprise a satellite community to some extent, however much of the site is developed.

EDUCATION: No objections.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Manse Street, Galashiels WTW has sufficient capacity. There are several water mains within the site and the site is located next to a water tank. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Caddonfoot WwTW has sufficient capacity. A Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. For a development of this scale there may be issues with the STW/network capacity. SW should confirm. The watercourse running through the site should be protected and enhanced and there should be no culverting for land gain.

**Overall assessment****PP status****Excluded****Overall assessment**

Unacceptable

**Site capacity**

130

**Conclusions**

A smaller part of this site has been considered previously (within the south eastern area of the site, adjacent to the settlement boundary) through the Local Development Plan 2016 and the Local Plan Amendment 2009 (ACLOV001). It was not considered that the site was required to meet the strategic housing requirement in the Central Borders Strategic Development Area. Furthermore, the site was considered to be doubtful in terms of landscape capacity and access.

A number of constraints were identified, through the consultation process, which include:

- The site is detached in nature from the rest of the village and is unable to integrate with the existing street network.
- Elevated on the skyline.
- A Drainage Assessment and information in respect of SUDS would be required.
- SEPA would require a FRA and consideration of surface water run-off.
- Mitigation measures would be required to protect trees and boundary features. Protect stone dyke feature and incorporate into design.
- The Council's Landscape Architect strongly recommended that for landscape and visual reasons only the lower part of the site should be developed for housing.

In conclusion, taking the above into consideration, it is not considered that this site is acceptable for a housing allocation and should be excluded from the Proposed LDP.

# Crailing

<b>Site reference</b> ACRAI004	<b>Site name</b> Crailing Toll (Larger Site)	<b>Settlement</b> Crailing	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 5	<b>Ha</b> 0.7	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

There are no major issues at this initial assessment stage. Part of this site is allocated within the Consolidated Local Plan.

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site lies out with the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extent. I would have no objections to this development on the grounds of flood risk.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourse which would appear to be culverted either through or immediately adjacent to the site. We do not support development over culverts that are to remain active.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> On site	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> 99/00897/OUT - Erection of a dwellinghouse (Refused)  The site was considered through the process of the Housing SG 2017 but was rejected (ACRAI004).
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Limited	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Limited	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> South-west
----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Moderate biodiversity risk. Site is improved pasture with some mature broad-leaved trees and garden ground on boundary. Potential connectivity with the River Tweed SAC (Oxnam water) via drain. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC (Oxnam water). Protect boundary trees and features and mitigation for protected species including bats and breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Crailing is a hamlet with a limited bus service. It relies on nearby Jedburgh for services. Mitigation measures would be required to prevent any impact on the River Tweed SAC.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY: The site formerly contained a farm steading and is at the edge of the medieval village. Archaeological evaluation is required.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific comment

HES: No comments.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Site is relatively large in relation to the existing settlement and there remains an undeveloped allocated site in the existing LDP.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: The site would benefit from some landscape structure planting along the south eastern boundary to help screen road and reduce road noise from site. Care will be needed to ensure structure planting does not shade development in the longer term.

SNH: No comment due to size and location of the site.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Additional properties will add to traffic using existing less-than-ideal junction with A698. Visibility out is okay but fast section of road and potential for nose to tail shunts for right-turning traffic as no dedicated right turn lane.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: I have no objections to this site being developed for housing although access would have to be via the adjacent approved site (ACRAI001) and not directly off the A698.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

No

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND: An area of the site appears to have been previously developed with agricultural buildings. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Connecting pathways/pavements between the East and West of the site requested for options for pedestrian access around the village.

EDUCATION: No issues.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER - Waste: No waste infrastructure in the area. Water: Robertson WTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the network

SEPA: There is no SW foul sewer network in this location. Consideration should be given to first time sewerage for this village to include the existing and proposed development site. Failing that private drainage would need to be provided with discharge to the Oxnam water (as opposed to the small burn). There may be a culvert running through or close to the site boundary - opportunities should be taken to de-culvert.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Acceptable	5

### Conclusions

There are no specific issues which would rule out development. There is a reliance on septic tanks in Crailing. SEPA have stated that consideration should be given to first time sewerage for this village to include the existing and proposed development site. If a WWT connection was not provided, SEPA have stated that overflow would have to be diverted to Oxnam Water not the small burn nearby. SEPA have not objected, either have Scottish Water, but there would be a need to ensure no impact on the River Tweed SAC (the Oxnam Water is covered by the SAC).

Crailing has the existing undeveloped allocated housing site for 5 units which forms part of this site. The landowner has stated that the additional allocation would make the existing site more marketable. However, no specific information has been provided to support this. Moreover, the scale of any allocation needs to be carefully considered with attention to the size of the existing settlement. It is considered that this site should have an indicative capacity of 5 units.

(The site was originally plotted as ACRAI003. Part of ACRAI003 is already allocated as ACRAI001 for 5 units. The site boundaries were therefore reduced and a new code was created - ACRAI004).

Following further consideration, it is proposed that this site ACRAI004 will not be taken forward into the Proposed Local Development Plan as a housing site. It is considered that there are other more appropriate sites that can be allocated within the Proposed Plan. Following the Main Issues Report public consultation period, it is not considered there is an identified housing need for additional housing within Crailing. The existing housing allocation remains undeveloped and this additional site was submitted by the same landowner with no evidence of an active developer being associated with the site. Therefore it would be difficult to justify the effectiveness of a larger site when the existing allocation of five units (ACRAI001) remains undeveloped. It is acknowledged that development at this location may be appropriate in the future however it is not felt that there is a need for a further housing allocation within the village at this point in time.

---

# Darnick

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
ADARN003	Bankhead	Darnick	Central	Housing	30	2.6	Excluded

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable	On/adjacent to sit ^	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

The River Tweed SAC extends into a small part of the north western corner of the site. The River Tweed SSSI is adjacent to the northern boundaries of the site.

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site lies outwith the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extent. Would require that surface water runoff is considered and that any flows are routed around any development.

SEPA: OS Map indicates a sufficient height difference between site and River Tweed.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	On/Adjacent to site	Greenfield	<p>No planning application history. The site was submitted for consideration through the process of the Housing SG. An initial stage 1 RAG assessment was undertaken, however concluded that the site should not be taken forward as part of the Housing SG. The conclusion was as follows:</p> <p>The proposed site sits within a sensitive area of the CAT policy area, where coalescence between Darnick and Tweedbank is a concern. Preventing coalescence between settlements is one of the main purposes of the CAT policy. The CAT policy does not preclude all development within the CAT area, but the development of this site would result in unacceptable coalescence between Darnick and Tweedbank. The site is also considered to relate too poorly to the settlement of Darnick to be considered further. The development would be expected to result in potential adverse impacts on the Southern Upland Way, the setting of Darnick, its conservation area, and Listed Buildings in the vicinity of the site, and potentially on Eildon and Leaderfoot National Scenic Area, whilst potential impacts on River tweed SAC, and River Tweed SSSI would require assessment. In conclusion, this site cannot be considered further.</p>

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Good	Good	Good	Minor	Not applicable

Central HMA      Darnick      ADARN003

## Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response received.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	On site	Not applicable

## Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: This site is in the core of the Inventory Battlefield of Darnick and if possible it should not be taken forward.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: Lies adjacent to the Darnick conservation area and close to three category B listed buildings; Darnlee, Lowood Bridge and The Waverley Castle Hotel. Development on this site would potentially have an adverse impact on the setting of these listed buildings. Site also lies with the battlefield.

HES: No comments.

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
On site	Not applicable			Not applicable

## Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: Potentially up to 25no however buffer zones, necessary to protect existing trees, may reduce this number.

SNH: Prominent site that lies within the Eildon & Leaderfoot National Scenic Area (NSA) and adjacent to the River Tweed Special Area of Conservation (SAC). Impacts on both designated sites should be assessed and, in the case of the SAC, the site should be screened as part of the Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA). At present, the landscape between the B6374 and the River Tweed is sparsely developed for some distance. Delivery of the site will change that character and site requirements should set out measures to avoid/reduce impacts.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

**Near a trunk road?**

Network Manager: Quite divorced from main settlement. Would be first area to north of the B6374 other than the existing hotel. Road layout complicated by section of single lane dualling and a right turning lane serving Darnick (in opposite direction).

Passenger Transport: No comment.

Roads Planning: This is a difficult site to comment on as it could have a role to play in how the Lowood mixed use site (MTWEE002) is accessed including the potential for a new bridge over the Tweed to replace/supplement the existing one at Lowood. Therefore it might be premature to allocate this land for housing meantime. For the current layout, means of vehicular access to serve the site is just about doable, but by no means straightforward. While traffic from the site could safely join the road leading to Lowood Bridge on the outside of the bend, access into the site is difficult here due to the close proximity to the main road into Melrose (B6374) and the likelihood of drivers making a right turn into the site having to wait on a convoy of traffic coming up from the traffic lights at Lowood Bridge. This could be resolved by introducing a short length of lane for right turn traffic so that such traffic does not interfere with the flow of traffic approaching Lowood Bridge from the Darnick side. Vehicular access into the site off the B6374 is difficult owing to the over-designed nature of the junctions serving Darnick and Lowood Bridge and the stretch of 5 lane road between the two junctions. Ideally this whole stretch of road

would be scaled down and rationalised, but this is an extensive scheme which would reduce the extent of public road required. For the current road layout the obvious vehicular access point would be just west of the existing pedestrian crossing and this would mean that right turns into or out of the site at this location would not be possible. This might just about work if the site is accessed from both the main road into Melrose and the road leading to Lowood Bridge. Hesitance in offering support for the allocation of this site for housing. On a positive, there are excellent opportunities for pedestrian and cycle connectivity from and to this site and the site stacks up well from a public transport point of view with a bus service and train service close by. A Transport Assessment would be required to address the above points raised as well as to address sustainable transport.

Strategic Transport: No response received.

Transport Scotland: No comments.

<b>Right of way</b>	<b>TPOs</b>	<b>Contaminated land</b>	<b>Water supply</b>	<b>Sewerage</b>	<b>Gas Supply</b>	<b>Education provision</b>
Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Connecting paths to core paths 1 & 18 required.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Conflicts with policy EP6 as would bring Darnick closer to Tweedbank Industrial Estate; Inappropriate addition to Darnick as the residential area is to the south of the B6374; Archaeological/battlefield implications; Potential impact on trees; Adjacent hotel is a Listed Building; Proximity to the River Tweed Special Area of Conservation and SSSI.

EDUCATION: No objections.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. 200mm water main running through site. Sufficient capacity in water network. Early engagements with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at WwTW. There is a surface water sewer running through the site. A Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network.

## Overall assessment

<b>PP status</b>	<b>Overall assessment</b>	<b>Site capacity</b>
Excluded	Unacceptable	30

### Conclusions

The proposed site sits within a sensitive and prominent area of the CAT policy area, where coalescence between Darnick and Tweedbank is a concern. Preventing coalescence between settlements is one of the main purposes of the CAT policy. The CAT policy does not preclude all development within the CAT area, but the development of this site would result in unacceptable coalescence between Darnick and Tweedbank being on a prominent open space between the settlements. The site is also considered to relate too poorly to the settlement of Darnick to be considered further, extending across the busy B6374.

The development would be expected to result in potential adverse impacts upon the setting of Darnick, its conservation area, and Listed Buildings in the vicinity of the site, and potentially on the Eildon and Leaderfoot National Scenic Area, whilst potential impacts on the River Tweed SAC and River Tweed SSSI would require assessment. Furthermore, the site is in the core of the Inventory Battlefield of Darnick.

The site is also problematic from a roads point of view in respect of access. In conclusion, it is not considered that this site is appropriate for allocation for housing within the Proposed LDP.

---

<b>Site reference</b> ADARN005	<b>Site name</b> Land south of Darnlee	<b>Settlement</b> Darnick	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 10	<b>Ha</b> 0.8	<b>PP status</b> Included
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is outwith both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. Would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

SEPA: No comments in respect of flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> No planning application history.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site is improved pasture with mature broad-leaved trees on boundary/within site. Potential for EPS (bats). No obvious connectivity with the River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Protect boundary trees and features and mitigation for protected species including bats and breeding birds.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> On site	<b>Open space</b> On site	<b>Listed buildings</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> On site	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: The site is within the Inventory Battlefield of Darnick. Mitigation is likely. Consideration of impacts to the setting of the battlefield is needed.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: The site is to the south of Darnlee, a category B listed building and lies within the Darnick conservation area. Whilst there may be some scope for a very small scale, well designed development on the southern boundary, it is considered that development of all of the proposed site would have an adverse impact on the setting of Darnlee and adversely impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: No comments.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

On site

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: 10-12 units given constraint of existing trees on site.

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: Wish to ensure that if this site is to be allocated within and adjacent to the NSA that a site brief is produced to identify the key natural heritage assets of the site to be protected and the key opportunities for the integration of green infrastructure within future development. The majority of the site lies within the Eildon & Leaderfoot Hills NSA. The site also forms an important context for, and a gateway to, Darnick. Its location within the NSA means that high standard design will be required. Key issues for a site brief are likely to include:

- Retention of key boundary features, including the existing wall and fence, woodland along the western boundary and mature trees along southern and eastern boundaries;
- Integration of the site with Broomilees Road, maintaining landscape character and sense of scale and place of this area with dwellings relating to both the parkland and the street.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: New junction required off existing Broomlees Road.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING: Not opposed in principle to this land being allocated for residential development. The site stacks up well in terms of sustainable transport with good opportunities for pedestrian and cycle connectivity with Melrose and Galashiels. The site is well served by public transport with a bus service close at hand and railway station nearby. Vehicular access is possible off the main road into Darnick on the east side of the site, but there is an issue to be addressed here as part of any development. The stretch of road here is used extensively for on-street parking for the village. Any road junction in this location would not work safely with this on-street parking remaining as junction visibility splay standards would not be met. Displacement parking would have to be provided in the site. Alternatively, it may be possible to upgrade the existing access serving Darnlee as a means of serving the site and introducing some lay-by parking in the main road. A supplementary vehicular access is also possible off Broomilees and this would help with street connectivity. This would entail widening Broomilees Road between the mature trees and may offer scope for a one-way traffic system over the initial narrow length of Broomilees Road. Strong street frontages are recommended and allowance for future street connectivity would be required. A Transport Statement can address the issues raised.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No comments.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Safe route for non-vehicular access would be strongly advised from this site to existing pavements and, therefore, the core path network.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Attractive area of parkland within the village associated with the Listed Building, within the Conservation Area; Archaeological/battlefield implications; Potential impact on

trees; Need structure planting/buffer between site and Listed Building; Some limited development of a high quality may be appropriate.

EDUCATION: No objections.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. A Flow and Pressure test is likely to be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. A Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing Scottish Water foul network.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Included	Acceptable	10

### Conclusions

The site is considered to represent a suitable infill development within the settlement of Darnick.

The existing woodland belt along the western boundary of the site as well as specimen trees along the southern boundary would require to be retained where possible. The developable area of the site would be established by the route protection areas of existing trees. Consideration would require to be given to how best to create separation along the northern boundary of the site to ensure the integrity of the setting of Darnlee is maintained.

Existing boundary features (including the existing stone wall and fencing) would require to be retained as much as possible.

On-street parking is currently an issue on Abbotsford Road. Main access would be from Abbotsford Road with a potential link into Broomilees Road which in turn may result in localised improvements. This would require to be addressed through any development of this site.

Any development would require to be of a high quality in order to safeguard the character and setting of the conservation area, the B listed Darnlee and the Inventory Battlefield. The relationship of development with the parkland and the street would require to be well considered. Due to the sensitivity of the site, it is considered that a Planning Brief would be required.

There is undeveloped land to the west of the site which may, in the future, offer an opportunity for future development. Access from the site in question would therefore require to be considered along with improvements to Broomilees Road as suggested by the Roads Officer.

---

# Denholm

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
ADENH006	Land south east of Thorncroft	Denholm	Central	Housing	12	0.7	Excluded

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable				

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is outwith both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. However, there is a ditch running through the grounds that has come close to flooding property in the past. This has, to our knowledge, not spilled onto this field but would still require a Flood Risk Assessment to show the risk to this development. At present, SBC Flood Team are considering work such as culverting this ditch.

SEPA: Require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourses which flow along the boundary of the site. These watercourses then enter a FPS which will require careful consideration to ensure there is no increase in flood risk due to site development. The study undertaken by JBA indicates that part of the site is at risk of flooding but it does not appear to fully modelled the adjacent watercourse. Consideration will need to be given to any culverts/ bridges which may exacerbate flood risk. Site may be constrained due to flood risk. Due to steep topography through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Combination	No relevant planning application history.

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Good	Good	Good	Moderate	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site is improved pasture with hedgerow and trees on boundary. Potential for EPS (bats) and breeding birds to use built structures within the site. No obvious connectivity with the River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Protect boundary trees and features and mitigation for protected species including bats and breeding birds.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There are no known archaeological issues.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: No comments.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: No comments.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Adjacent to site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: 10 – 12no taking account narrowness of site and RPAs of adjacent field boundary trees.

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to size and location.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGEMENT: Creation of a new junction onto the A698.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Consider relocation of bus stop, provision of shelter.

ROADS PLANNING: Not opposed to development on this site. Access via the A698 will require the demolition of some existing outbuildings, but satisfactory access can be achieved. An acceptable revised parking arrangement would be required for the existing dwellinghouse (Thorncroft). The linear nature of the site limits potential internal street connectivity; however there may be the possibility of a link to Ruberslaw Road via the vacant plot within that development. This would require 3rd party discussions. If this site is allocated, any site layout would have to allow for future links to the land along the eastern boundary. The existing infrastructure along the A698 would have to be extended into the development site.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No comments.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

On site

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: An area of the site appears to have been previously developed with buildings, possibly of commercial/ industrial use. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: If possible a pedestrian link to Ruberslaw Road would allow pedestrian access to Core path 01 avoiding the A698.

EDUCATION: No objections.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Robertson WTW has sufficient capacity. There is a 6" water main running across the South side of the site. There is also a 4" water main north of site. Sufficient capacity in the network. Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. There is a foul and surface water sewer running through the middle of the site. Sufficient capacity in the network for foul only connection.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Acceptable	12

### Conclusions

The site was identified within the Main Issues Report as a preferred option for development and the site is considered appropriate for residential development in principle. However, it must be acknowledged that there has been low take up of development land within the village in recent years, with two sites already allocated within the village (RD4B and ADENH001) with a total indicative capacity of 50 units, which remain undeveloped. It is not therefore considered appropriate to allocate a further housing site at this time. It must be noted, however, that the site in question is located within the settlement boundary and could therefore be developed, through the process of a planning application. It is acknowledged that the site could be considered again for inclusion in a future LDP.

In deciding which of the many MIR sites were ultimately included within the Proposed LDP consideration was given to a range of factors. These included, for example, the housing land requirement based on the proposed SDP2 which was informed by HND A2, any developer interest in the site, provision of local facilities / services, comparison with other submitted sites. Ultimately it was considered that there were more appropriate sites considered within the MIR to contribute towards the housing land requirement and the site was not included. It is acknowledged that the site could be considered again for inclusion in a future LDP.

The site is considered to offer an appropriate opportunity for infill development within the settlement boundary of Denholm. Consideration will require to be given to the residential amenity of existing properties within the immediate vicinity. The Roads Officer has confirmed that an acceptable access is achievable from the A698, this would require removal of some existing outbuildings. These would require investigation for potential contamination.

The Council's Flood and Coastal Management Team and the Scottish Environment Protection Agency have requested that a Flood Risk Assessment be undertaken in relation to a ditch running through the grounds that has come close to flooding property in the past. Consideration is currently being given to culverting this ditch. The site would require careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and the proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff.

# Earlston

---

<b>Site reference</b>	<b>Site name</b>	<b>Settlement</b>	<b>SDA</b>	<b>Proposed Use</b>	<b>Indicative Capacity</b>	<b>Ha</b>	<b>PP status</b>
EEA12B	Earlston Glebe	Earlston	Central	Housing	25	2.5	Remove LDP Site

---

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b>	<b>SAC</b>	<b>SPA</b>	<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
1:200				

### Initial assessment summary

Nearly half the site (southern end) falls within the 1:200 year flood area. The dismantled railway would have to be retained to provide for a walkway. Part of the site (south of the dismantled railway) has 16/0033/FUL permission for football pitch and pavilion.

---

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b>	<b>Planning history references</b>
			Greenfield	16/00033/FUL - Change of use of grazing land to football training pitch, erection of 6no floodlighting columns and 2 no storage containers (Approved)

---

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b>	<b>Access to employment</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b>	<b>Site aspect</b>
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
--------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------------

### Local impact and integration summary

---

## Landscape assessment

---

NSA

SLA

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

Wild Land

## Landscape summary

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

Right of way

TPOs

Contaminated land

Water supply

Sewerage

Gas Supply

Education provision

## Planning & infrastructure summary

---

## Overall assessment

**PP status**

**Overall assessment**

**Site capacity**

Remove LDP Site

25

### Conclusions

This site is to be removed as an allocation and instead incorporated within the Earlston settlement boundary. The landowner (Church of Scotland) has responded to SBC mailout and has stated that they aim to develop the site but no developer for the site or specific plan for its development has been identified.

The site has been allocated since 1995, soon after this two houses were developed. Since then, development has not taken place and the site's effectiveness was questioned as long ago as 2007 by SG reporters as part of previous Local Plan process.

The site will become 'white land' this means it could be developed for housing in future as infill development, and it would then contribute a windfall development.

It should be noted that a significant part of the site is affected by flood risk and will not be developable for housing, however this had already been accounted for and has been reflected in its lower than usual site capacity in the LDP 2016.

---

<b>Site reference</b> MEARL004	<b>Site name</b> Georgefield & East Turrford	<b>Settlement</b> Earlston	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Mixed Use	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 700	<b>Ha</b> 69.9	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> On site	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	-----------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

There are no initial constraints on the site which would preclude it from being developed.

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The site is within the surface water 1 in 200 year flood extent. Would have no objection to the proposal on the grounds of flood risk. I would however ask that due to the size of the development that surface water flooding is considered and it is ensured that water would be routed around housing.

SEPA: Require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Turrford Burn and small watercourses which flow through or adjacent to the site. Consideration should be given to whether there are any culverted watercourses within/ near the site which can exacerbate flood risk. Areas adjacent to the Turrford Burn will likely be constrained due to flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map and steep topography shows that there may be flooding issues on the site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> 05/02263/OUT - Erection of high school with associated sports facilities (Withdrawn)  Part of the site is allocated for housing in the LDP (AEARL010 & AEARL011) and identified for longer term mixed use development (SEARL006).
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> South-west
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: No comments.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Part of this site is already allocated in the Scottish Borders LDP 2016. AEARL010 (40 units) and AEAR011 (120 units). The proposal is to increase the number of units on those existing allocations to 255 units in total and to reallocate 27 acres of land which is currently broadly identified for Structure Planting/ Landscaping within a wider 'longer term mixed use' allocation SEARL006 for housing instead. In total this development proposal seeks, in the long term, to allocate 796 units on the sites AEARL010; AEAR011; SEARL006.

There are no plans to remove sites AEARL010 (40 units) and AEAR011 (120 units) from the LDP. In terms of accessibility and sustainability, these sites are still considered to meet the objectives of the LDP

and represent a suitable and deliverable expansion of Earlston. There is no basis for increasing the amount of development on these sites. Additionally there is no basis for altering what is a broad Long Term Expansion allocation and specifying both 796 units and the replacement of areas of the site currently broadly identified for Structure Planting/ Landscaping for housing instead.

It should be noted at this point that the proposal submitted is both vague on the location for development and the specifics of what is proposed. It provides no tangible case for the changes proposed. The argument that is made is, strangely, based on a basic site layout dating from 2009 with frequent reference made to the long out of date Scottish Borders Consolidated Local Plan (2011).

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	On site	Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY: There is archaeological potential within the site, and one known cropmark. Archaeological investigation will be required.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: This is a significant expansion and lies on sloping land which makes the potential development highly visible. Boundary treatments, external colour and physical links to Earlston will be important as would phase proposals. A development of this scale would almost double the size of Earlston and there is potential need to consider off site infrastructure (not solely education) in terms of impacts on the town centre and linkage to transport and other facilities.

HES: No comments.

---

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable			Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: No comments.

SNH: While this site lies outwith the current settlement boundary, we note that it is included in the LDP as a longer-term safeguarded site (SEARL006). If you are minded to support development of this site during the current plan period, further detailed assessment will be required.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

<b>Physical access/road capacity</b>	<b>Near a trunk road?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------

NETWORK MANAGER: Georgefield Road is not ideal access for this scale of development.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Need to consider bus infrastructure.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: This site is expansive and somewhat remote from the rest of the village, especially the eastern part of it. Should it be zoned for development I shall require a new access onto the A6105 just east of Tower Farm. Improvements will be required to urbanise the entrance to the village on the main road from the east in order to reduce vehicle speeds. A link to the Georgefield road will also be required in order to provide for appropriate street connectivity. The Georgefield road will require significant upgrading in terms of horizontal and vertical geometry, width, construction make-up, pedestrian provision and street lighting. I presume this will affect third party land.

As well as internal street connectivity the development will have to connect externally and allow for future connectivity.

A coherent masterplan will be required for the whole area of Georgefield. As well as sustainable transport affairs, a Transport Assessment will have to comprehensively assess the full extent of upgrading work required for the Georgefield road and will have to assess the capacity of the main street through the village which has pinch-points for both vehicular and pedestrian traffic.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: The potential impact of 700 units on the trunk road would require to be determined with appropriate and deliverable mitigation measures identified.

<b>Right of way</b>	<b>TPOs</b>	<b>Contaminated land</b>	<b>Water supply</b>	<b>Sewerage</b>	<b>Gas Supply</b>	<b>Education provision</b>
On site	Not applicable	Not applicable	Yes	Limited	Yes	Average

## Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: The proposed mixed use areas are well placed to serve the new high school, but are divorced from the centre of the town and therefore it will be difficult to encourage more sustainable travel movements without significant improvements to the local walking and cycling network in the immediate area. It is recommended that a master-planning exercise is carried out to develop suitable ideas in terms of vehicular access to the site, sustainable transport options and public transport provision. There is a long term ambition to develop the former railway line that lies to the north of the site as a shared access route.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Site is already allocated for mixed use and housing development.

EDUCATION: Extension or New School may need to be considered.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Waste: Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Water: Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SEPA: The Turford burn and a trib run through/adjacent to the site so would need to be protected and enhanced as part of any development. There should be no culverting for land gain. The Turford burn is a HMWB as a result of morphological changes (straightening). With regard to foul drainage this must be connected to the SW foul network which would likely necessitate an upgrade of the STW. Earlston STW is currently a failing site due to storm sewage infrastructure at the site and is due for upgrading under Q&S imminently. SW should confirm the position. A Drainage Impact Assessment and SUDS would be required for the site.

---

## Overall assessment

<b>PP status</b>	<b>Overall assessment</b>	<b>Site capacity</b>
Excluded	Doubtful	700

## Conclusions

Part of this site is already allocated in the Scottish Borders LDP 2016, AEARL010 (40 units) and AEAR011 (120 units). The proposal is to increase the number of units on those existing allocations to 255 units in what is roughly the plan period through bringing forward phasing and to reallocate 27 acres of land which is currently broadly identified for Structure Planting/ Landscaping within a wider 'longer term mixed use' allocation SEARL006 for housing instead. In total this development proposal seeks, in the long term, to allocate 796 units on the sites AEARL010; AEAR011; and SEARL006.

There are no plans to remove sites AEARL010 (40 units) and AEAR011 (120 units) from the LDP. These sites are still considered to meet the objectives of the LDP and represent a suitable and deliverable expansion of Earlston. However, there is no basis for increasing the amount of development on these sites. Additionally there is no basis for altering what is a broad Long Term Expansion allocation and specifying both 796 units and the replacement of areas of the site currently broadly identified for Structure Planting/ Landscaping for housing instead.

It should be noted at this point that the proposal submitted is vague on the location of development and the specifics of what is proposed. It provides no tangible case for the changes proposed. The argument that is made is, strangely, based on a basic site layout dating from 2009 with frequent reference made to the long out of date Scottish Borders Consolidated Local Plan (2011).

Taking the above into consideration, it is not intended to allocate site MEARL004 within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

---

# Eckford

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
AECKF002	Land at the Black Barn	Eckford	Central	Housing	10	1.1	Excluded

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable				

### Initial assessment summary

There are no initial constraints on the site which would preclude it from being developed.

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

SEPA: Review of OS Map indicates a potentially culverted watercourse along the eastern boundary of the site. We would recommend that this is investigated as part of an FRA. We do not support development over culverts that are to remain active.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	On site	Buildings	97/00580/OUT - Residential development 97/00617/COU - Change of use of land from agriculture to garden ground

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Poor	Poor	Poor	Moderate	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGICAL OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site appears to be arable field and improved pasture with hedgerow on boundary and trees and scrub within site. Possible potential for EPS (bats) and breeding birds to use built structures within the site. No obvious connectivity with the River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Protect boundary features and trees, mitigation for protected species including bats and breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located on the south-eastern edge of the small village of Eckford. In terms of accessibility it scores poorly. There are no key services in Eckford.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY: There are no known archaeological issues. However, the site is in close proximity to the known location of medieval Eckford and some evidence for this may exist in the site. Also, the existing building is on the site of an early 19th century farmstead evidence of which may also exist. Mitigation may be required.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific comment.

HES: No comments.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: Given the existing density and pattern of development in Eckford, capacity is likely to be 6-8 units. To alleviate the restricted nature of the existing access track, an additional strip of the field alongside the established woodland strip next to the access track could be included in the site and planted up with trees. This would allow the removal of the existing tree belt. Any removal of hedges on either side of the track should be replaced outwith the visibility splays.

SNH: No comment due to size and location.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: No comments.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: I am not opposed in principle to this land being allocated for housing. The main road through the village already benefits from street lighting provision, but lacks provision for pedestrians. If this site is to be allocated for housing then footway provision between the site access and the crossroads in the village at 'Tower Cottage' should be a consideration. A length of road side hedging is likely to have to be removed in order to achieve suitable junction visibility.

### Near a trunk road?

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

No

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND: An area of the site appears to have been previously developed with a building, possibly of commercial/ industrial use. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Connecting path suitable for walkers cyclists from road through site and on to North East corner of site to allow future link for footpath network to link site to Loaning local path network. Section of wide verge required at entrance of site into the public road for pedestrian use.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: History of refusal and appeal, 97/00580/OUT. Suggest a development brief is required. Again private waste water systems are currently being used in development boundary, 17/00032/FUL.

EDUCATION: No comments.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER - Waste: No sewers within the area. Water: Robertson WTW has sufficient capacity. A Flow and Pressure test is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. This may require to be upgraded to accommodate this development.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Acceptable	10

### Conclusions

The proposal involves the demolition of an agricultural barn/shed currently situated outside the settlement and its replacement with housing. In addition to this, housing would be allocated on fields that currently surround the shed and the village. The landowner's proposal suggests a new settlement boundary enveloping the site with 5+ houses to be developed. Technically the site could accommodate up to 10 units. The site is partly enveloped by existing buildings to the north, west, and south. There are no absolute constraints ruling out development. However, Eckford is a village without basic services. There is no WWT available, so private sewerage would be required. It is a very small village and development of the whole site, although small, would still be relatively significant.

Following further consideration, it is proposed that this site AECKF002 will not be taken forward into the Proposed Local Development Plan as a housing site. It is considered that there are other more appropriate sites that can be allocated within the Proposed Plan. Following the public consultation period on the Main Issues Report it is not considered there is an identified housing need for additional housing within Eckford. The site was submitted with no active developer associated with the site and therefore it is difficult to justify the effectiveness of the site. It is considered there are more appropriate sites available to meet the housing land requirement. This in addition to the site constraints relating to wastewater, scale of development and site access it is not considered that this site should be taken forward into the Proposed Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b> RECKF002	<b>Site name</b> Easter Wooden Steading	<b>Settlement</b> Eckford	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Redevelopment	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 5	<b>Ha</b> 0.7	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

There are no initial constraints on the site which would preclude it from being developed.

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. However, there are several small burns in close proximity and I would require that surface water runoff is considered and that any flows are routed around any development.

SEPA: The OS Map indicates the site is set back from the Moses Burn and tributary. It also indicates the 90m contour though the site and 80m contour adjacent to the watercourse. Due to steep topography adjacent to the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> On site	<b>Current use/s</b> Buildings	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no relevant planning history on the site.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Poor	<b>Access to employment</b> Poor	<b>Access to services</b> Poor	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site consists of farm buildings including stone steadings and modern agricultural sheds. Potential for EPS (bats) and breeding birds to use built structures within the site. Potential connectivity with the River Tweed SAC/SSSI via drainage to the Moses burn. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC. Mitigation for protected species including bats and breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: This is an isolated site which would consist of a steading conversion. Such sites usually come forward through housing in the countryside policy rather than allocations in the development plan.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On/adjacent to site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: Our HER records this as the site of a medieval farmstead. There have also been a number of Bronze and Iron Age artefacts found locally. The site of an enclosure of unknown date is in the field immediately to the east. Mitigation may be required.

HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER: Potential for redevelopment.

HES: No comments.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: No comments.

SNH: No comment due to size and location.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: No comments.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: No objections in principle to the redevelopment of the existing farm steading. Junction visibility concerns over the existing access onto the B6401 from the farm, but it would appear solutions are possible; either by shifting the junction in a westerly direction or by stopping up the existing access and using the more favourable Easter Wooden Farm Cottages junction. It should be noted that only a maximum of 4 new build can be served off a private access (5 if the number of dwellinghouses permitted off a private access is increased from 4 to 5, in line with the National Roads Development Guide, through the LDP process). This does not include conversions.

### Near a trunk road?

### Right of way

On site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

On site

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

No

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site is developed as an agricultural steading and is understood to have included petroleum storage. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Right of way BR34 through site link to east and to track to South of site. Scope to upgrade path links to existing nearby path network

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Housing in the Countryside design guidance relevant.

EDUCATION: No issues

NHS: No comments.

SCOTTISH WATER: Waste: No sewers within the area. Water: Robertson WTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the network.

SEPA: Private foul drainage would be required as no SW foul network in vicinity

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	5

### Conclusions

The LDP would not allocate an area of land in a rural setting for a proposal which would be tested via a planning application under the Council's Housing in the Countryside policy. The site should not be included within the Proposed LDP.

---

# Ednam

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
AEDNA011	Cliftonhill (v)	Ednam	Central	Housing	15	1.3	Excluded

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
1:200	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

There are no initial constraints on the site which would preclude it from being developed.

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourse which flows adjacent to the site and enters the Eden Water. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map and steep topography indicates that there may be flooding issues at this site or immediately adjacent. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff.

Note: Surface water flood map is offset from burn suggesting an error within the flood map.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	On site	Greenfield	99/00957/OUT - Residential Development Refused, Appeal Dismissed. 01/00782/OUT - Residential Development Refused. 04/02140/OUT - Residential Development Refused.
				Site has been considered as part of previous LDP processes (site NE of War Memorial). The Reporter concluded that once the allocated site (AEDNA002) is fully developed "the preferred area for future period of this Local Plan (2011), if required, will be to the east side of the village".

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Limited	Limited	Limited	Moderate	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Moderate biodiversity risk. Site an arable field with lowland mixed deciduous woodland and hedgerow on boundary. Potential connectivity with the River Tweed SAC via drainage to the Eden water. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC. Mitigation for protected species including bats, badger and breeding birds.

SNH: No comments received.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located in the centre of Ednam, close to the crossroads and the bus shelter. Ednam has a bus service to Kelso and Berwick and is only 2.5 miles from Kelso. The site slopes towards the crossroads but sits higher than the centre of the village. The village has a post office, village hall and a primary school. Mitigation would be required to prevent any impacts on Eden water.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	On/adjacent to site	Not applicable	On/adjacent to site	Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY: Historic mapping (General Roy 1750s, Stobie 1770) shows this area as containing the earlier village core to the east of the burn. Mitigation is likely.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No comments received.

HES: No comments.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located close to the centre of the small village. Boundary is provided to the south by heavy hedgrows which run along the road towards Milburn. There is heavy vegetation on the western border which separates the site from the village on this side. The northern section of the site would take development up the Duns road in quite a prominent position and in quite a linear form. The Old Smiddy is a C listed building, but any impact would be low. Archaeological interests in the southern half of the site which would required mitigation.

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable			Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: No fundamental concerns but eastern boundary looks very arbitrary and does not relate to any features on the ground. One consequence of that is that the northern end is so narrow that it is probably undevelopable. It would be desirable to retain all the existing woodland that is outside the site on the west side and this implies a buffer zone of at least 10m along that side. This will affect the developable area. Presumably access would have to come off the SW corner which would affect the amenity of the Ednam to Cliftonhill road and would need to avoid impacting on the War Memorial and the Old Smithy opposite which is all quite tight and awkward.

SNH: No comment due to size and location.

General comments: This is quite a large site but the landscape impact is relatively limited. The site is partly screened by heavy hedgrows and vegetation on the west and south sides. The south-western part of the site slopes steadily towards the crossroads and this reduces landscape impact on a large portion of the site. However, roads requirements for widening of the C-class road on the south of the site might significantly reduce the hedgerow/vegetation on the south side of the site.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

<b>Physical access/road capacity</b>	<b>Near a trunk road?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

NETWORK MANAGER: Access off single track road and then junction with limited visibility onto B Class Road.

ROADS PLANNING SERVICE: I am able to support this site for residential development on the basis of provision of suitable pedestrian and street lighting connectivity with the rest of the village and the carriageway of the minor public road to the south being widened to 5.5m. Frontage development along the minor public road is highly desirable; however this will require significant engineering works given the difference in level. It should be noted that the shape of the site under consideration does not bode well in terms of a potential layout; however a link through to Eden Park should be considered which would benefit the site. A strip of housing adjacent to the existing public road may be more in-keeping with the form of the village and the lie of the land.

#### Right of way

Not applicable

#### TPOs

Not applicable

#### Contaminated land

Not applicable

#### Water supply

Yes

#### Sewerage

Yes

#### Gas Supply

Yes

#### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: No comment.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Potential coalescence of Cliftonhill and Ednam.

EDUCATION: No issues.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Waste: Kelso WwTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the network. Water: Robertson WTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the network.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. The pump station at Ednam may require to be upgraded to account for the proposed developments. SW should confirm.

OVERALL SUMMARY: No major planning and infrastructure constraints. However, there are roads issues on this site. The road to the south is a single track road, which will require widening, and there are visibility issues on the B-road (Duns Road). Each of these could be resolved.

---

## Overall assessment

#### PP status

Excluded

#### Overall assessment

Acceptable

#### Site capacity

15

### Conclusions

If this site was to be allocated, it would be important to incorporate landscaping to resist further development to the north east and coalescence with Milburn and Cliftonhill Farm. The minor road to the south of the site requires widening for access. This will mean a reduction in the hedgerow screening. Level differences from the site to the minor road means major engineering required in order to achieve desirable development frontage along the southern section of the site, avoiding a layout that turns its back on the village. That said, as much of the hedgerow as possible would need to be retained on the southern boundary. On balance appears a more complex site to bring up to appropriate roads access standards than others.

There are no significant constraints affecting the site although there is already an allocated site in this small village and it is considered there are better options available.

Following further consideration, it is proposed that this site AEDNA011 will not be taken forward into the Proposed Local Development Plan as a housing site. It is considered that there are other more appropriate sites that can be allocated within the Proposed Plan. Following the public consultation period on the Main Issues Report it is not considered there is an identified housing need for additional

housing within Ednam. The site was submitted with no active developer associated with the site and therefore it is difficult to justify the effectiveness of the site. This site received a number of objections from residents of the village who did not support development at this location. There is also an existing housing allocation within the village at West Mill for 12 units which remains undeveloped.

It should also be noted Woodland Trust Scotland objected to the inclusion of the site as the site boundary includes an area of woodland identified on the Native Woodland Survey for Scotland and therefore they strongly recommend that this alternative option is not carried forward to LDP2.

The site will not be included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b> AEDNA012	<b>Site name</b> Land east of Keleden	<b>Settlement</b> Ednam	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 6	<b>Ha</b> 0.4	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	------------------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Adjacent to site	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

There are no initial constraints on the site which would preclude it from being developed. Issues raised by SEPA would require to be investigated although the Council's Flood Team has raised no objections.

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. No objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

SEPA: Require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Eden Water. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site which may exacerbate flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map and steep topography indicates that there may be flooding issues at this site or immediately adjacent. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> On site	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> 18/00086/FUL - Change of use from agricultural land to garden ground and retrospective (Refused). Appeal granted at LRB. 16/00617/PPP - Erection of dwellinghouse (Refused) 16/01425/PPP - Erection of dwellinghouse (Refused) 06/02130/FUL - Erection of dwellinghouse and detached double garage (Approved) - planning application only partially overlaps the site.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Limited	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Limited	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Major	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: No specific comments for LDP2 from the Ecology Officer, however, the following comments were made through the process of the LDP 2016 for a larger site at this location: There are major biodiversity issues to be addressed and flooding issues in the extreme south-west corner. Biodiversity Risk: Major (part of flood plain of River Tweed SAC). Phase 1 habitat (aerial interpretation) Improved field (B4). Field boundaries: Riverbank, hedgerow, post & wire fence. Eden water (River Tweed SAC within site). Biological records: salmonids, European eel associated with Eden water. Mitigation: Avoid significant impacts on the integrity of the River Tweed SAC. Protect and enhance boundary features –riverbank margin, riparian planting and hedgerow network. Site clearance outside breeding bird season. Flood Risk (Fluvial 1in 200): Yes.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located in the centre of Ednam, close to the crossroads and the bus shelter. Ednam has a bus service to Kelso and Berwick and is 2.5 km from Kelso. Ednam has some

local services including a primary school, post office, and village hall. Access to services and employment opportunities available in main settlement of Kelso. Biodiversity issues to be addressed.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY: Historic mapping (General Roy 1750s, Stobie 1770) shows this area as containing the earlier village core to the east of the burn. Mitigation is likely.

HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER: No specific comment.

HES: No comments.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: No comments received.

SNH: The site is within 50m of the River Tweed Special Area of Conservation (SAC). If you are minded to take this site forward into the plan, it should be included in the Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA).

GENERAL COMMENT: Site is quite prominent when viewed from the south, but is a small site and landscape mitigation is possible.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: Access off single track road and then junction with limited visibility onto B Class Road.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: I am able to support this site for residential development on the basis of provision of suitable pedestrian and street lighting connectivity with the rest of the village and the carriageway of the minor public road to the north being widened to 5.5m.

### Near a trunk road?

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may

present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: No comment.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Case history on site for development in the countryside. Loss of visual separation of cliftonhill and Ednam

EDUCATION: No issues.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Waste: Kelso WwTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the network. Water: Robertson WTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the network.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. The pump station at Ednam may require to be upgraded to account for the proposed developments. SW should confirm.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Doubtful	6

### Conclusions

Since the Roads Planning Team commented, planning consent was recently given for a house on the northern part of this site which in turn may have implications for access to the site. It may be possible an access to the southern part of the site could be formed through this plot. An alternative access could likely be formed over land to the east which is understood to be outwith the applicant's control. The Roads Planning Team also raised the requirement for pedestrian and street lighting connectivity with the rest of the village and the carriageway of the minor public road to the north would require to be widened to 5.5m.

Comments from the biodiversity officer are still awaited with regards to any potential impact upon the River Tweed SAC. The major issue with this site is that the LDP does not allocate land for development of less than five units. It is not considered the site can comfortably achieve this and would be out of character with the low density of surrounding detached properties. It is considered there are more appropriate sites tabled for consideration as part of the MIR site submission process.

Following further consideration, it is proposed that this site AEDNA012 will not be taken forward into the Proposed Local Development Plan as a housing site. It is considered that there are other more appropriate sites that can be allocated within the Proposed Plan. It is noted that the landowner objected to the non-inclusion of the site within the MIR and resubmitted the site for further consideration. This site was excluded from the MIR as it was not considered an appropriate extension of the settlement and there were major biodiversity issues to be addressed. It is also not considered that the site is capable of accommodating five or more properties in keeping with the character of existing neighbouring dwellings. It should be noted that the northern part of this site was subject to planning approval for a large detached dwellinghouse (18/01770/FUL) in February 2019.

In conclusion, the site will not be taken forward for inclusion with the Proposed Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b> AEDNA013	<b>Site name</b> Land north of Primary School	<b>Settlement</b> Ednam	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 20	<b>Ha</b> 1.4	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

There are no initial constraints on the site which would preclude it from being developed.

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is outwith both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. Due to the size of the development I would recommend surface water runoff be considered.

SEPA: No detailed comments on flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> On site	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> 01/00782/OUT - Residential development (refused) 04/02140/OUT - Residential development (refused) 99/00957/OUT - Residential development (refused)
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Limited	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Limited	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Low impact. Site is an arable field with hedgerow, garden ground and amenity ground on boundary. No obvious connectivity with the River Tweed SAC. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Ednam has a bus service to Kelso and Berwick and is only 2.5 miles from Kelso. The village does have a post office, village hall and a primary school. The site has low impact in terms of biodiversity risk. There is already an existing allocation in Ednam.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Not applicable	<b>Open space</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Listed buildings</b> Not applicable	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> Not applicable	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> Not applicable
--------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

## Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY: There are no known archaeological issues.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Site lies on the approach to the village form Ednam; boundary treatments and connections (both physical and visual) to the settlement will be important issues.

HES: No comments.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: 20-25no houses, if density of adjacent Eden Park was reflected in any proposed development.(and if additional land was included to ensure required structure planting was achievable. A belt of structure planting to the north boundary would create shelter from northerly winds and act as visual containment.

SNH: We recommend that if this site is to be allocated that a site brief is produced to identify the key natural heritage assets of the site to be protected and the key opportunities for the integration of green infrastructure within future development. Our advice on this site is based on prior knowledge and desktop assessment using GIS and streetview. We may provide further advice based on a site visit if the potential allocation is carried forward. The current settlement statement in LDP1 states that further expansion of Ednam would be to the north and east. This potential allocation conforms to those placemaking considerations. However, a site brief is still required if potential adverse effects on setting and character of the existing settlement are to be avoided through the promotion of a design led planning approach.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Impact on existing 30 mph limit if new access onto B Road. Access off Stichill Road less of an impact but will increase volume through more restricted section of village.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Possible bus stop infrastructure.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I am able to recommend in favour of this land being allocated for development. The street lighting and footway infrastructure in the village will have to be extended along the main road as appropriate and a modest extension of the 30 mph speed limit is likely to be required. Access should be taken from both the B6461 and the minor public road to the south west to allow a connected street network to develop. A strong street frontage onto the B6461 will create a sense of arrival from the north and will help justify a shifting of the 30 mph speed limit. Depending on the scale of development a Transport Statement may be required.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: No comment.

EDUCATION: No issues.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: (WASTE): Kelso WwTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WATER)Water: Robertson WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. The pump station at Ednam may require to be upgraded to account for the proposed developments. SW should confirm.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Acceptable	20

### Conclusions

The proposed site is capable of being developed. There are no restrictions that rule out development. This site is in quite a prominent position to the north of the settlement, on slightly raised ground, overlooking Ednam. It could be integrated with the settlement with appropriate layout and design, connectivity, and boundary treatment. The site was considered as an 'alternative site in the MIR'.

Following the public consultation period on the Main Issues Report it is not considered there is an identified housing need for additional housing within Ednam. The site was submitted with no active developer associated with the site and therefore it is difficult to justify the effectiveness of the site. This site received a number of objections from residents of the village who did not support development at this location. There is also an existing housing allocation within the village at West Mill for 12 units which remains undeveloped.

Therefore, following further consideration, it is proposed that this site AEDNA013 will not be taken forward into the Proposed Local Development Plan as a housing site. It is considered that there are other more appropriate sites that can be allocated within the Proposed Plan.

---

# Eildon

---

<b>Site reference</b>	<b>Site name</b>	<b>Settlement</b>	<b>SDA</b>	<b>Proposed Use</b>	<b>Indicative Capacity</b>	<b>Ha</b>	<b>PP status</b>
AEILD002	West Eildon	Eildon	Central	Housing	5	0.8	Retain LDP Site

---

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b>	<b>SAC</b>	<b>SPA</b>	<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
------------------	------------	------------	-------------	---------------

### Initial assessment summary

This is an existing housing allocation within the LDP, which was subject to a review as part of the MIR process.

---

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b>	<b>Planning history references</b>
--------------------------	------------	--------------------------------------------	----------------------	------------------------------------

---

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b>	<b>Access to employment</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b>	<b>Site aspect</b>
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
--------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------------------	--------------------	------------------------------------------

### Local impact and integration summary

---

## Landscape assessment

---

NSA

SLA

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

Wild Land

## Landscape summary

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

Right of way

TPOs

Contaminated land

Water supply

Sewerage

Gas Supply

Education provision

## Planning & infrastructure summary

---

## Overall assessment

**PP status**

**Overall assessment**

**Site capacity**

Retain LDP Site

5

### Conclusions

The site is currently allocated for housing within the LDP, with an indicative site capacity of 5 units. All existing allocations were subject to review, as part of the MIR process. The site was allocated as part of the Scottish Borders Consolidated Local Plan 2011 and there has been no planning history on the site to date. The site is currently an enclosed grassed area. A Mini Planning Brief was produced for the site in 2011. Given previous indications that it may not be the landowner's intention to develop the site, a letter was sent out to the landowner requesting whether there is a realistic likelihood of the site being developed.

The joint landowners responded to the letter, confirming that several enquiries regarding a possible sale of the land had been received but that these are currently at a preliminary stage and the owners advised that a development could happen within the next two or three years.

Given this information, it is considered that the site should remain allocated for housing within the LDP. Furthermore, the units are programmed as being effective within the HLA.

---

# Galashiels

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
<b>BGALA005</b>	Easter Langlee Renewable Park	Galashiels	Central	Business and Industrial	N/A	67.8	<b>Excluded</b>

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
1:200	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The majority of this site is outwith both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. However, a small section on the North East point (Avenel Haugh) is at risk of flooding at a 1 in 200 year flood. Also, there are a few small pockets of surface water risk throughout the area highlighted. No major objections on the grounds of flood risk but would require surface water management to be considered for a site this large.

SEPA: Require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Allan Water and small watercourses which flow through the site. Consideration should be given to whether there are any culverted watercourses within/ near the site. Buildings must not be constructed over an existing drain (including a field drain) that is to remain active. Due to the steep topography surrounding the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and the proposed development is not affected by surface runoff.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	E165/92 - Formation of kart track. Approved 10 Aug 1992. Consent never implemented.  The site was considered during the process of the Local Development Plan 2016 for allocation as a renewable park. The following was the conclusion of the site assessment:  The site is physically separated from the town by existing woodland but could be considered for longer term development purposes. Impact on biodiversity is considered to be moderate due to scale but the following should be conserved: trees & hedges, adjacent woodland. There is considerable archaeology within the proposed area and the site is identified as being constrained in the Landscape Capacity Study as it is in a valley which is detached from the settlement; it is separated by a lip of land from the Tweed valley; the proximity of the waste disposal site and the overhead lines which currently fragment the site with wayleaves. The development of this site would require improved road access. The following require detailed investigation: ROW to S, the potentially contaminated land of the waste disposal site to the east, the gas hazard pipelines and their protection zones, electricity pylons.

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

**Access to public transport**

Good

**Access to employment**

Good

**Access to services**

Good

**Wider biodiversity impacts**

Moderate

**Site aspect**

South

**Accessibility and sustainability summary**

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site contains Improved pasture with woodland, trees & hedgerow and a small area of upland ashwood. Potential for EPS (otter and bats) using the site. Potential connectivity with River Tweed SAC (Allan water at edge of site). Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC (Allan water) Protect trees and boundary features and mitigation for protected species including otter, bat, badger, breeding birds.

**Local impact and integration assessment****Conservation area**

Not applicable

**Open space**

Not applicable

**Listed buildings**

Not applicable

**Scheduled Monument**

Not applicable

**Ancient woodland inventory**

Not applicable

**Archaeology**

On/adjacent to site

**Garden and designed landscape**

Not applicable

**Local impact and integration summary**

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: The north-eastern corner of the site contains a known archaeological site of likely prehistoric date and should be avoided. The remainder of the site has archaeological potential and evaluation would be required.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: From a built heritage perspective, there are designations either within or close to this site.

HES: The robust application of national and appropriate local policies should be able to mitigate any potential adverse impacts on heritage assets, and do not have any specific comments to offer. For those sites which are considered to be preferred or reasonable alternatives for allocation in LDP2, the environmental assessment should consider the likely effects and identify site specific mitigation where negative effects are identified.

**Landscape assessment****NSA**

Not applicable

**SLA**

Not applicable

**Over 200 metres?** **Over 12 degree slope** **Wild Land**

Not applicable

**Landscape summary**

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: If site is identified as suitable for business and industrial use a scheme of structure planting will help to mitigate the landscape and visual impacts.

SNH: Placemaking considerations from LDP1 settlement statement: "The area at Easter Langlee Mains is currently not appropriate for longer term development, but can be reconsidered in future Local Development Plan reviews depending on the development of waste disposal and recycling related facilities in the surrounding area. Easter Langlee is identified as a key waste management site for the whole of the Scottish Borders, with the existing landfill and waste management operations. The Council is taking forward the delivery of a waste treatment plant for the region to divert the majority of collected domestic and commercial waste away from landfill. This will result in significantly less waste being disposed of in the existing Easter Langlee Landfill site, subsequently elongating the possible lifespan of the landfill site. This development will also create renewable energy from waste derived fuel, with the possibility of a district heating scheme to provide heat to neighbouring households and businesses." From the examination report: "The proposed site at Easter Langlee would have three phases with the first phase of "ground mounted solar development" which, from the accompanying drawing, appears to comprise photovoltaic panels. The second and third phases would comprise "other appropriate renewable technologies" such as biomass or anaerobic digestion. In principle, Policy ED9 offers encouragement to such proposals. However, the policy is explicit in stating that renewable technologies that require a countryside location will be assessed against the relevant environmental protection policies." This site, due to its location on elevated ground above the existing settlement and existing areas of waste disposal development and in proximity to the Eildon and Leaderfoot National Scenic Area (NSA), could present a range of problems relating to the successful accommodation of the proposal in landscape and visual terms. For example, based on the information provided we highlight our concerns about the potential of the site to successfully accommodate large buildings and gasification or emission stacks. The sensitivity of this site in landscape and visual impact terms is heightened by the close proximity of the site to the NSA. While details of the siting, scale, massing of buildings, and the height of any emissions stacks and plumes that may arise from development are not yet clear, at this stage we

suggest that development of the types proposed could be prominent, leading to a range of adverse impacts experienced from key areas within the NSA. A degree of mitigation may be possible through careful site design, but again there are few details and little or no indication of the broad approach to site development that may be proposed. SNH therefore advise that the potential impacts arising from this proposal are given full and early consideration against the national and local plan policy tests relating to local landscape protection and the National Scenic Area. If this site is to be taken forward as a potentially suitable for the forms of development as set out, SNH would advise that further assessment is undertaken to demonstrate the landscape capacity of this site for the different aspects of development. SNH also suggest that if this site is to be allocated for the uses proposed, that a site development brief should be produced, informed by the landscape capacity work. This brief should guide the different components of the proposed development to the most appropriate areas on the site while also setting out clear requirements for site layout, impact avoidance, impact reduction or mitigation in landscape and visual terms.

Comments from LDP 2016 site assessment: The site is identified as being constrained in the Landscape Capacity Study for the following reasons: it is in a valley which is detached from the settlement; it is separated by a lip of land from the Tweed valley; the proximity of the waste disposal site; the overhead lines which currently fragment the site with wayleaves. The following should have more detailed investigation: the steep slopes in SW & pocket in NW, the electricity pylons. However the study identifies landscape enhancement proposals: woodland to the east of the site to screen it from the waste disposal site, regeneration and reestablishment of hedges with field trees and SUDS to the south east.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Would need to consider impact on existing national speed limit on adjacent C77 Road. Increased vehicle usage on minor road will be contentious locally.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: This land, or at least a southerly portion of it, can be developed, but it will rely on a significant upgrading of the Langshaw road leading to it from the town, and in particular the length past Easter Langlee, in order to achieve a less tortuous road alignment. It should be noted that this will affect land outwith the road boundary and will impact directly on the roadside cottage. The road alignment just north of the top Coopersknowe junction may also need to be realigned. The pedestrian and lighting infrastructure in the Langshaw road will need to be extended out from its current termination. Furthermore, the main distributor road (Hawthorn Road) serving the existing Langlee housing development to the south west will have to be extended to join the Langshaw road in order to achieve proper connectivity and to allow proper integration with the existing street network in the vicinity. Again this would require land that is not currently within the boundary being considered. The section of the Langshaw road adjacent to the site will require upgrading, in terms of carriageway widening and extending the footway and lighting infrastructure out from the town, and the northern part of the road may require realignment in order to facilitate safe access to it. Contributions may also be required towards the provision of a roundabout at the junction of the Langshaw road and Melrose Road. On balance, able to support this site, or at least a southerly portion of it, for development, but aforesaid requirements should be carefully noted and without these improvements the Roads Officer would be unable to support the development of the site. A Transport Assessment will be a prerequisite for any development of this site to address accessibility and sustainable transport.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No comments given the impact on the trunk road network would likely be negligible.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

On site

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site incorporates an existing agricultural/ forestry/ commercial use and is also adjacent to a former landfill. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Create non-vehicular access to the site for workers. Good opportunity to have a non-vehicular route connecting Langlee Woodland to the rights of way leading to Ladhope Forest and Ladhope Recreation Ground.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: It is important that significant new employment allocations are available to facilitate growth associated with the Borders Railway. This is one of the few sites in the Galashiels area that can support economic growth potential. There have been various proposals presented by the owner for this site. Employment uses have been proposed in the past and we were aware a Renewable Energy Park has been promoted as an option. Parts of this site have potential for some employment use, as it is reasonably flat, is separated by woodland from existing housing, and is close to the refuse tip, which could sit comfortably with industrial uses. We think that there is great potential for some employment use here. We consider the whole BGAL005 allocation should be zoned at this stage to ensure a long term supply of employment land. A study needs to be undertaken to allow a better understanding of the potential for the site so identifying areas that may be too difficult or costly to develop, as well as dealing with the high voltage overhead electricity lines.

EDUCATION: No issues raised.

NHS: No comments received.

HEALTH AND SAFETY EXECUTIVE: Would require to consult in the event of the Council supporting the proposal in principle.

HOUSING STRATEGY OFFICER: No comments.

Scottish Water: Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss flow demand for the development and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. A Water Impact Assessment will be required, as well as a Drainage Impact Assessment. This is to determine what impact this development has on the existing network and if any network mitigation is required. Please note there is Scottish Water infrastructure within the site and the Developer should contact Scottish Water to discuss.

SEPA: Two small tribs appear to run adjacent or within the site in the top east corner. These should be protected and enhanced as part of any development. This site is located immediately opposite the E Langlee landfill site (PPC permit), Risk of odour, dust and noise are high plus there is a risk of landfill gas migrating off site. There is also a proposed housing site immediately to the south, AGALA038 which if developed in whole or part may represent a co-location issue. There is also residential housing at Langlee Mains which is just to the west of the proposed development and within Easter Langlee, Coopersknowe and Melrose Gait developments. It is unclear what kind of activities are proposed for the renewables park and therefore it is hard to comment on what impacts such a development would have. Further information would allow more detailed comments to be made.

Comments from LDP 2016 site assessment: The development of this site would require improved road access. The following require detailed investigation: ROW to S, the potentially contaminated land of the waste disposal site to the east, the gas hazard pipelines and their protection zones, the electricity pylons. Further consultation with HSE is required. The site is adjacent to Easter Langlee landfill and may have nuisances as odour, noise, birds, vermin and gas migration. There may be flood risk from small drainage ditch. Bounded to the south by core footpath.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	N/A

### Conclusions

Conclusion from LDP 2016 site assessment: The site is physically separated from the town by existing woodland. Impact on biodiversity is considered to be moderate due to scale but the following should be conserved: trees & hedges, adjacent woodland.

There is considerable archaeology within the north east corner of the site which would require to be avoided. The site is identified as being constrained in the Landscape Capacity Study as it is in a valley which is detached from the settlement; it is separated by a lip of land from the Tweed valley; the proximity of the waste disposal site and the overhead lines which currently fragment the site with wayleaves. The development of this site would require significant improved road access which would require land outwith the control of the applicant but could be considered for longer term development purposes.

The following would require detailed investigation: ROW to S, the potentially contaminated land of the waste disposal site to the east, the gas hazard pipelines and their protection zones, electricity pylons. It is not considered the site should be included within the Proposed LDP.

<b>Site reference</b> BGALA006	<b>Site name</b> Land at Winston Road I	<b>Settlement</b> Galashiels	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Business and Industrial	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> N/A	<b>Ha</b> 2.5	<b>PP status</b> Included
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------	------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Adjacent to site	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The site is not shown to be at flood risk within the SEPA 1 in 200 year flood map. Small areas of the site are anticipated to be affected by surface water runoff and this site is relatively steep so it would be expected that the applicant shows how this would be mitigated.

SEPA: SEPA have post flood survey levels for nearby area after the 2005 flood event. A flood level of 92.86mAOD recorded 30m downstream of bridge on right bank. SEPA require a FRA which assesses the risk from the River Tweed. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Brownfield	<b>Planning history references</b> There are no planning applications of interest. The site was considered through the process of the Housing SG 2017 (RGALA003 & RGALA005) but was excluded.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> South
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	-----------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site consists of sheds/ abattoir and areas of scrub and tall ruderal vegetation. Potential for EPS (bats) and breeding birds to use built structures within the site. Potential connectivity with the adjacent River Tweed SAC/SSSI via drainage. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC. Mitigation for protected species including bats, badger and breeding birds.

SNH: SNH responded and advised the following: From previous response of 03 August 2016, for allocation references RGALA003 and RGALA005: This site is for re-development of an abattoir and a former refuse tip. The proximity of the former refuse tip site (RGALA003) to the River Tweed SAC means that assessment and mitigation of impacts on the SAC will be required. It is not clear what the site requirement "there is moderate biodiversity risk associated with the site which must be given due consideration" refers to. As related site requirements refer to potential for protected species to be present, the supplementary guidance should make clear the need for survey. Further advice on survey is available on our website: <http://www.snh.gov.uk/protecting-scotlands-nature/protected-species/your-responsibilities/developers-and-builders/>.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Adjacent to site

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There are no known archaeological issues.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: Brownfield land in part, appears to have some potential for redevelopment.

HES: No comments.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: No comments received although the following comments were received during the process of the Housing SG which remain relevant:

Fairly level site in elevated location above River Tweed with gently rising ground to N and steep bank down to river on SE side. Site elevation is around 105-110m AOD. Following the closure of the abattoir the site has lain empty and become overgrown. It is 'brownfield' land. To the north of site is Scottish Power Substation and storage yard, with field extending from site boundary up the side of Winston Road and along Melrose Road as far as garage. Line of conifers separating ex-abattoir site from field and storage yard to north. Railway running along base of bank at southern side. Steep partially tree clad bank along east side. Site separated from Winston Rd by line of conifers. 2 attractive deciduous trees in verge to outside of western site boundary. 3/4 mature oak near top of slope down to railway track near SW corner of site and a mature sycamore further to east on same banking. 2 mature sycamores on or just outside SE corner at top of Steeply sloping bank down to Tweed. Trees outside and inside northern boundary adjacent to substation. Overhead HV powerlines on various sizes of pylons overrunning site in SE and SW directions. Attractive views out over Tweed with Eildon Hills beyond. Existing trees have value for birds and invertebrates. Potential for woodland restoration on steep slopes to River Tweed and on slope overlooking railway. (The abattoir has now been demolished from the site).

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Need to consider impact on existing road network, particularly junction of Winston Road and Melrose Road.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comment.

ROADS PLANNING: No objections in principle to the regeneration of this site. There needs to be two public road access points from Winston Road into the site and a strong frontage onto Winston Road is recommended. A footway on the east side of Winston Road from Melrose Road to the road bridge over the railway line will be required and pedestrian crossing points will be needed in Winston Road, the locations of which can be determined through a Transport Assessment for the site.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No comment.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

On site

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site was quarried and subsequently used as a refuse tip. Part of the site was developed as an Abattoir. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Non-vehicular access to existing pavements required.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: To some extent, it is a more comfortable fit to have this site designated for industrial use, given its closest neighbours to north and south and past abattoir use. The same flooding/ecological constraints would apply. Impacts on residents opposite would need accounted for, however, if both land uses are to avoid conflict.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Whilst this is generally an existing employment land site, its redevelopment to modern standards may be economically challenging due to the apparent problems with the site - o/h power lines, potential contamination, demolition costs, remediation of tip, etc. However, if no other employment land can be identified in the town, this may well be an important allocation.

HEALTH AND SAFETY EXECUTIVE: Require to be consulted.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. "Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the Wtw. Note there is a surface water sewer running through the site.

SEPA: Foul must connect to SW foul network. The site is close to the River Tweed however is elevated above river level. Care should be taken not to damage the river banking as part of any development. This site is located immediately adjacent to the Gala STW (CAR and WML licence). Odour is likely to be problematic from the STW. A suitable buffer should be provided in line with SPP requirements between the licensed sites and the proposed development. This is likely to impact the developable area available.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Included	Acceptable	N/A

## Conclusions

Given the former uses which occupied the site, namely an abattoir and refuse site, it is considered that the principle of the use of this site for business and industrial development is acceptable. The residential amenity of the neighbouring residential properties must be considered, however, it is noted that alternative uses to those that existed previously can only offer an improvement. There are limited business and industrial sites in Galashiels and it is considered that this site, albeit with constraints, brings an opportunity forward. It might be possible on the potentially contaminated parts of the site that a use could be implemented that would require minimal groundworks. Given the nature of this proposed allocation and the identified constraints, including O/H powerlines, odour from sewage works, potential contamination, it is not considered that this site is suitable to accommodate an element of housing. Appropriate boundary planting would be required.

A Flood Risk Assessment would be required and there is moderate biodiversity risk. Assessment and mitigation of impact on SAC required. Capacity of the site would depend upon the wayleaves required for OH powerlines and this may take out parts of the site. Environmentally there are few limits although existing trees within the site on the south and near eastern side should be retained to provide setting and minimise impacts on the adjacent River Tweed. A Transport Assessment would be required. Contamination would require to be investigated and mitigated. Underground hazardous pipeline would also require to be considered in consultation with HSE.

<b>Site reference</b> AGALA029	<b>Site name</b> Netherbarns	<b>Settlement</b> Galashiels	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 45	<b>Ha</b> 7.3	<b>PP status</b> Included
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Adjacent to site	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The site is not shown to be at flood risk within the SEPA 1 in 200 year flood map. Small areas of the site are anticipated to be affected by surface water runoff and this site is relatively steep so would expect the applicant to consider this as well as drainage and SUDS.

SEPA: Require an FRA which assesses the risk from the River Tweed. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map and steep topography nearby indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> 04/00706/FUL - Erection of seventy nine dwellinghouse (refused by the Scottish Ministers after they had called it in).  This site was considered during the Local Plan Inquiry 2006 (EGL2B) and at the recent Local Development Plan Examination 2016. The Reporter's recommendation at both was for the site to be removed from the Local Plan/LDP.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> South-west
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Moderate risk – Potential connectivity with River Tweed SAC/SSSI through drainage. Site separated from River Tweed by minor road and disused railway/broad-leaved woodland strip. Mitigation required to ensure no significant adverse effects on integrity of River Tweed SAC. Within site- improved field boundary features of tree line and within site old hedgerow. Protect boundary features, mitigation required e.g. badger and breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site has good access to local services and facilities and employment in the settlement. The settlement is on the A7(T) and A6091(T) and the strategic public transport network.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Adjacent to site

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

Adjacent to site

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There are no known archaeological issues.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: Previously commented on the potential of this site back in 2016. This site lies opposite category A listed Abbotsford House but is screened in part by existing trees along the riverside and the former railway line and is set down below the level of the A7 and more recent housing development. The key issue is to avoid having an adverse impact on the setting of Abbotsford House. There is potentially some scope for limited development on this site, which may require the reinforcement of the planting to the east. Careful attention would be needed to the external colours of any development to minimise its impact.

HES: Setting of LB15104 Abbotsford House and GDL00001 Abbotsford House. Content with the principle of development for 45 units here, on the basis that site development will be brought forward via a masterplan which will ensure that the detail of scale and detailed views analysis, amongst other things, can be considered. HES would wish to be consulted on these details and others as the masterplanning process develops. The Abbotsford Trust have recently commissioned a landscape management plan for the Abbotsford estate. The plan's proposals may involve reopening of historic views from house and estate, which may take in this site. This will also need to be taken into account in the development of the masterplan. HES note that further information has been provided in relation to landscape and visuals since the Housing SG, and recommend that if this site is considered to be a reasonable alternative, these should be made available to inform the Main Issues Report consultation and assessment.

GENERAL COMMENTS: This site was considered in the Local Plan Inquiry and at the recent Local Development Plan Examination. The Garden and Designed Landscape lies to the south east of the site. The Reporters' assessment was that the site should not be developed because of the adverse impact on the setting of the A Listed Abbotsford House and its Garden and Designed Landscape. However, Historic Scotland have now removed their objection to some form of development on the site. The setting of the listed footbridge to the NE of the site and Netherbarns farmhouse, steading and stables to the west of the site should also be taken into consideration.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Adjacent to site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: This site has previously been discounted as suitable for development given its proximity to and potential impact on Abbotsford Designed Landscape which is regarded as of national importance. Potential adverse impacts on views from the DL are a major constraint. However, retention of existing (TPO) tree cover will provide a reasonable degree of mitigation (although not entirely in winter). The Landscape Architect previously stated that 'the most sensitive development scenario would be to restrict new development to the lower SE parts of the site avoiding the higher areas which cannot be effectively screened from the DL, at least until further planting has been established.' The recently submitted Landscape and Visual Appraisal in support of the site being allocated suggests with photomontages that the upper field and part of the lower field of the site are suitable for development, given the screening from the intervening trees. Before allocating the site we should require further visual assessment carried out in the winter months to test the conclusions of the recent appraisal. The supporting information lacks any assessment of the tree resource - a Tree Survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment should be part of the information provided to support the allocation and to establish a realistic 'developable area'. It is clear if this site is allocated the protected trees along the south eastern boundary will be critical in protecting the core area of Abbotsford Designed Landscape from visual intrusion and a long term retention and management programme will have to be an intrinsic part of any such allocation. Any development at this location on the edge of site would have to take into consideration SPG 'Placemaking and Design' to establish the correct built form and density.

On receipt of further photo montages from the Agent, the Landscape Architect made the following comments: The Year 15 photomontages show less visibility of existing and proposed housing than the year 1 photomontages, as additional evergreen tree planting is proposed on site. Any gaps that develop in the existing mature tree screen will open up views to the existing and proposed housing opposite. It will be crucial that:

1. The existing mature tree belt is retained and regenerated.
2. Additional screen tree planting along the SW boundary of the site is additional to the existing tree belt.

SNH: This site lies outwith the current settlement boundary as shown in the LDP. SNH understand that the site was included as an allocation in the Proposed Plan but, in their report of examination, the Reporter recommended its deletion. This recommendation was based partly on landscape impacts. SNH is not aware of a potential solution that should change that decision.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is also visible from the stretches of the A7(T) and the Southern Upland Way immediately adjacent to the site. There is a semi mature/ mature tree belt south of the site and young tree belts in the middle of the site and along the A7 (T). There are also mature trees along the fringe of the site. There is a small hillock in the north west of the site. There are small areas of steep slopes in the SW of the site and along its SE fringe. The impact on the Garden and Designed Landscape is also a constraint on landscape capacity.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: No comments.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: The A7 immediately adjacent to the site has the benefit of: street lighting and a 40mph speed limit; a footway for pedestrians, including a crossing island in the main road; and public transport provision by way of bus lay-bys and shelters. The existing road junction serving Kingsknowe Drive, which would also serve this site, has the benefit of a right turn lane on the A7 to assist with traffic flow on the main road. As such, much of the transport infrastructure required to serve this site is already in place. A Transport Assessment would be required to address any adjustments/upgrades required to accommodate the increase in traffic associated with the site, particularly at the junction with the A7/Kingsknowe Drive. With the A7 being a Trunk Road, Transport Scotland would observe on the impact on the A7, adjacent to and in the proximity of the site, including any speed reducing measures to be addressed. The design of any development would have to take significant cognisance of pedestrians and cyclists including external links with the surrounding infrastructure. All matters considered, supportive of the principle of development on this site from a transport perspective.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: AGALA029/38/39 or 06 – The potential cumulative impact of these 3 housing sites, which total 559 units, or 2 housing sites and a business and industry development, would be required to be determined with appropriate and deliverable mitigation measures identified for the trunk road network.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Adjacent to site

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained largely undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed with the exception of railway running lines along the eastern boundary. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS: Connecting paths to core path 189 (Southern Upland Way) and existing pavements required.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: There are positive elements in the landscape framework/design concept. Sections through the site would be helpful to better understand topographical relationships, particularly the lower area of housing which may appear somewhat detached from the higher section. I would query the value/purpose of the open space that would remain (it appears more left over than an integral space within the residential development, and perhaps may benefit from more substantial woodland creation). I would also query the capacity to develop what remains and still provide the level of tree protection and new tree cover. There is also potentially a general lack of connectivity within the development that the linear form of layout would lead to. I would also voice concern that PD rights be removed from the development, which would be akin to applying a Conservation Area level of regulation which I would suggest would be unnecessary. If the layout has the right landscape containment; is of appropriate scale, form, palette; and based on public fronts/private backs and designing streets concepts, then this additional tier of control should not be necessary, or at least should be minimised. Overall, a well-designed development, with good levels of landscaping at its heart, can be devised, but I think the current proposals here will require more detailed scrutiny and further thought.

EDUCATION: Extension or new school may need to be considered.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Included	Acceptable	45

### Conclusions

This site has a detailed planning history and has previously been removed from the LDP following Examination by Reporters. This has primarily been in relation to perceived detrimental impacts upon the setting and views from Abbotsford House. When considering sites which have been submitted via the call for sites process, which have a detailed planning history, consideration must be given as to any proposed new mitigation matters which have been submitted as part of the proposal. In this instance the plans confirm further screening of the site would be carried out and there is an amended indicative layout which seeks to ensure any house positions would be kept away from any alleged sensitive parts of the site when viewed from Abbotsford House. These proposals confirm the site will not be visible from Abbotsford House during the Summer months and in the Winter months (when Abbotsford House is closed to the public) photomontages have shown that only fleeting views of very small parts of the site could be seen, but proposed housing (i.e. this would be a low density development of 45 units) would not be located within these visible locations. The site is well screened from the A7 and does not interfere at all with any views towards Abbotsford House. The Blueprint for the Railway requires the Council to maximise economic benefits along the railway corridor and finding housing land in Galashiels is a major element of that requirement. Finding housing land in Galashiels is a major challenge given a number of constraints within the town in terms of for example access, flood risk and topography. Officers feel this site remains the best option for new development in the town. It is fully acknowledged that Abbotsford House will continue to have a key role in attracting tourists to the central Scottish Borders and any proposal which is considered to prejudice this position must be thoroughly investigated. However, it is considered any impacts from Abbotsford House will be negligible and the proposal can be incorporated within the Proposed LDP.

---

<b>Site reference</b> <b>AGALA038</b>	<b>Site name</b> Easter Langlee Mains II	<b>Settlement</b> Galashiels	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 400	<b>Ha</b> 24.5	<b>PP status</b> <b>Excluded</b>
------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is outwith both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. No objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. Due to the size of the development it is recommended that surface water runoff be considered. A Drainage Impact Assessment/SUDS would be required.

SEPA: Small watercourse adjacent to site but topography indicates they will flow away from the site. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map and steep topography nearby indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no planning application history for this site. The site (with varying boundaries) has been considered in the past, more recently through the LDP 2016 and the Housing SG 2017.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response received. It is therefore assumed that there would be a minor biodiversity impact.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Not applicable	<b>Open space</b> Not applicable	<b>Listed buildings</b> Not applicable	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> On site	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> On site
--------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There is a known enclosure of unknown date within the site. This is potentially prehistoric. There is also a general potential within the site given discoveries in the wider area. Archaeological evaluation will be needed, and preservation in situ of the known enclosure is preferred.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: No comments.

HES: No comments.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: No comments received.

SNH: No comments received.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Major development on edge of town. Existing local concerns with main access road. Improvements likely to be required. Will extend existing 30 mph limit.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Bus stop infrastructure and contribution towards provision of bus service.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: This land can be developed, but it will rely on a significant upgrading of the Langshaw road leading to it from the town, and in particular the length past Easter Langlee, in order to achieve a less tortuous road alignment. It should be noted that this will affect land outwith the road boundary and will impact directly on the roadside cottage. The road alignment just north of the top Coopersknowe junction may also need to be realigned. The pedestrian and lighting infrastructure in the Langshaw road will need to be extended out from the town. Furthermore, the main distributor road (Hawthorn Road) serving the existing Langlee housing development to the south west will have to be extended to join the Langshaw road in order to achieve proper connectivity and to allow proper integration with the existing street network in the vicinity. Again this would require land that is not currently within the boundary being considered. The section of the Langshaw road adjacent to the site will require upgrading, in terms of carriageway widening and extending the footway and lighting infrastructure out from the town, and the northern part of the road may require realignment in order to facilitate safe access to it. Contributions may also be required towards the provision of a roundabout at the junction of the Langshaw road and Melrose Road. On balance, able to support this site for development, but the aforesaid requirements should be carefully noted and without these improvements Roads Planning would be unable to support the development of the site. A Transport Assessment will be a prerequisite for any development of this site to address accessibility and sustainable transport.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: AGALA029 / 38 / 39 or 06 – The potential cumulative impact of these 3 housing sites, which total 559 units, or 2 housing sites and a business and industry development, would be required to be determined with appropriate and deliverable mitigation measures identified for the trunk road network.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

On site

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained largely undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed with the exception of railway running lines along the eastern boundary. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Connecting paths to core path 19 (Langlee Woodland) required and upgrade of cp19 where it connects down to Melrose Road.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: The landfill's closure will reduce potential conflict with this site from the waste activities, though account will need to be had for the remaining uses - the aggregate recycling

site in particular. The other key issue with this site will be access and it is suggested that the merits of the access proposals be principally considered by the Roads Planning Service. Other constraints, including pipelines, will need consideration by the relevant consultees, and overhead lines will have to be accounted for by developers. Would prefer to know more about the potential wider landscape fit of development here and how it would relate to the overall town, particularly to guide the extent of development where it spreads west into rising ground.

EDUCATION OFFICER: Extension or new school may need to be considered.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. There are existing water mains running through the site. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. There is existing sewer infrastructure running through site. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SEPA: Recommend the site is not allocated due to co-location issues. This is because this site is located immediately opposite the Easter Langlee landfill site (PPC permit), Community recycling centre (WML), aggregates recycling yard (Exempt site) and newly approved waste transfer station (WML). Risk of odour, dust and noise are high plus there is a risk of landfill gas migrating off site. This site as submitted is unsuitable for development and we recommend it is removed from the plan. This site is located immediately opposite the E Langlee landfill site (PPC permit), Community recycling centre (WML), aggregates recycling yard (Exempt site) and newly approved waste transfer station (WML). Risk of odour, dust and noise are high plus there is a risk of landfill gas migrating off site. This site as submitted is unsuitable for development and we recommend it is removed from the plan.

HEALTH AND SAFETY EXECUTIVE: Need to consult re hazardous pipeline should this site be pursued further.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	400

### Conclusions

The site was considered through the process of the Housing SG. An initial stage 1 RAG assessment was undertaken, however this concluded that the site should not be taken forward as part of the Housing SG. The conclusion of the assessment was as follows:

This site is located outwith the settlement boundary and is separated from nearby housing by a mature shelter belt. The site is constrained by the detachment from Galashiels, compounded by distance from the town centre and the barrier created by the 'lip' of land which separates the area from the Tweed Valley. The site has good access to services and facilities and is served by an acceptable level of public transport including the proposed Borders Railway. The potential impact on biodiversity is minor. The section of the Langshaw road adjacent to the site will require upgrading, in terms of carriageway widening and extending the footway and lighting infrastructure out from the town, and the northern part of the road may require realignment in order to facilitate safe access to it. A major hazard pipeline runs through the site and the Easter Langlee landfill site is located immediately to the east of the site. It is considered that other, more appropriate sites are available within the housing market area to meet the shortfall. This site would not represent a logical extension of the built up area as it would extend the settlement beyond an existing mature shelter belt to the north of Coopersknowe. This would prejudice the character and natural built up edge of the settlement to the detriment of the landscape setting. Furthermore, the proximity of the site to the existing landfill site would be contrary to prevailing national policy leading to unacceptable adverse impacts on the residential amenity of the proposed dwellings as result of noise and odour nuisance from the adjacent landfill site.

The southern part of this site was considered for housing as part of the Local Development Plan Examination (LDP 2016), the Reporter made the following comments in relation to housing site (AGALA030): "Approaching the site from the north, the land to the west of the road has a pleasant countryside appearance and the crest of the hill provides a distinct entrance to Galashiels. The construction of the houses, as proposed, would have a marked visual impact and severely detract from the local importance of this land within the landscape setting of the town. Whilst the proposed community allotments would be unlikely to have a significant impact, the construction of even a small number of houses at this location would not be acceptable in either visual or landscape character terms. Irrespective of the location of the site within the landscape, the proximity of the Easter Langlee landfill operation is a practical concern. The distance between the proposed residential development and the landfill site would be less than 100 metres. Noting the guidance in Scottish Planning Policy I agree with the council that this would not be acceptable".

Since the aforesaid proposals were considered, it is now established that the landfill site will be capped in the near future. Despite this, the Waste Manager of SBC would remain concerned by any proposed housing within close proximity of the landfill site due to potential leakage. The additional overriding issue with any development of this site is that Langshaw Road would require significant upgrading

involving land outwith the control of the applicant.

Due to the aforementioned reasons it is not therefore considered appropriate to allocate this site for housing within the Proposed LDP.

---

<b>Site reference</b> AGALA039	<b>Site name</b> Land at Winston Road	<b>Settlement</b> Galashiels	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 114	<b>Ha</b> 2.5	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	------------------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Adjacent to site	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The site is not shown to be at flood risk within the SEPA 1 in 200 year flood map. Small areas of the site are anticipated to be affected by surface water runoff and this site is relatively steep so the applicant would be expected to show how this would be mitigated. Drainage Impact Assessment and SUDS would be required.

SEPA: Require an FRA which assesses the risk from the River Tweed. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Brownfield	<b>Planning history references</b> There are no planning applications of interest. The eastern part of the site, adjacent to the River Tweed, is allocated within the LDP 2016 as a redevelopment site. The proposed site was previously considered through the process of the Housing SG 2017 (RGALA005).
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> South
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	-----------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response received although the following response was received during the process of the Housing SG 2017 and remains relevant: Moderate risk - existing built structures (textile mill) have potential to support protected species such as bats (EPS) and breeding birds. Open ground and area of trees and scrub may support protected species e.g. badger and breeding birds. Small part of site within flood plain of River Tweed SAC/SSSI (SEPA 1 in 200year fluvial flood risk).

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Not applicable	<b>Open space</b> Not applicable	<b>Listed buildings</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> Not applicable	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> Not applicable
--------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

## Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There are no known archaeological issues.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: No comments.

HES: No comments.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: No response received although the comments made during the process of the Housing SG for this site which remain relevant:

Fairly level site in elevated location above River Tweed with gently rising ground to N and steep bank down to river on SE side. Site elevation is around 105-110m AOD. Following the closure of the abattoir the site has lain empty and become overgrown. It is 'brownfield' land. To the north of site is Scottish Power Substation and storage yard, with field extending from site boundary up the side of Winston Road and along Melrose Road as far as garage. Line of conifers separating ex-abattoir site from field and storage yard to north. Railway running along base of bank at southern side. Steep partially tree clad bank along east side. Site separated from Winston Rd by line of conifers. 2 attractive deciduous trees in verge to outside of western site boundary. 3/4 mature oak near top of slope down to railway track near SW corner of site and a mature sycamore further to east on same banking. 2 mature sycamores on or just outside SE corner at top of steeply sloping bank down to Tweed. Trees outside and inside northern boundary adjacent to substation. Overhead HV powerlines on various sizes of pylons overrunning site in SE and SW directions. Attractive views out over Tweed with Eildon Hills beyond. Existing trees have value for birds and invertebrates. Potential for woodland restoration on steep slopes to River Tweed and on slope overlooking railway.

SNH: From our response of 03 August 2016, for allocation references RGALA003 and RGALA005:

This site is for re-development of an abattoir and a former refuse tip. The proximity of the former refuse tip site (RGALA003) to the River Tweed SAC means that assessment and mitigation of impacts on the SAC will be required. It is not clear what the site requirement "there is moderate biodiversity risk associated with the site which must be given due consideration" refers to. As related site requirements refer to potential for protected species to be present, the supplementary guidance should make clear the need for survey. Further advice on survey is available on our website: <http://www.snh.gov.uk/protecting-scotlands-nature/protected-species/your-responsibilities/developers-and-builders/>.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Need to consider impact on existing road network, particularly junction of Winston Road and Melrose Road.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Possible bus shelter required on Winston Road.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: No objections in principle to the regeneration of this site. There needs to be two public road access points from Winston Road into the site, and internally a connected street layout is required. A strong street frontage onto Winston Road is recommended. A footway on the east side of Winston Road from Melrose Road to the road bridge over the railway line will be required and pedestrian crossing points will be needed in Winston Road, the locations of which can be determined through a Transport Assessment for the site.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: AGALA029 / 38 / 39 or 06 – The potential cumulative impact of these 3 housing sites, which total 559 units, or 2 housing sites and a business and industry development, would be required to be determined with appropriate and deliverable mitigation measures identified for the trunk road network.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

On site

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Good

---

Central HMA

Galashiels

AGALA039

## Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site was quarried and subsequently used as a refuse tip. Part of the site was developed as an Abattoir. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Connecting paths to core path 189 (Southern Upland Way) and existing pavement leading south to this core path.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Suggest it's a suitable housing site for a well-designed scheme, but the main issues will be relationships with the power station, railway line and sewage works. These all hold potential risks to the amenity of future residents. Impacts on trees to the east, the SAC/SSSI and potential flood risk would need accounted for.

EDUCATION: No objections.

HEALTH AND SAFETY EXECUTIVE: Require to consult should this proposal be pursued further by means of a planning application. A preliminary consultation with HSE established that HSE would not advise against the proposal. This was based on the understanding that any building would be less than 3-storeys and that there would be no more than 100 people employed on the site.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. Please note there is a Surface water sewer running through site. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SEPA: This site is located immediately adjacent to the Gala STW (CAR and WML licence). Odour is likely to be problematic from the STW. A suitable buffer should be provided in line with SPP requirements between the licensed sites and the proposed development. This is likely to impact the developable area available.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Doubtful	114

### Conclusions

The location of the site is acceptable in principle for residential development. However, a key issue is potential conflict with adjacent uses. These include the substation site (noise, vibration, overhead lines), sewage works (odours), railway line (noise/vibration) and an exclusion zone with gas pipeline running within the eastern boundary of the site. A Flood Risk Assessment would be required by SEPA. There is moderate biodiversity risk. Assessment and mitigation of impact on SAC required. Capacity of the site would depend upon the wayleaves required for OH powerlines and this may take out parts of the site. Environmentally there are few limits although existing trees within the site on the south and near eastern side should be retained to provide setting and minimise impacts on River Tweed adjoining. A Transport Assessment would be required. Contamination would require to be investigated and mitigated. It is considered that for the aforesaid conflicts, this is not a desirable location for residential development. It is therefore concluded that the site should be excluded from the Proposed LDP.

<b>Site reference</b> <b>AGALA040</b>	<b>Site name</b> Land to North of Wood Street	<b>Settlement</b> Galashiels	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 30	<b>Ha</b> 1.0	<b>PP status</b> <b>Excluded</b>
------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Adjacent to site	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

Flood Risk and Coastal Management: This site does not lie within the SEPA 1 in 200 year fluvial (river) flood extent. There is a very small pocket of potential surface water impact shown on the North Western side of the site at a 1 in 200 year pluvial flood event. This risk is not expected to cause a significant issue and would not object to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. However, the applicant would be asked to consider surface water runoff issues on site and ensure no properties are at risk of this type of flooding.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency: Based on OS Map and LiDAR there is sufficient height difference between site and Gala Water. Consideration could be given to providing a buffer between the development and the Gala Water to mitigate the residual fluvial flood risk. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at an increased risk of flooding. There is a surface water hazard at the site and water environment issues.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b>
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Major	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

Ecology Officer: Biodiversity Risk: High impact. Site appears to be mature broad-leaved woodland (lowland mixed deciduous) part of which is Ancient woodland (Long-established of plantation origin). Recent record of a locally scarce plan (Common twayblade *Neottia ovata*) within woodland. Old record of red squirrel. Potential impacts on EPS (bats and otter), badger and breeding birds. Site is adjacent to the Gala water, potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC. Compensatory replanting plan would be required in accordance with Policy EP13 Unsuitable location for a housing site.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Not applicable	<b>Open space</b> Not applicable	<b>Listed buildings</b> Not applicable	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> On/adjacent to site	<b>Archaeology</b> On site	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> On/adjacent to site
--------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------

## Local impact and integration summary

Archaeology Officer: Section of Catrail may run through the site. Evaluation required.

Heritage & Design Officer: No specific H&D issues, but note that the former railway line to Peebles will need to be safeguarded and that consideration will be need to be given to the implication of a housing development adjacent to the active railway line.

Scottish Natural Heritage: From a brief appraisal of this site, SHN consider it challenging. Housing would be out of line with the main frontage of existing housing and it appears likely that 75 units would be an overdevelopment of this location. Due to the proximity of the railway line and the site's location between the line and existing housing, we consider it likely that there could be difficulties with establishing permeability and access. This includes the existing path that runs through the site, providing a quiet link between the west of the town and the town centre. If allocated, retention of mature trees and pedestrian access should be considered as part of the concept. Would require HRA due to proximity to River Tweed SAC at north-western edge of site.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

Landscape Architect: No response received.

The western part of the site is constrained within the Landscape Capacity Study: Development within the 'Policies' is severely constrained by the quality and character of the landscape, which occupies a strategically significant location at the head of the valley and is enriched by widespread historic sites. The golf course also limits development, as does flooding on low lying haughs. In addition, the area is detached and physically distant from the settlement, separation which is reinforced by roads, the river and the railway.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Passenger Transport: No objections.

Near a trunk road?

Roads Planning: Would not be able to support this site for housing. The topography of the area is such that it is unlikely that a satisfactory access road could be achieved due to gradients. Furthermore the site straddles the pedestrian/cycleway between Galashiels and Clovenfords. The required visibility at the junction with Wood Street would be compromised by existing on-street parking and road geometry. Moreover, development of this site would offer little in the way of integration and street connectivity with its surroundings which is at odds with the Government Policy Statement 'Designing Streets'. If the loss of trees is considered acceptable, I may be able to support a level of development similar to the existing properties to the south east i.e. a strip of roadside development at the top of the site with appropriate on-street parking provision. This arrangement could extend in a north westerly direction outwith the site. If this site was to be allocated then a Transport Statement may be required in due course depending on the sale of development.

Network Management: New access onto A72 but within existing 30 mph.

### Right of way

On/adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

On site

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

Contaminated Land Officer: The site appears to have operated as railway running lines possibly including an element of site re-profiling. The site is brownfield land and its use may present development constraints.

Countryside Ranger: This site sits over the multi-use path from Galashiels to Clovenfords and we would object to building in this area.

Development Management: Development here would substantially affect woodland that provides landscape containment, and a buffer between houses and the railway line. Ecological impacts would need examined too. It is expected there will be topographical challenges to developing here and those, as well as the layout of the site boundaries, gives me concern as to quite how housing could be sympathetically developed here, in a manner that makes it an organic addition to the settlement. There is also a right of way that would be affected. Even if the route is retained, its character would be seriously altered. Development would also be close to the railway line itself, so potential issues of noise and vibration would need addressed. Overall, my impression is that this site will prove significantly challenging in terms of fitting any development into the landscape and linking it with the existing townscape.

Economic Development: No objections.

Education: No objections.

Housing Strategy: No objections.

Scottish Water: There is limited capacity at the Wastewater Treatment Works. A growth project has started at the Water Works, this site is not part of the calculation. There is sufficient capacity at the Manse Street Water Treatment Works.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency: This site is within the Scottish Water foul sewer network and as such foul drainage must connect to the foul sewer.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	30

## Conclusions

There are a number of constraints identified with the development of this site, which are highlighted below:

- There is high impact biodiversity risk associated with the site given the mature broad-leaved woodland part of which is Ancient woodland.
- The site encroaches into mature woodland. The existing mature woodland acts as a mature and well established boundary to the settlement at this location. The removal of mature trees in order to facilitate development is not encouraged.
- Wood Street is characterised by properties extending along the street frontage. Any development at this location would constitute backland development, out of character with adjacent properties.
- The Roads Officer objects to the proposal. The site is unacceptable for reasons of topography, interference with multi-use path, insufficient visibility at access, little integration with street

For the aforesaid reasons, it is not considered that this site is suitable for housing development.

---

<b>Site reference</b> EGL17B	<b>Site name</b> Buckholm Corner	<b>Settlement</b> Galashiels	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 60	<b>Ha</b> 4.4	<b>PP status</b> Retain LDP Site
---------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------

---

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b>	<b>SAC</b>	<b>SPA</b>	<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
------------------	------------	------------	-------------	---------------

### Initial assessment summary

This is an existing housing allocation within the LDP, which was subject to a review as part of the MIR process.

---

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b>	<b>Planning history references</b>
--------------------------	------------	--------------------------------------------	----------------------	------------------------------------

---

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b>	<b>Access to employment</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b>	<b>Site aspect</b>
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
--------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------------------	--------------------	------------------------------------------

### Local impact and integration summary

---

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
------------	------------	--------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	------------------

### Landscape summary

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

Right of way

TPOs

Contaminated land

Water supply

Sewerage

Gas Supply

Education provision

Planning & infrastructure summary

---

## Overall assessment

**PP status**

**Overall assessment**

**Site capacity**

Retain LDP Site

60

### Conclusions

The site is currently allocated for housing within the LDP, with an indicative site capacity of 60 units. All existing allocations were subject to review, as part of the MIR process. The site was allocated for housing within the Ettrick and Lauderdale Local Plan 1995 up to the Local Development Plan 2016. Given the length of time the site has been allocated and the fact there is no history of planning applications on the site, a letter was sent to the landowner requesting whether there is a realistic likelihood of the site being developed.

A response was received from DM Hall on behalf of Thomson Cooper who are the administrators appointed to act on behalf of Murray & Burrell Ltd who are now in administration. DM Hall are currently marketing the site for housing and note that this is a good housing site located within a sustainable location and therefore strongly believe that they can deliver housing in the not too distant future and therefore seek the Council's support in continuing the allocation of the site for housing development in the next LDP.

It is acknowledged that there has been no recent interest in the housing allocation, however, the housing market has been particularly slow since the recession.

Given this information, it is considered that the site should remain allocated for housing within the LDP.

---

<b>Site reference</b> EGL200	<b>Site name</b> North Ryehaugh	<b>Settlement</b> Galashiels	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 20	<b>Ha</b> 1.7	<b>PP status</b> Retain LDP Site
---------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------

---

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b>	<b>SAC</b>	<b>SPA</b>	<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
------------------	------------	------------	-------------	---------------

### Initial assessment summary

This is an existing housing allocation within the LDP, which was subject to a review as part of the MIR process.

---

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b>	<b>Planning history references</b>
--------------------------	------------	--------------------------------------------	----------------------	------------------------------------

---

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b>	<b>Access to employment</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b>	<b>Site aspect</b>
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
--------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------------------	--------------------	------------------------------------------

### Local impact and integration summary

---

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
------------	------------	--------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	------------------

### Landscape summary

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

Right of way

TPOs

Contaminated land

Water supply

Sewerage

Gas Supply

Education provision

Planning & infrastructure summary

---

## Overall assessment

**PP status**

**Overall assessment**

**Site capacity**

Retain LDP Site

20

### Conclusions

The site is currently allocated for housing within the LDP, with an indicative site capacity of 20 units. All existing allocations were subject to review, as part of the MIR process. The site was allocated for housing within the Scottish Borders Local Plan 2008 up to the Local Development Plan 2016. Given the length of time the site has been allocated and the fact there is no history of planning applications on the site, a letter was sent to the landowner requesting whether there is a realistic likelihood of the site being developed.

A response was received from DM Hall on behalf of Thomson Cooper who are the administrators appointed to act on behalf of Murray & Burrell Ltd who are now in administration. DM Hall are currently marketing the site for housing and note that this is a good housing site located within a sustainable location and therefore strongly believe that they can deliver housing in the not too distant future and therefore seek the Council's support in continuing the allocation of the site for housing development in the next LDP.

It is acknowledged that there has been no recent interest in the housing allocation, however, the housing market has been particularly slow since the recession.

Given this information, it is considered that the site should remain allocated for housing within the LDP.

---

<b>Site reference</b> EGL32B	<b>Site name</b> Ryehaugh	<b>Settlement</b> Galashiels	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 10	<b>Ha</b> 2.6	<b>PP status</b> Retain LDP Site
---------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------

---

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b>	<b>SAC</b>	<b>SPA</b>	<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
------------------	------------	------------	-------------	---------------

### Initial assessment summary

This is an existing housing allocation within the LDP, which was subject to a review as part of the MIR process.

---

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b>	<b>Planning history references</b>
--------------------------	------------	--------------------------------------------	----------------------	------------------------------------

---

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b>	<b>Access to employment</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b>	<b>Site aspect</b>
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
--------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------------------	--------------------	------------------------------------------

### Local impact and integration summary

---

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
------------	------------	--------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	------------------

### Landscape summary

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

Right of way

TPOs

Contaminated land

Water supply

Sewerage

Gas Supply

Education provision

Planning & infrastructure summary

---

## Overall assessment

**PP status**

**Overall assessment**

**Site capacity**

Retain LDP Site

10

### Conclusions

The site is currently allocated for housing within the LDP, with an indicative capacity of 10 units. All existing allocations were subject to review, as part of the MIR process. The site has been allocated for housing since at least the Ettrick and Lauderdale Local Plan 1996 and there has been no planning history on the site to date.

Torwoodlee and Buckholm Estates Company Ltd own the site and have indicated that the site is currently being marketed and it is anticipated that the recent return of the railway will generate more interest in the site. This is a medium term anticipation.

It is acknowledged that there has been no recent interest in the housing allocation, however, the housing market has been particularly slow since the recession.

Given this information from the landowner, it is considered that the site should remain allocated for housing within the LDP.

---

<b>Site reference</b> EGL41	<b>Site name</b> Buckholm North	<b>Settlement</b> Galashiels	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 180	<b>Ha</b> 8.7	<b>PP status</b> Retain LDP Site
--------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------

## Initial assessment

**Floodrisk**      **SAC**      **SPA**      **SSSI**      **Ramsar**

### Initial assessment summary

This is an existing housing allocation within the LDP, which was subject to a review as part of the MIR process.

## Background information

**Minerals and coal**    **NNR**      **Prime Quality Agricultural Land**    **Current use/s**    **Planning history references**

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

**Access to public transport**      **Access to employment**      **Access to services**      **Wider biodiversity impacts**      **Site aspect**

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

## Local impact and integration assessment

**Conservation area**    **Open space**    **Listed buildings**    **Scheduled Monument**    **Ancient woodland inventory**    **Archaeology**    **Garden and designed landscape**

### Local impact and integration summary

## Landscape assessment

**NSA**      **SLA**      **Over 200 metres?**       **Over 12 degree slope**       **Wild Land**

### Landscape summary

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

Right of way

TPOs

Contaminated land

Water supply

Sewerage

Gas Supply

Education provision

Planning & infrastructure summary

---

## Overall assessment

**PP status**

**Overall assessment**

**Site capacity**

Retain LDP Site

180

### Conclusions

The site is currently allocated for housing within the LDP, with an indicative capacity of 180 units. All existing allocations were subject to review, as part of the MIR process. The site has been allocated for housing since the Scottish Borders Local Plan 2008 and there has been no planning history on the site to date. Given the length of time the site has been allocated, a letter was sent out to the landowner requesting whether there is a realistic likelihood of the site being developed.

Torwoodlee and Buckholm Estates Company Ltd own the site and have indicated that the site is currently being marketed and it is anticipated that the recent return of the railway will generate more interest in the site. This is a medium term anticipation.

It is acknowledged that there has been no recent interest in the housing allocation, however, the housing market has been particularly slow since the recession.

Given this information from the landowner, it is considered that the site should remain allocated for housing within the LDP.

---

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
MGALA007	Easter Langlee III	Galashiels	Central	Mixed Use	450	70.8	Excluded

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
1:200	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD RISK AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT (SBC): The majority of this site does not lie within the SEPA 1 in 200 year flood risk extent. There is a small section next to the Allan Water on the East of the site that does appear to be at risk during the 1 in 200 year flood event. There are issues/ditches shown throughout the site, therefore require that surface water management is assessed on site and submitted to the Council.

SCOTTISH ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AGENCY: Require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Allan Water and small watercourses which flow through the site. Consideration should be given to any culverts/bridges might may exacerbate flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map and steep slopes indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Combination	<p>05/00891/OUT - Erection of offices and welfare accommodation to service meat processing facility (Approved)</p> <p>05/02107/FUL - Part change of use and alterations to form meat processing facility and erection of welfare and office accommodation (Approved)</p> <p>10/00249/FUL - Change of use of land to form temporary construction base, siting of 4 No storage containers, 7 No office units and 1 no security office, and erection of temporary heras boundary fencing (Approved)</p> <p>15/01451/FUL - Extensions to form 2 No storage units (retrospective) and 7 No storage units and erection of wood storage building (Refused)</p> <p>14/01223/SCR - Installation of 19MWp solar farm (Screening/Scoping Opinion Issued)</p> <p>15/00369/SCR - Installation of 4 no. solar farms with capacity up to 20MWp (Screening Opinion Issued)</p> <p>16/00356/FUL - Extension to existing agricultural building (retrospective), change of use of agricultural building and extension to form forestry contractor business premises and erection of timber storage building (Approved)</p> <p>17/00199/FUL - Change of use of land to commercial storage and siting of 40 No additional storage containers (Approved)</p> <p>19/00839/FUL - Change of use to commercial storage and siting of 42 no storage containers on area A (16/00397/FUL) and change of use of land to commercial storage and siting of 40 No additional storage containers on area B (17/00199/FUL) (Approved)</p>

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

**Access to public transport**

Good

**Access to employment**

Good

**Access to services**

Good

**Wider biodiversity impacts**

Moderate

**Site aspect**

South

**Accessibility and sustainability summary**

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Although no response has been received from this consultation, the following response was received for BGALA005: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site contains Improved pasture with woodland, trees & hedgerow and a small area of upland ashwood. Potential for EPS (otter and bats) using the site. Potential connectivity with River Tweed SAC (Allan water at edge of site). Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC (Allan water) Protect trees and boundary features and mitigation for protected species including otter, bat, badger, breeding birds.

**Local impact and integration assessment****Conservation area**

Not applicable

**Open space**

Not applicable

**Listed buildings**

Not applicable

**Scheduled Monument**

Not applicable

**Ancient woodland inventory**

Adjacent to site

**Archaeology**

On site

**Garden and designed landscape**

On/adjacent to site

**Local impact and integration summary**

Archaeology Officer: Known archaeology within the site that may need to be avoided by design. Evaluation will be required.

Contaminated Land Officer: The site appears to have housed an agricultural steading and is adjacent to former and current landfills. A portion of the site is brownfield land and its location relative to landfill sites may present development constraints.

Heritage & Design Officer: No specific heritage and design issues.

Historic Environment Scotland: No objections.

**Landscape assessment****NSA**

Not applicable

**SLA**

Not applicable

**Over 200 metres?** **Over 12 degree slope** **Wild Land**

Not applicable

**Landscape summary**

Landscape Architect: No response received.

Scottish Natural Heritage: From response of 15 March 2018:

“Placemaking considerations from LDP1 settlement statement: “The area at Easter Langlee Mains is currently not appropriate for longer term development, but can be reconsidered in future Local Development Plan reviews depending on the development of waste disposal and recycling related facilities in the surrounding area. Easter Langlee is identified as a key waste management site for the whole of the Scottish Borders, with the existing landfill and waste management operations. The Council is taking forward the delivery of a waste treatment plant for the region to divert the majority of collected domestic and commercial waste away from landfill. This will result in significantly less waste being disposed of in the existing Easter Langlee Landfill site, subsequently elongating the possible lifespan of the landfill site. This development will also create renewable energy from waste derived fuel, with the possibility of a district heating scheme to provide heat to neighbouring households and businesses.”

From the examination report: “The proposed site at Easter Langlee would have three phases with the first phase of “ground mounted solar development” which, from the accompanying drawing, appears to comprise photovoltaic panels. The second and third phases would comprise “other appropriate renewable technologies” such as biomass or anaerobic digestion. In principle, Policy ED9 offers encouragement to such proposals. However, the policy is explicit in stating that renewable technologies that require a countryside location will be assessed against the relevant environmental protection policies.”

This site, due to its location on elevated ground above the existing settlement and existing areas of waste disposal development and in proximity to the Eildon and Leaderfoot National Scenic Area (NSA), could present a range of problems relating to the successful accommodation of the proposal in landscape and visual terms. For example, based on the information provided SNH highlight their concerns about the potential of the site to successfully accommodate large buildings and gasification or emission stacks

The sensitivity of this site in landscape and visual impact terms is heightened by the close proximity of the site to the NSA. While details of the siting, scale, massing of buildings, and the height of any emissions stacks and plumes that may arise from development are not yet clear, at this stage SNH suggest that development of the types proposed could be prominent, leading to a range of adverse impacts experienced from key areas within the NSA. A degree of mitigation may be possible through careful site design, but again there are few details and little or no indication of the broad approach to site development that may be proposed.

SNH therefore advise that the potential impacts arising from this proposal are given full and early consideration against the national and local plan policy tests relating to local landscape protection and the National Scenic Area.

If this site is to be taken forward as a potentially suitable for the forms of development as set out, SNH would advise that further assessment is undertaken to demonstrate the landscape capacity of this site for the different aspects of development.

SNH also suggest that if this site is to be allocated for the uses proposed, that a site development brief should be produced, informed by the landscape capacity work. This brief should guide the different components of the proposed development to the most appropriate areas on the site while also setting out clear requirements for site layout, impact avoidance, impact reduction or mitigation in landscape and visual terms."

LANDSCAPE CAPACITY STUDY: Development within the 'Undulating Valley Floor' is constrained by the detachment from Galashiels, compounded by distance from the town centre and the barrier created by the 'lip' of land which separates the area from the Tweed valley. Settlement expansion here is further constrained by the impacts associated with traffic noise and activity associated with the waste disposal sites and overhead lines.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

Network Management: Major development on edge of town. Existing local concerns with main access road. Improvements likely to be required. Will extend existing 30 mph limit.

Passenger Transport: Section 75 contribution required to extend bus services beyond Melrose Gait. Bus turning area to be incorporated into road layout. Bus stop infrastructure required.

Roads Planning: This land, or more realistically a southerly portion of it, can be developed for mixed use, but before being able to offer my support I will need confirmation that my following points can be satisfactorily addressed:

Development of this land, or at least a southerly portion of it, will rely on a significant upgrading of the Langshaw road (C77) in the vicinity of the pinch-point at the roadside cottages at Easter Langlee in order to achieve: a less tortuous road alignment, increased carriageway width, and appropriate provision for pedestrians. It should be noted that this will affect land outwith the road boundary and will impact directly on the roadside cottage. The road alignment just north of the top Coopersknowe junction may also need to be improved.

Depending on the scale of development Improvements may also be required on the C77 northwards towards Lauder as there will inevitably be an increase in the traffic heading north to the A68. The pedestrian and lighting infrastructure in the C77 will need to be extended out from their current termination. Furthermore, the main distributor road (Hawthorn Road) serving the existing Langlee housing development to the south west will have to be extended to join the C77 in order to achieve proper connectivity and to allow proper integration with the existing street network in the vicinity. Again this will require land that is not currently within the site boundary. The section of the C77 adjacent to the site will require upgrading, in terms of carriageway widening and extending the footway and lighting infrastructure out from the town. The alignment of the C77 adjacent to the northerly portion of the site does not lend itself to safe access and this part of the road may require realignment in order to facilitate safe access to the site. Contributions may be required towards the provision of a roundabout at the junction of the C77 and Melrose Road. The existing services running through the site will require to be relocated. A Transport Assessment will be a prerequisite for any development of this site to address accessibility and sustainable transport issues.

**Right of way**

On/adjacent to site

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

On/adjacent to site

**Water supply**

Yes

**Sewerage**

Limited

**Gas Supply**

Yes

**Education provision**

Good

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

**CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER:** The site appears to have housed an agricultural steading and is adjacent to former and current landfills. A portion of the site is brownfield land and its location relative to landfill sites may present development constraints.

**COUNTRYSIDE RANGER:** An area this size would require good non-vehicular connectivity, whether commercial or residential. A holistic approach to the entire site would maximise connectivity.

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT:** It is important that significant new employment allocations are available to facilitate growth associated with the Borders Railway. This is one of the few sites in the Galashiels area that can support economic growth potential. There have been various proposals presented by the owner for this site. Employment uses have been proposed in the past and we continue to support this option. Parts of this site have potential for some employment use, as it is reasonably flat, is separated by woodland from existing housing, and is close to the refuse tip, which could sit comfortably with industrial uses. A study needs to be undertaken to allow a better understanding of the potential for the site so identifying areas that may be too difficult or costly to develop, as well as dealing with the high voltage overhead electricity lines and improving off-site infrastructure such as road access. We do not consider this to be a suitable mixed use site.

**EDUCATION OFFICER:** Langlee Primary capacity being considered as part of review of all primary schools in Gala – if spare capacity being taken by other school changes, may require to consider this in the review.

**ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH:** Depending on the exact uses and locations proposed, Environmental Health may not be able to support applications for this site. Due to the civic amenity site and industrial uses to the south and east already being the subject of complaints from existing residential dwellings, residential use of this site may not be possible. Similarly, an expansion of industrial uses within the vicinity of existing dwellings may not be supported.

**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT:** This site is very substantial. It appears detached from the town in landscape terms, has road and general accessibility constraints, is alongside the landfill site where work is now being applied to reducing its landscape and visual impacts (through capping and restoration). Though part of this site is becoming a little more commercial (due to recent expansion of the storage facility), this area is still the rural hinterland of the town, and a decision to expand so significantly in this direction (whether houses, commercial, or a mix) potentially will result in a satellite area of development. There are also power lines and a gas pipeline. Ultimately, it is not clear on how development here would positively contribute to the town's setting or its character and amenity in this location.

**HOUSING STRATEGY:** No objections.

**SCOTTISH ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AGENCY:** There is a small tributary of the Allan water in the northerly field (Avenel Haugh) which runs through part of the proposed site. This must be protected if any development were to go ahead. SEPA has a policy against culverting for land gain. Foul sewage would need to connect into the public foul network although although this site is currently just beyond the edge of the sewered catchment, the network would need to be extended and the STW would likely require upgrading too. Depending on what the 'mixed use' comprises some industrial uses may require separate permissions from SEPA to operate certain types of processes. This site is located immediately opposite/adjacent to the E Langlee landfill site (PPC permit), Community recycling centre (WML), aggregates recycling yard (Exempt site) and newly approved waste transfer station (WML). Risk of odour, dust and noise plus there is a risk of landfill gas migrating off site. This site as submitted is unsuitable for development and it is recommended that it is removed from the plan. If the site were to be divided up into smaller allocations it is possible that the far western field could be suitable for development.

**SCOTTISH WATER:** There is limited capacity at the Waste Water Treatment Works (Galashiels DOA). There is sufficient capacity the Water Treatment Works (Howden WOA). There are water mains and foul drainage pipes intersecting the site. Protection measures must be in place to protect these assets.

**WASTE MANAGEMENT:** The proposed application is adjacent to a site of strategic importance for the delivery Council services. The Council Site (Easter Langlee Depot) includes depot buildings, aggregate recycling facility, two waste transfer stations, a Community Recycling Centre, Skip and vehicle storage area and a landfill site. The Councils current Local Development Plan 2016 identifies the site of strategic importance under policy IS10 – Waste Management Facilities. The development of housing within such close proximity to an operational site of significant strategic importance is likely to be highly problematic and do not align well. It should also be noted that various guidance (planning and waste) proposes that waste facilities are protected from developments that do not align and also environmental buffer Zones are implemented. This is of particular importance in relation to landfills due to potential landfill gas migration.

**Overall assessment**

**PP status**

Excluded

**Overall assessment**

Unacceptable

**Site capacity**

450

**Conclusions**

Conclusion from LDP 2016 site assessment: The site is physically separated from the town by existing woodland. Impact on biodiversity is considered to be moderate due to scale but trees, hedges and adjacent woodland should be conserved.

There is considerable archaeology within the north east corner of the site which would require to be avoided. The site is identified as being constrained in the Landscape Capacity Study as it is in a valley which is detached from the settlement; it is separated by a lip of land from the Tweed valley; the proximity of the waste disposal site and the overhead lines which currently fragment the site with wayleaves. The development of this site would require significant improved road access which would require land outwith the control of the applicant but could be considered for longer term development purposes.

The following would require detailed investigation: ROW to S, the potentially contaminated land of the waste disposal site to the east, the gas hazard pipelines and their protection zones, electricity pylons. It is not considered the site should be included within the LDP.

---

<b>Site reference</b> RGALA007	<b>Site name</b> St John's Manse	<b>Settlement</b> Galashiels	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Redevelopment	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 6	<b>Ha</b> 0.1	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is outwith both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. No objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

SEPA: Due to the steep topography to the north of the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and the proposed development is not affected by surface runoff.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Buildings	<b>Planning history references</b> 94/00540/FUL - Removal of skylight, re-roofing and addition of external downpipes.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> South-west
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site consists of brick built manse with slate roof. Potential for EPS (bats) and breeding birds to use built structures within the site. Some tree cover in garden ground and Langlee woods 60m to N. No obvious connectivity with the River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Mitigation for protected species including bats and breeding birds.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Not applicable	<b>Open space</b> Not applicable	<b>Listed buildings</b> Not applicable	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> On site	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> Adjacent to site
--------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: The manse sits on the site of Wester Langlee. Archaeology of the earlier farm and possibly medieval settlement may still exist. Mitigation may be required.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: From a built heritage perspective, there are designations either within or close to this site.

HES: A robust application of national and appropriate local policies should be able to mitigate any potential adverse impacts on heritage assets, and do not have any specific comments to offer. For those sites which are considered to be preferred or reasonable alternatives for allocation in LDP2, the environmental assessment should consider the likely effects and identify site specific mitigation where negative effects are identified.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: New build along the north boundary to take advantage of the south facing views and in the SE corner. 6-8 units if existing house converted to flats/apartments and additional new build which respects the existing house.

SNH: No comment.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Vehicular access on inside of sweeping bend is not ideal, but is currently used to lesser extent.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments received.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: No objections to this site being developed for housing. A layout with street frontage and parking to the rear would seem appropriate. Vehicular access onto Hawthorn Road will need careful consideration due to the existing geometry and junction visibility requirements. Pedestrian connectivity is a key consideration for this site. It is noted there is a bit of 'no man's land' between this site and Site AGALA036.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No comments.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

On site

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have previously been developed as part of an agricultural steading (Wester Langlee). The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Presuming that there will be multi-residential units in here then the same amount of non-vehicular connectivity that exists in the rest of Langlee should be included.

EDUCATION: No objections.

NHS: No comments received.

HOUSING STRATEGY OFFICER: It is understood that Eildon HA is negotiating to buy this property to convert to suit use of identified individual.

SCOTTISH WATER: Howden Water Treatment Works (WTW) has sufficient capacity for this development as does the water network. Galashiels Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) has sufficient capacity as does the waste network for foul only.

SEPA: Foul must connect to SW foul sewer network.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Development of the site for residential purposes is regarded as acceptable in principle. This is an appropriate infill site within the settlement boundary. The Council would not, however, allocate a site which cannot accommodate less than 5 units. The eastern part of the site is occupied by a traditional dwellinghouse and it is unclear if it would be the intention to demolish the dwellinghouse or retain it. It is therefore unclear if the site in question can accommodate 5 or more properties. Regardless of this, the site in question is located within the settlement boundary and would offer an opportunity for infill development through the planning application process. Given the uncertainty relating to the capacity of the site, it is considered that this proposal is better considered through the planning application process as infill development.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Doubtful	6

### Conclusions

Development of the site for residential purposes is regarded as acceptable in principle. This is an appropriate infill site within the settlement boundary. The Council would not, however, allocate a site which cannot accommodate more than 5 units. The eastern part of the site is occupied by a traditional dwellinghouse and it is unclear if it would be the intention to demolish the dwellinghouse or retain it. It is therefore unclear if the site in question can accommodate 5 or more properties. Regardless of this, the site in question is located within the settlement boundary and would offer an opportunity for infill development through the planning application process. Given the uncertainty relating to the capacity of the site, it is considered that this proposal is better considered through the planning application process as infill development.

---

# Gattonside

<b>Site reference</b> SBGAT002	<b>Site name</b> Gattonside Development Boundary Amendment	<b>Settlement</b> Gattonside	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Development Boundary	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> N/A	<b>Ha</b> 0.2	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designation constraint.

SEPA: Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at an increased risk of flooding. The potential development of the allocation could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere.

The site is on the edge of the sewered catchment and hence must connect to the public foul sewer.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site does not lie within the SEPA 1 in 200 year fluvial (river) flood extent. No objections on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no planning application history within the site.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site appears to be mature broad-leaved woodland. Potential for bat roosts (EPS), badger and breeding birds. Mitigation for protected species potentially including bats (loss of roosts and lighting), badger and breeding birds. Compensatory replanting plan would be required in accordance with Policy EP13.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Gattonside has good access to public transport, employment and services. There is a moderate biodiversity risk within the site.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE AND DESIGN: Site lies outside the conservation area, so no direct heritage and design issues but appears currently to be wooded?

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: No known archaeology or potential.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

On site

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: This site is within Eildon & Leaderfoot NSA. However, this appears to be a small amendment to the development boundary that would at least benefit from establishing legible boundary as it follows distinct elements on the ground, e.g. paths. We consider that further change would be less robust / defensible as it would extend into existing woodland where there are no clear internal boundaries.

While this is a development boundary amendment, this change appears very likely to lead to a proposal for housing within the newly extended boundary. If this was considered, it should relate to existing development and avoid layout/design that could lead to 'privatisation' of adjacent paths in the woodland.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No response received.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: State they have no observations.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I would have no objections to this site being allocated for a single dwelling. The existing access serving the existing house would require some improvements in terms of running surface.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

### Near a trunk road?

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

On/adjacent to sit

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: The area appears to be part of a larger woodland. Including this site in the development boundary would open the potential for development, which may impact on these trees. The view of our Landscape Architect should be sought on the value and extent of these trees.

EDUCATION: No objections.

HOUSING STRATEGY: No objections.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): There is limited capacity at the Melrose WWTW.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): There is sufficient capacity at the Howden WTW. No real concerns however it would depend on anticipated water consumption.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: This site must allow links from houses to the south and west of the site to the path network on the east of the site.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No objections.

NHS: No objections.

---

## Overall assessment

### PP status

Excluded

### Overall assessment

Doubtful

### Site capacity

N/A

### Conclusions

The proposed development boundary amendment was submitted as part of the MIR Consultation stage. The site forms part of the garden ground associated with Fauhope House, which lies to the east of the site. The land owner indicates within their submission that the site would lend itself to the development of a single house. Goatbrae Plantation lies to the north and there is extensive tree planting to the north east of this site, which forms a backdrop to the existing recent housing at Monkswood.

An amendment to the village Development Boundary to the west of SBGAT002 was considered for the LDP 2016 (SBGAT001). This was considered to be a natural infill of the then existing Development Boundary between allocated housing land and a tree belt on the eastern side. It was considered the previous amendment in the LDP 2016 was an appropriate edge to this part of Gattonside.

This proposed amendment to the development boundary would effectively break into the existing garden ground association with Fauhope House, leaving the existing house outwith the development boundary and part of the garden ground within the development boundary. The amendment would extend the existing settlement boundary beyond existing mature trees which currently form an appropriate edge to the village. The current development boundary follows the line of the garden ground and is considered to reflect the existing development line. There are a number of constraints, which are outlined below;

- Site is located within MOD safeguarded area;
- Moderate biodiversity risk, given the broad leaved woodland;
- Potential for bat roosts, badger and breeding birds;
- Compensatory planting would be required for the loss of any trees;
- Located within the CAT policy area;
- Site is located within the National Scenic Area, 'Eildon and Leaderfoot'; and
- Site must allow links from houses to the south and west of the site, to the path network on the east of the site.

Although the proposal is for a development boundary amendment, the site is currently garden ground associated with Fauhope House, therefore this would allow proposals to essentially be assessed against the infill policy (Policy PMD5: Infill Development). The land owner has made it clear within their submission that the intention is for a single house within this site. It is not considered appropriate to expand a development boundary merely in order to provide infill opportunities within the settlement itself, without a formal allocation. Furthermore, it is not the purpose of the Local Development Plan to identify and allocate single plots for development, only sites with a capacity of five or more units will be allocated.

It is not considered that there is any reasoning why part of the garden ground associated with Fauhope House should be included within the development boundary, other than the fact that it would allow the site to be assessed against Policy PMD5 for a single house.

In conclusion, taking the above into consideration, the development boundary amendment will not be included within the Proposed Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b> AGATT013	<b>Site name</b> Gateside Meadow/Castlefield	<b>Settlement</b> Gattonside	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 60	<b>Ha</b> 19.7	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The site is not shown to be at flood risk within the SEPA 1 in 200 year flood map. As this site is relatively steep the applicant would be expected to consider how surface water runoff would be mitigated.

SEPA: Due to steep topography through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff. There is a well and a spring identified on the southern boundary of the site which may require further investigation at the detailed stage.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no relevant planning application history. This site has been submitted for consideration in the past, more recently as part of the Housing SG 2017.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> South
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	-----------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response has been received from the Ecology Officer, however, the following response received during the process of the Housing SG 2017:

Biodiversity Risk: Moderate. Phase 1 habitat (aerial interpretation) Improved pasture (B4), arable field (J1.1). Field boundaries: Hedgerows, hedgeline trees  
Biological records: moth records, amphibia, breeding birds, protected species. Mitigation: Protect and enhance boundary features –Potential EPS survey required and protected mammals. Enhance hedgerow network, protect trees on boundary. Site clearance outside breeding bird season. Flood Risk (Fluvial 1in 200): No

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Not applicable	<b>Open space</b> Not applicable	<b>Listed buildings</b> Not applicable	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> On/adjacent to site	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> Not applicable
--------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

## Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: The eastern side of the site has high archaeological potential with a possible castle, or medieval grange, suspected. There have also been a number of discoveries of medieval plough pebbles in the area suggesting a good deal of evidence for medieval cultivation. There have also been recent metal-detected medieval finds within the field. There are a number of prehistoric sites and features in the area to the west. Given the potential of the site, archaeological evaluation will be required.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: This site lies to the N of the current Gattonside Conservation Area; development of the site should take account of the potential impact on the conservation area.

HES: No comments.

General Comments: This site was the subject of an objection at the 2006 Local Plan Inquiry and the recent Local Development Plan Examination. The Reporters' assessment noted that one of the reasons why the site should not be developed was the adverse impact on the setting of the settlement. In addition the Local Plan Settlement Profile identifies that due to the sensitivity of the character and setting of the settlement no areas for longer term expansion were identified. There are archaeological implications for this proposal. The eastern area in particular is of some concern. While we have no firm evidence for an archaeological site in this area, the easternmost field is called 'Castle Field'. This could indicate that at some point a tower existed in this area. This is also one of the suspected sites of a medieval grange associated with Melrose Abbey. The remainder of the area has a lower archaeological potential, though stone artefacts have been found in the area. Archaeological assessment of the site will be necessary. Issues that development of this large site may have a detrimental impact upon the current conservation area.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

On site

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: No comments received.

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comments received.

The site is constrained in the Scottish Borders Development and Landscape Capacity Study (2007) which states the following: Development across the 'Undulating Slopes' is constrained by the more complex topography, and often steep slopes which would require earth moving to accommodate development. This area is also highly open and relatively exposed because of the broadly convex curvature of the hill flank, which also tends to orientate westwards, away from the village. The slopes are very visible, particularly from the south and Eildon Hills, from where they contribute to the scenic quality of the NSA. The fields are largely cultivated, indicating that this may be a valuable agricultural resource which is difficult to recreate.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: Significant impact on existing limited road infrastructure.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Bus stop infrastructure and contribution towards provision of bus service.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: Providing two new vehicular access points into this development site is critical for my support. The only current route available is utilising The Loan which is totally unsuitable, and there is even some merit in stopping-up the most northerly section of this road. From the south, a suitable access from Montgomerie Terrace is achievable via Site EGT10B, and from the northeast a new access can be achieved linking into the new Monksford Road. This particular corner will require a detailed new road layout to be approved. There are a number of pedestrian links bounding this site that require to be upgraded and linked into the new development. It should be noted that no vehicular access would be supported accessing onto the high road serving Gattonside Mains, though a pedestrian link will be required. The above requirements affect land outwith the hatched site and it should be noted that even if satisfactory access can be achieved the Roads Officer would only be able to support the development of an easterly portion of the site. A Transport Assessment will be a prerequisite for any development of this site to address accessibility and sustainable transport.

### Near a trunk road?

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: The potential cumulative impact from these sites (including AGATT016) on the A6091 would require to be determined.

<b>Right of way</b>	<b>TPOs</b>	<b>Contaminated land</b>	<b>Water supply</b>	<b>Sewerage</b>	<b>Gas Supply</b>	<b>Education provision</b>
Adjacent to site	On site	Not applicable	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Connecting paths to new right of way from Montgomerie Terrace going east to allow safe non-vehicular movement to main road.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Conflicts with Policy EP6. Inappropriate addition to the settlement in terms of location and scale.

EDUCATION: No objections.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. However for a development of this scale there are likely to be network and STW capacity issues. SW should confirm.

General Comments: There are considerable access issues to be addressed. There is a promoted route on the north and east of the site. Although the route follows a minor road an allowance would need to be made for an off-road path. In terms of contaminated land the site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land and that its historic uses may present development constraints.

---

## Overall assessment

<b>PP status</b>	<b>Overall assessment</b>	<b>Site capacity</b>
Excluded	Unacceptable	60

### Conclusions

The site was identified as constrained in the Development and Landscape Capacity Study for the following reasons: development across the undulating slopes is constrained by the more complex topography and often steep slopes which would require earthworks; the area is highly open and relatively exposed because of the broadly convex curvature of the hill flank; the slopes are very visible, particularly from the south and the Eildon Hills, from where they contribute to the scenic quality of the National Scenic Area; the fields are a valuable agricultural resource. There are also considerable access issues to be addressed and resolved.

It should also be noted that this site formed part of the 2006 Local Plan Inquiry and the Local Development Plan 2016 Examination for 150 units. The Reporter of the LDP Examination agreed with the findings of the previous Reporter who noted that, "in view of its elevated position and slope, development would be prominent when viewed from the immediate vicinity and in more distant views from the south, including the Eildon Hills. Development of this greenfield site would also have an adverse effect on the rural setting of this part of Gattonside. I am not satisfied that development at a low density would satisfactorily resolve those matters. That is a consideration to which I must attach great weight given the likely impact on the Eildon and Leaderfoot National Scenic Area". This position remains unchanged and therefore it is not considered appropriate to allocate this site for housing.

The site is located within the CAT policy area which aims to ensure the high quality living environment is protected and to prevent piecemeal development, which would detract from the area's environment. The scale of the development within this elevated and prominent position would not adhere to the requirements of the CAT policy.

The issues raised by the Council's Roads Planning Team appear to be insurmountable given the land requirements are outwith the ownership of the applicant.

---

<b>Site reference</b> AGATT016	<b>Site name</b> Lower Gateside	<b>Settlement</b> Gattonside	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 70	<b>Ha</b> 5.5	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Adjacent to site	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The site is not shown to be at flood risk within the SEPA 1 in 200 year flood map. As this site is relatively steep the applicant would be expected to consider surface water mitigation. SUDS and Drainage Impact Assessment required.

SEPA: Surface water/fluvial adjacent to site. Based on OS Map there is sufficient height difference between site and River Tweed. Due to steep topography through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> N/A
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> South
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	-----------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response received, however, the comments raised during the process of the Housing SG 2017 remain relevant:

Biodiversity Risk: Minor-Moderate. No obvious connectivity with River Tweed SAC/SSSI through drainage. Site on sloping ground, separated from River Tweed by road (B6360) and broad-leaved woodland strip adjacent to River Tweed. Mitigation may potentially be required to ensure no significant adverse effects on integrity of River Tweed SAC. Within site- improved pasture, boundary features of mature trees and hedgerow. Protect boundary features, mitigation required e.g. badger and breeding birds

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Open space</b> Not applicable	<b>Listed buildings</b> Not applicable	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> On site	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> Not applicable
----------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

## Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There is an archaeological potential within the area, some mitigation may be required.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: This site lies to the W of the current Gattonside Conservation Area; development of the site should take account of the potential impact on the conservation area.

HES: No comments.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

On site

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: No comments received although the comments made during the process of the Housing SG 2017 remain relevant:

This site at the very edge of the Gattonside settlement does not lend itself to residential development of this scale. A sizeable residential development at this village edge location would be out of character with the historic pattern of development of Gattonside and the localised development pattern of the detached houses, mansion houses on this western edge of the village. It would be very difficult to assimilate a development of this size into Gattonside and would look out of place and out of character with the existing pattern of development of Gattonside and of the wider north side of this section of the Tweed valley, especially when seen from elevated locations on the other side of the valley.

Scottish Natural Heritage: In views from the Eildon Hills, developing the entirety of the site would lead to the introduction of development beyond the existing settlement boundary, likely detracting from the existing settlement pattern, while also impacting adversely on landscape character and visual amenity. Impacts under such a scenario would also likely be experienced from the Southern Upland Way which runs alongside and on the western boundary of the site. In the absence of details regarding the overall extent of the area for built development, or the scale and layout of the built development, or the retention of existing landscape features and the incorporation of new planting, we highlight the potential for this development to have significant and adverse effects on the Special Qualities of the NSA. The site also lies in close proximity to the River Tweed Special Area of Conservation. The intervening road and distance from the designated site mean that, with appropriate measures in place, it should be possible to avoid likely significant effects. However, we recommend that the caveats used elsewhere in the Local Development Plan to secure site-level Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA) are included in site requirements.

General Comments: The site is constraint in the Scottish Borders Development and Landscape Capacity Study (2007) which states the following: Development across the 'Undulating Slopes' is constrained by the more complex topography, and often steep slopes which would require earth moving to accommodate development. This area is also highly open and relatively exposed because of the broadly convex curvature of the hill flank, which also tends to orientate westwards, away from the village. The slopes are very visible, particularly from the south and Eildon Hills, from where they contribute to the scenic quality of the NSA. The fields are largely cultivated, indicating that this may be a valuable agricultural resource which is difficult to recreate.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: Need to provide suitable access onto B6360. May impact on existing 30 mph limit location.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Bus stop infrastructure and contribution towards provision of bus service.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: Good street design and place-making principles encourage and support developments which can integrate and connect well with their surroundings. It is difficult to see how this divorced site can achieve this. In particular, no pedestrian connectivity with the rest of the village appears to be available other than by way of the main road footway which is extremely narrow in part. There appears no obvious means of resolving this issue other than by way of affecting third party land. Vehicular access would have to be directly from the B6360 outside the village towards the western end of the site. While appropriate junction visibility splays are likely to be achievable, particularly since the introduction of 'Designing Streets' and the reduced sight-line requirements therein, the access would be onto a section of road tortuous in nature and the access point would be slightly remote from the village. Taking all of the above into consideration, Roads Planning is unable to recommend in favour of this land

being zoned for residential development.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: The potential cumulative impact from these sites (including AGATT013) on the A6091 would require to be determined.

<b>Right of way</b>	<b>TPOs</b>	<b>Contaminated land</b>	<b>Water supply</b>	<b>Sewerage</b>	<b>Gas Supply</b>	<b>Education provision</b>
Adjacent to site	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Connecting paths to site AGATT013, to core path 189 (Southern Upland Way) and new right of way going east from Montgomery Terrace to allow safe non-vehicular movement to main road.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Conflicts with policy EP6 as would bring Gattonside closer to Melrose. Inappropriate addition to the settlement in terms of location and scale.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. However for a development of this scale there are likely to be network and STW capacity issues. SW should confirm. There is however an exempt composting site located at the Pavillion approx 700m to the west. We receive the occasional odour complaint relating to this site. The SBC landfill is obviously located further to the west however we do not receive odour complaints from Gattonside relating to the landfill operations.

---

## Overall assessment

<b>PP status</b>	<b>Overall assessment</b>	<b>Site capacity</b>
Excluded	Unacceptable	70

### Conclusions

The site subject to this assessment is for housing with an indicative capacity of 70 units. The site is located immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary of Gattonside to the west of the village. Access would be from the B6360 to the south where the existing road layout is problematic. The site would extend the village beyond an existing well established landscape buffer which exists within the garden ground of a residential property known as 'Woodlands' to the south east of the site. It would be difficult to assimilate a development of the size proposed into Gattonside and would look out of place and out of character with the existing pattern of development of Gattonside and the wider north side of this section of the Tweed Valley, especially when seen from elevated locations on the other side of the valley. SNH has objected to the allocation of the site due to the likely detrimental impact upon the existing settlement pattern, landscape character, visual amenity and the NSA.

The site is located within the CAT policy area which aims to ensure the high quality living environment is protected and to prevent piecemeal development, which would detract from the area's environment. The scale of the development within this elevated and prominent position would not adhere to the requirements of the CAT policy.

Whilst Gattonside is well located in terms of access to services being located within the Central Borders, there are difficulties relating to the access at the site. The Roads Planning Officer has objected to the allocation of the site in respect of it's poor relationship with the village in respect of pedestrian connectivity. There appears no obvious means of resolving this issue other than by way of affecting third party land. Vehicular access would have to be directly from the B6360 outside the village towards the western end of the site. Whilst appropriate junction visibility splays are likely to be achievable, particularly since the introduction of 'Designing Streets' and the reduced sight-line requirements therein, the access would be onto a section of road tortuous in nature and the access point would be slightly remote from the village.

It is not therefore considered that this site should be allocated for housing.

---

<b>Site reference</b> EGT10B	<b>Site name</b> Orchard	<b>Settlement</b> Gattonside	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 5	<b>Ha</b> 0.5	<b>PP status</b> Retain LDP Site
---------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------

---

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b>	<b>SAC</b>	<b>SPA</b>	<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
------------------	------------	------------	-------------	---------------

### Initial assessment summary

This is an existing housing allocation within the LDP, which was subject to a review as part of the MIR process.

---

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b>	<b>Planning history references</b>
--------------------------	------------	--------------------------------------------	----------------------	------------------------------------

---

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b>	<b>Access to employment</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b>	<b>Site aspect</b>
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
--------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------------------	--------------------	------------------------------------------

### Local impact and integration summary

---

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
------------	------------	--------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	------------------

### Landscape summary

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

Right of way

TPOs

Contaminated land

Water supply

Sewerage

Gas Supply

Education provision

Planning & infrastructure summary

---

## Overall assessment

**PP status**

**Overall assessment**

**Site capacity**

Retain LDP Site

5

### Conclusions

The site is currently allocated for housing within the LDP, with an indicative capacity of 5 units. All existing allocations were subject to review, as part of the MIR process. The site has been allocated for housing since at least the Ettrick and Lauderdale Local Plan 1995. An outline planning application for residential development was submitted in 2003 (03/01969/OUT) for this site and the adjoining land to the north, this was ultimately removed. A more recent full planning application (18/01795/FUL) for the demolition of a dwellinghouse and the erection of 7 dwellinghouses was approved in October 2019. The plots are now being marketed by the local developer. The landowner has confirmed verbally they would wish for this allocation to be retained.

Given this information, it is considered that the site should remain allocated for housing within the LDP. Furthermore, the units are programmed as being effective within the HLA.

---

# Hawick

<b>Site reference</b> BHAWI003	<b>Site name</b> Gala Law II	<b>Settlement</b> Hawick	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Business and Industrial	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> N/A	<b>Ha</b> 0.7	<b>PP status</b> Included
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is outwith both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. No objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

SEPA: Due to steep topography through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no history of planning applications. The site is currently allocated within the LDP 2016 as part of a mixed use site (MHAWI001).
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site appears to be dense scrub, poor semi-improved grassland and mature broadleaf trees/ garden ground. No obvious connectivity to River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats, badger and breeding birds (0.64ha)

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Not applicable	<b>Open space</b> Not applicable	<b>Listed buildings</b> Not applicable	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> Not applicable
--------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

## Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: Advised verbally that there is potential for archaeology within the site. Archaeology evaluation/mitigation required.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: No comments.

HES: No comments.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: Site is visually well contained and access is good so no issues in principle. The mature trees at the south western end of the site have an important screening function and might be better protected by removing that area from the allocation (unless separately covered in a site development brief)? There could be issues in relation to tree protection / developable area where the site adjoins mature woodland on the south east boundary also.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

ROADS OFFICER: No objections to the allocation of this land for business and industrial use. It is noted that the land is currently zoned for mixed use development. This site will essentially be an extension to the existing business and industrial units at Gala Law. As such the existing infrastructure will need to be extended to incorporate this site. Any development of this land must not preclude access to the remainder of the mixed use site (MHAWI001). A Transport Statement will be required.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No objections.

### Right of way

On/adjacent to site

### TPOs

Adjacent to site

### Contaminated land

On/adjacent to site

### Water supply

Limited

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have been utilised as land associated with Galalaw Farm and includes a sheepwash. The site is brownfield land and its use may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Track HAWI/GL003/1 forms part of the path network in this area and therefore a pavement or other access route providing non-vehicular access along the North edge of the site is required.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Excepting the need for attention to trees, this would be a logical extension to the existing business/industrial land provision within the area.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: The northern site boundary of this allocation needs to be amended and reduced by around 2-3m. The plot was reduced and a new fence erected to allow a vehicular and pedestrian right of access through to additional land to the west. In addition, the SW corner of the site should also be included as it is defined by the boundary ownership with the private house.

EDUCATION: No comments.

HOUSING STRATEGY: No objections.

SEPA: Foul drainage from the development must be connected to the existing SW foul sewer network. Standard comments for SUDS. Depending on the use of the proposed units there may be a requirement for permissions to be sought for certain activities from SEPA.

SCOTTISH WATER: Robertson WTW has sufficient capacity. Please note there is an existing 180mm water main running through the middle of the site. Depending on flow demand for this development, will determine if a Water Impact assessment is required. Hawick WwTW has sufficient capacity. Please note there is existing foul and surface water sewers running along the North of site. Depending on the flow demand for this development, will determine if a Drainage Impact assessment is required.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Included	Acceptable	N/A

### Conclusions

The Council's Economic Development Section has highlighted a need for sufficient business and industrial land in Hawick. This is particularly pertinent at this time as funding is available in the forthcoming years from the South of Scotland Economic Partnership as a forerunner to a regional enterprise agency being launched in 2020. Economic Development identified this site as a possibility. The land is currently allocated for mixed use purposes (part of MHAWI001), however, the site represents a logical extension of the existing business and industrial land to the west.

The following issues would require to be addressed during the process of any planning application:

- Consideration is required to be given to surface water
- Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats, badger and breeding birds
- Existing trees to be protected and retained
- A Transport Statement is required. Development must not preclude access to site MHAWI001.
- Potential contamination to be investigated and mitigated
- Footpath link along the northern edge of site is required
- Water and Drainage Impact Assessments may be required
- A water main runs through the middle of the site
- Archaeology evaluation/mitigation required

Overall, it is considered that given the location of this site immediately adjacent to the existing business and industrial site that this site is appropriate for allocation within the Proposed LDP.

---

<b>Site reference</b> BHAWI004	<b>Site name</b> Land to South of Burnhead	<b>Settlement</b> Hawick	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Business and Industrial	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> N/A	<b>Ha</b> 5.1	<b>PP status</b> Included
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is outwith both the fluvial (river) 1 in 200 year flood extents but there is a very small pocket of potential surface water impacts on the North Western side of the site at a 1 in 200 year flood event. No objections on the grounds of flood risk. However, would ask that due to surface water risk and the size of the development that surface water flooding is considered and it is ensured that any water would be routed around the housing.

SEPA: There does appear to be a surface water/ combined drains through the site but no evidence of a culverted watercourse can be found. Due to steep topography through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no planning application history for this site. The site was assessed as part of the Local Plan Amendment for housing (AHAWI004).
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGICAL OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site appears to be an arable field with hedgerow, garden ground and mature broadleaf trees on part of boundary. No obvious connectivity to River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats, badger and breeding birds. SEPA CAR construction site licence required (site >4ha) (5.08ha).

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Not applicable	<b>Open space</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Listed buildings</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> On/adjacent to site	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> Not applicable
--------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

## Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: Advised verbally that there is potential for archaeology within the site. Archaeology evaluation/mitigation required.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: As previously flagged, the site lies close to Burnhead Tower, a category B listed tower house. The proposed development may have an impact on its setting, especially if larger buildings are proposed but this can probably be addressed through mitigation.

HES: No comments.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

On/adjacent to site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: Site is included within the Teviot Valleys SLA. It is also highly visible from the A7 Galalaw roundabout close to the direction of view towards Rubers Law. This makes it very sensitive to visual intrusion and does not suggest industrial use. Well-designed housing with ample structure planting would be a more acceptable option.

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: We note that a planning brief in the form of Supplementary Guidance is proposed for nearby allocations at BHAWI001 and BHAWI002. The principles established in this planning brief, such as integrating site planning with other allocations and infrastructure should also apply to this site, ensuring green network connections between allocations and existing areas. This is a prominent site for large scale buildings of the type likely for business/industrial use. The rolling topography perhaps does not easily lend itself to the proposed use. Therefore, development of it could have significant landscape and visual impacts, experienced particularly on the important approach to Hawick from the north. The challenging nature of the site suggests it would benefit from a strategic approach to development layout and landscape mitigation. Design approaches which could reduce impacts include guidance on scale and massing of buildings in prominent positions on the site, the colour and detailing of external appearance and measures needed to provide a landscape framework / green network connections.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: Vehicular access to this site is easily achievable from the B6359 (Lilliesleaf road). The Roads Officer is therefore able to support the proposal for a Business and Industrial allocation for the land. The B6359, beyond the Henderson Road junction, will have to be upgraded in terms of width, footway provision and street lighting and a 30mph speed limit is likely to be required. The site can fully integrate with the existing residential streets to the south by way of possible links to Boonraw Road, Galalaw Road and Burnhead Road. A Transport Statement will be required.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No objections.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Track HAWI/GL003/1 forms part of the path network in this area and therefore a pavement or other access route providing non-vehicular access along the North edge of the site is required. Opportunity to create better pedestrian/cycling access along the B6359 and also to provide connectivity to the A7 and the rest of Burnfoot and the wider path network.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: This site would be suitable for housing or business and industrial land. It is perhaps unfortunate that the identified housing allocation to the west would essentially end up

sandwiched between two industrial areas. This site – BHAWI004 – also appears to be a relatively contained site.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: No objections.

EDUCATION: No comments.

HOUSING STRATEGY: No objections.

SEPA: Foul drainage from the development must be connected to the existing SW foul sewer network. Std comments for SUDS. Depending on the use of the proposed units there may be a requirement for permissions to be sought for certain activities from SEPA.

SCOTTISH WATER: Robertson WTW has sufficient capacity. Please note there is an existing 180mm water main running through the middle of the site. Depending on flow demand for this development, will determine if a Water Impact assessment is required. Hawick WwTW has sufficient capacity. Please note there is existing foul and surface water sewers running along the North of site. Depending on the flow demand for this development, will determine if a Drainage Impact assessment is required.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Included	Acceptable	N/A

### Conclusions

The Council's Economic Development Section has highlighted a need for sufficient business and industrial land in Hawick. This is particularly pertinent at this time as funding is available in the forthcoming years from the South of Scotland Economic Partnership as a forerunner to a regional enterprise agency being launched in 2020. Economic Development identified this site as a possibility. Whilst there are concerns relating to the location of the site within the Teviot Valleys SLA, the site is only just within the boundary and it is not considered that the development of the site, with mitigation and high quality design, would have a detrimental impact upon the SLA. The following issues would require to be addressed during the process of any planning application:

- A Planning Brief has been suggested by SNH.
- Issues relating to surface water would require to be addressed.
- Ecological impacts require to be considered with appropriate mitigation where appropriate.
- Burnhead Tower, a category B listed building to the north of the site, must be safeguarded. Mitigation to safeguard the setting is required.
- A Transport Statement is required.
- Improved connectivity is required.
- A Drainage Impact Assessment may be required.
- Structure planting required along the boundaries of the site, particularly along and within the north eastern boundary.
- Green infrastructure connections through the site, including links to housing at Burnfoot and the existing path network to the east of Burnhead Road.

<b>Site reference</b> AHAWI019	<b>Site name</b> Land west of Crumhaugh House Hospital	<b>Settlement</b> Hawick	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 10	<b>Ha</b> 1.0	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The northern portion of the site is within the 1:200 year flood extent of the River Teviot. A flood risk assessment would require to be undertaken for the site.

SEPA: Require an FRA which assesses the risk from the River Teviot. Access/ egress should also be considered. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map and steep topography indicates that there may be flooding issues at this site or immediately adjacent. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Other	<b>Planning history references</b> 99/01587/COU - Change of use from restaurant to dwellinghouse (Park View) 09/00689/FUL - Part change of use from guest house to form additional dwellinghouse (Dunira House) 15/01197/SCR - Flood Protection Scheme 15/01196/SCO - Flood Protection Scheme
The site was considered through the process of the Local Plan Amendment (AHAWI019)				

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response received.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Not applicable	<b>Open space</b> Not applicable	<b>Listed buildings</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> Not applicable	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> Not applicable
--------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

## Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There are no known archaeological issues.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: The former category B listed Cottage Hospital lies to the east of part of the site. Any proposals should take account of the setting of the listed building; this may limit the opportunity of developing N of the frontage line of the former hospital.

HES: No comments.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: No comments received.

SNH: No comments due to size and location.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: Existing junction with A7.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: This site should not be specifically zoned for residential development as vehicular access to the A7 Trunk Road is somewhat constrained and, of more concern, the majority of the site is excessively steep in nature so that it is unlikely that a public road would meet my gradient requirements. Even if it could, it would inevitably have to be over engineered. The junction onto the A7, serving 'Dunira House', could be upgraded to serve a maximum of four new dwellinghouses on the lower part of the site (5 if the number of dwellinghouses permitted off a private access is increased from 4 to 5, in line with the National Roads Development Guide, through the LDP process). Same rules apply for a new junction off the private access road serving the new college and former cottage hospital. It should be noted that any alterations to either access would require the approval of Transport Scotland.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Access strategy will require some thought and discussion with Transport Scotland. Access may require to be rationalised or shared.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

On/adjacent to sit

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: No comments.

EDUCATION: No objections.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Roberton WTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the network. Hawick WwTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity for waste in the network.

SEPA: Foul must connect to SW foul sewer network.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	10

### Conclusions

Whilst the development of this site appears to be acceptable in principle subject to the retention and protection of TPO'd trees within and adjacent to the site and also subject to care being taken to protect the character and setting of the category B listed former Cottage Hospital, the Roads Planning Officer is unable to support development due to the vehicular access onto the A7 Trunk Road which is constrained. Furthermore, the majority of the site is excessively steep in nature so it is unlikely that a public road could meet gradient requirements. Even if it could, it would inevitably have to be over engineered. Works to the access would invariably require works to existing protected trees. A Flood Risk Assessment would also be required. Any development at this location would be small scale and would be best considered through the development management process. It is therefore concluded that the site should be excluded from the Proposed LDP.

---

<b>Site reference</b> AHAWI024	<b>Site name</b> Former Stonefield Quarry	<b>Settlement</b> Hawick	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 1	<b>Ha</b> 0.2	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	----------------------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> On site	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The site is within the surface water 1 in 200 year flood extent. No objection to the proposal on the grounds of flood risk. Surface water flooding would require to be considered and it is ensured that water would be routed around housing.

SEPA: Review of OS Maps indicates a sufficient height difference between the Slitrig Water and the site. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map and steep topography indicates that there may be flooding issues at this site or immediately adjacent. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Buildings	<b>Planning history references</b> 11/01518/PPP - Re-location of existing stable block and erection of dwellinghouse. Refused 09/01/12 and later appeal refused by Local Review Bosy.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: No comments received.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Not applicable	<b>Open space</b> Not applicable	<b>Listed buildings</b> Not applicable	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> Not applicable	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> Not applicable
--------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There are no known archaeological issues.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: No comments.

HES: No comments.

Low impact on the wider settlement but site does not integrate well into the surrounding area. Site is separated from the settlement by the former railway embankment. It is a relatively secluded site located within a former quarry on the east site of the dismantled Waverley Line. Poor relationship with the settlement and not consistent with general pattern of development in the area.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: No comments received.

SNH: No comment due to size and location.

Site is located within a former quarry and is isolated from the settlement. Former quarry walls on 3 sides with north west boundary of site open to the dismantled railway embankment. The site slopes down from the quarry wall to the north east.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: No issues due to small scale nature of the proposal.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: The access serving this site is inappropriate for the vehicles associated with housing development in terms of gradient, surfacing and drainage. Furthermore the site is on the opposite side of the former railway line and does not provide an obvious or appropriate extension to the settlement.

### Right of way

On/adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

On site

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

No

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site was previously quarried and may have been subsequently infilled/ partially infilled. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Scope to upgrade customary link path to path network nearby disused railway path and BR113.

EDUCATION: No objections.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Roberton WTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the network. No sewers within the area.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to SW foul network.

The access serving this site is inappropriate for the vehicles associated with housing development in terms of gradient and surfacing. Furthermore the site is on the opposite side of the former railway line and does not provide an obvious or appropriate extension to the settlement. A right of way (BR113) crosses the site from east to west.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	1

### Conclusions

The site is separated from the settlement by the former railway embankment. It is a relatively secluded site located within a former quarry on the east site of the dismantled Waverley Line and has a poor relationship with the settlement and is not consistent with the general pattern of development in the area. There would be low impact on the wider settlement but the site does not integrate well into the surrounding area. This site may be at risk of flooding during a 1 in 200 year pluvial event and there is also a steep gradient from Hardie's Hill to the East of the site where surface water management may also be required. There are no known archaeological issues.

The access serving this site is inappropriate for the vehicles associated with housing development in terms of gradient and surfacing. A right of way (BR113) crosses the site from east to west.

The site was considered by the Reporter during the process of the Local Development Plan 2016 who agreed to exclude the site for the following reasons:

1. The written submission simply requires the site of the former Stonefield Quarry to be included within the plan. The accompanying drawing is entitled "Proposed House at Quarry Site, Stonefield."
2. I share the council's opinion that the embankment of the former railway line provides a very well-defined settlement boundary in this part of Hawick. Access to the site would be via an existing bridge through the embankment with an incline from Stonefield, the nearest public road. The embankment and the means of access would ensure development of the site would be largely unconnected with the settlement of Hawick both visually and physically. In turn, development would not contribute to place-making, a central principle of Scottish Planning Policy.
3. In addition, I believe that the confines of the site, located within a former quarry and bounded to the north by the high embankment, would not lead to a residential ambience of high quality.
4. As it appears only one house is intended within the former quarry, there is no strategic significance in the potential development of the site.
5. All-in-all, I conclude that the land of the former Stonefield Quarry should not be allocated for residential development, be it a single house or a small group of houses. Similarly, the settlement boundary should not be adjusted at this location. As pointed out by the council, any formal proposal would be assessed against the relevant policies of the local development plan.

It is therefore concluded that the site should be excluded from the Proposed LDP.

---

<b>Site reference</b> AHAWI027	<b>Site name</b> Burnfoot (Phase 1)	<b>Settlement</b> Hawick	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 60	<b>Ha</b> 5.0	<b>PP status</b> Included
-----------------------------------	----------------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:100	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is outwith the fluvial (river) 1 in 200 year flood extents but there are small pockets of potential surface water impacts on the South Eastern side of the site at a 1 in 200 year flood event. No objections on the grounds of flood risk. However, would require that due to surface water risk and the capacity of the development that surface water flooding is considered and it is ensured that any water would be routed around the housing.

SEPA: Historic maps shows a watercourse flowing through the middle of the site which may now be culverted. SEPA require an FRA which assesses the risk from this culverted watercourse. Buildings must not be constructed over an existing drain (including a field drain) that is to remain active. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues at this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes SEPA would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at increased risk of flooding.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> No planning application history. The site was previously considered for a housing allocation within the process of the Housing SG 2017 and is currently shown as a longer term housing site within the LDP 2016.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> South-west
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	----------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Low impact. Site appears to be an arable field with rank semi-improved grassland / marshy grassland in south-west part of site, scrub and hedgerow and trees on part of the boundary. No obvious connectivity to River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats (EPS), badger and breeding birds. SEPA CAR construction site licence required (site >4ha) (4.95ha)

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located adjacent to Hawick's settlement boundary, at Burnfoot. The site is less than 2 km from Hawick High Street. A wide range of facilities and services are available within Hawick, including a number of key services within Burnfoot. Hawick has regular bus service to several places in the Borders, as well as Edinburgh and Carlisle.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Adjacent to site

### Listed buildings

Adjacent to site

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: Advised verbally that there is potential for archaeology within the site. Archaeology evaluation/mitigation required.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: No listed building or conservation area issues. Appears to be a sensible opportunity filling in the low ground between the Retail Park and the existing residential area. The roofscape will be important as it will be viewed from the higher level of the A7.

HES: No comments.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Adjacent to site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: The site indicated is not all developable. Protection of views to and from surrounding roads, avoidance of steeper ground along NW side and avoidance of wetland area to W of site all limit developable area.

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: SNH's previous advice on this site (in response to the Housing SG): This prominent site lies outwith the current settlement boundary as shown in the LDP but is included as a longer-term safeguard (SHAWI003). Justification for the eastern boundary of the site is unclear – there are no obvious physical features and it appears likely that the site would extend to the field boundary opposite Burnhead. When considered alongside adjacent allocations in the LDP it appears that a design framework for the north of Hawick is required to co-ordinate issues between sites in this area of significant change. If taken forward individually, SNH would strongly advocate a site brief for this site. SNH maintain this position. In addition, SNH highlight the potential for adverse landscape and visual impacts relating to possible intrusion of development on the wider views currently gained towards the hills on this key approach into Hawick. If this site was to be allocated we would advise that close attention should be paid to the settlement edge and to maintaining key views. Providing green infrastructure connections and suitable densities of development on less sensitive parts of the site should be also be considered.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: Access is achievable off the B6359, with pedestrian linkage required to the bus laybys on A7 by the roundabout. A footway will also be required on the north west side of the B6359 to tie-in with A7 footways. Any layout will have to facilitate projections into the adjoining land to the north east (BHAWI001). Whilst there may some benefits in direct vehicular access to the roundabout on the A7 this is unlikely to be supported by Transport Scotland as trunk road authority and it is not an absolute requirement for the development of this site. Any development will have to incorporate the principles of 'Designing Streets' in terms of layout and design and there is an opportunity to create a street-feel onto the B6359. A Transport Assessment will be required for this level of development.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Would like to discuss the access strategy for this site as it appears to be located adjacent to the A7 trunk road.

STRATEGIC TRANSPORT OFFICER: Opportunity to create better pedestrian/cycling access along the B6359 and also to provide connectivity to the A7 and the rest of Burnfoot.

**Right of way**

Not applicable

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

On site

**Water supply**

Yes

**Sewerage**

Yes

**Gas Supply**

Yes

**Education provision**

Good

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed with the exception of a water course intersecting the site. This appears to have subsequently been infilled. The site is brownfield land and its use may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Track HAWI/GL003/1 forms part of the path network in this area and therefore a pavement or other access route providing non-vehicular access along the North edge of the site is required. Opportunity to create better pedestrian/cycling access along the B6359 and also to provide connectivity to the A7 and the rest of Burnfoot and the wider path network

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: The landscaping of the boundary of this site would be highly significant given its presence within a 'gateway' approach to Hawick on the A7. The development of this land would appear liable to set off a drift towards the NE in the land between the two roads.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Some landscape separation may be required as a development condition between this site and allocation BHAWI001.

EDUCATION: No comments.

HOUSING STRATEGY: No objections.

NHS: No comments received.

SEPA: Foul drainage from the development must be connected to the existing SW foul sewer network. Standard comments for SUDS.

**Overall assessment****PP status**

Included

**Overall assessment**

Acceptable

**Site capacity**

60

**Conclusions**

This site is currently identified as having longer term housing potential in the LDP 2016. Although the site sits outwith the Hawick LDP boundary it is effectively encircled by the town on all sides, including to the north-east of the site, which is allocated for business and industrial use.

The site's relationship with Hawick is acceptable, but careful consideration of that NE boundary and connectivity and boundary treatment between the sites is required. Accessibility within the town, and to neighbouring towns is good.

In landscape terms, the site is acceptable but not all will be developable. Protection of views and attention to the site's boundary to the NE will be required. Up to half the site could need to be given over to landscaping or SUDS, or lost due to being steeply sloping ground on the periphery of the site. Although the LDP longer term site has a capacity of 100 units this does not account for these constraints. In practice the site capacity is around 60 units.

A Flood Risk Assessment is required in order to assess the risk from a watercourse which is understood to run through the site and may be culverted. Consideration should be given to the potential for surface water runoff in the south of the site, as per SEPA's 1 in 200 year surface water flood risk mapping.

There are no significant biodiversity issues, but mitigation for protected species would be required and may be necessary. There is potential for on-site play provision. Archaeology evaluation/mitigation required.

In summary, there are no constraints to development and the site should be included within the Proposed LDP.

<b>Site reference</b> AHAWI028	<b>Site name</b> Land at West Lees	<b>Settlement</b> Hawick	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 15	<b>Ha</b> 1.5	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The northern boundary of this site is at risk of flooding at a 1 in 200 year flood event. There may be issues with ensuring flood free access and egress to the site. An FRA is therefore required to be undertaken for this site.

SEPA: Require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Boonraw Burn. Access/ egress will potentially be difficult and should be investigated at an early stage. Consideration will need to be given to any culverts/ bridges which may exacerbate flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within/ adjacent to site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Combination	<b>Planning history references</b> N/A
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate. Site is improved grassland and includes an area of mature lowland mixed deciduous woodland and agricultural shed within boundary. Potential for connectivity with River Tweed SAC/SSSI via Boonraw burn (non-designated). Potential for EPS (bats) Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC. Protect mature woodland and mitigation for protected species including potentially bats, badger and breeding birds.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Not applicable	<b>Open space</b> Not applicable	<b>Listed buildings</b> Not applicable	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> On site	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> Not applicable
--------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There is some archaeological potential. Historic maps suggest at least a mid-18th century origin for West and East Lees. It first appears as one settlement of Lees with at least 4

buildings. Archaeology for the earlier phases of settlement may exist in the area. Mitigation is possible.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: No comments.

HES: No comments.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: Site is isolated from any building group and in a prominent location as well as a location which is exposed to the prevailing winds from south west. Do not think any development beyond restoration and limited additional development associated with the immediate West Lees steading is appropriate at this isolated location.

SNH: No comment due to size and location.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Serviced by single track road, may need passing places.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: The site lies out with any recognised settlement. In principle not in favour of a site of this extent being allocated for housing in this location due to its remote nature in respect of service provision. Developments need to be in locations that allow accessibility to local amenities by sustainable transport modes such as walking and public transport. The level of development proposed would require a new public road to serve it. The private track serving this site is single track and the gradient steeper than would normally be acceptable for a public road. Access onto the existing public road is problematic due to it being situated on the inside of a bend where visibility is restricted due to the horizontal alignment of the road and a bridge parapet to the east.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Further development traffic utilising the A7 trunk road junction with the local road may require the junction to be upgraded.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

On site

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

No

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site apparently housed agricultural buildings. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Consideration of this area for a path plan with AHAWI029 and existing dwellings at Appletreehall for a path network for non-vehicular use within the dwelling areas between them and access to nearby path locations which is currently on public road with no pavement. Suggest path link from public road along North edge of site to East of site to allow possible link to AHAWI029.

EDUCATION: No objections.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Roberton WTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the network. No sewers within the area.

SEPA: Private foul drainage would be required as no SW foul network in vicinity, however this could be difficult due to existing pressures from Appletreehall private drainage discharging in to the Boonraw burn. Consideration should be given to first time sewerage for this and the existing houses at Appletreehall if this site is to be included in the LDP. The site appears to be close to the Boonraw burn at its northern end so opportunities should be taken to protect and enhance this.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	15

### Conclusions

The LDP would not allocate areas of land in rural locations such as this for a proposal which would otherwise be tested under the Council's Housing in the Countryside policy.

A Flood Risk Assessment would be required for any development at the site. The proposal is unacceptable from a roads point of view due to the site's remote nature in respect of service provision. Developments need to be in locations that allow accessibility to local amenities by sustainable transport modes such as walking and public transport. The level of development proposed would require a new public road to serve it. The private track serving this site is single track and the gradient steeper than would normally be acceptable for a public road. Access onto the existing public road is problematic due to it being situated on the inside of a bend where visibility is restricted due to the horizontal alignment of the road and a bridge parapet to the east. The site is located within a prominent rural location.

---

<b>Site reference</b> AHAWI029	<b>Site name</b> Land at Appletreehall	<b>Settlement</b> Hawick	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 10	<b>Ha</b> 1.7	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The north/eastern boundaries of the site are within the 1:200 year flood extent of the Boonraw Burn. A flood risk assessment is required to be undertaken for this site.

SEPA: Require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Boonraw Burn. Access/ egress will potentially be difficult and should be investigated at an early stage as this may affect the viability of the development. Consideration will need to be given to any culverts/ bridges which may exacerbate flood risk. Site will likely be constrained due to flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within/ adjacent to site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> No relevant planning history.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate. Site is an arable field bordering an area of mature lowland mixed deciduous woodland and garden ground and garage within boundary. Potential for connectivity with River Tweed SAC/SSSI via Boonraw burn (non-designated). Potential for EPS (bats). Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC. Protect mature woodland and mitigation for protected species including potentially bats, badger and breeding birds.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Not applicable	<b>Open space</b> Not applicable	<b>Listed buildings</b> Not applicable	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> Not applicable	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> Not applicable
--------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: Mapping shows that the mid 18th century hamlet appears to have contained buildings that no longer exist. One of these appears at the projected entrance to this site. Mitigation

may be needed in this area.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: No comments.

HES: No comments.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Adjacent to site

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: Given the poor access, do not think this is a good site for expansion of the Appletreehall settlement. If development is deemed appropriate a strong woodland shelterbelt should be planted along the (straight) SW boundary to help mitigate the landscape and visual impacts.

SNH: No comment due to size and location.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

Network Manager: Increased traffic onto existing substandard junction (poor visibility).

Passenger Transport: No comments.

Roads Planning: In principle, not in favour of a site of this extent being allocated for housing in this location due to its remote nature in respect of service provision. Developments need to be in locations that allow accessibility to local amenities by sustainable transport modes such as walking and public transport. The road network in and around Appletreehall is constrained and lacking in appropriate infrastructure to support such a development. The proposed access point is of some concern due to the presence of the adjacent building which would impact on junction visibility.

Strategic Transport: No comments received.

Transport Scotland: Further development traffic utilising the A7 trunk road junction with the local road may require the junction to be upgraded.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

No

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Consideration of this area for a path plan with AHAWI028 and existing dwellings at Appletreehall for a path network for non-vehicular use within the dwelling areas between them and access to nearby path locations which is currently on public road with no pavement. Suggest path link from public road along North East of site to allow path links to AHAWI028 and to South East of site.

EDUCATION: No objections.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Roberton WTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the water network. No sewers within the area.

SEPA: Private foul drainage would be required as no SW foul network in vicinity, however this could be difficult due to existing pressures from Appletreehall private drainage discharging in to the Boonraw burn. Consideration should be given to first time sewerage for this and the existing houses at Appletreehall if this site is to be included in the LDP. The site is close to the Boonraw burn at its northern end and appears to cross it so opportunities should be taken to protect and enhance this. Any river crossings should be designed in accordance with good practice and avoid in stream structures.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	10

### Conclusions

The LDP would not allocate areas of land in rural locations such as this for a proposal which would otherwise be tested under the Council's Housing in the Countryside policy.

A Flood Risk Assessment would be required for any development at the site. From a roads point of view, the allocation of this site for housing would not be acceptable due to its remote nature in respect of service provision. Developments need to be in locations that allow accessibility to local amenities by sustainable transport modes such as walking and public transport. The road network in and around Appletreehall is constrained and lacking in appropriate infrastructure to support such a development. The proposed access point is of some concern due to the presence of the adjacent building which would impact on junction visibility.

---

<b>Site reference</b> AHAWI030	<b>Site name</b> Land at Former Allotments, Braid Road	<b>Settlement</b> Hawick	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 20	<b>Ha</b> 1.1	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is outwith both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. No objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. Due to the size of the development it is recommended surface water runoff be considered.

SEPA: Due to steep topography adjacent/ through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Other	<b>Planning history references</b> No planning application history. The site is currently allocated within the Scottish Borders Local Development Plan 2016 for 'Key Greenspace' (GSHAWI003) having formerly been used as allotments.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate. Site is former allotments with broad-leaved trees and scrub, allotment shed within site, garden ground and hedgerow on boundary. Potential for EPS (bats). Mitigation for protected species including potentially bats, badger and breeding birds.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Not applicable	<b>Open space</b> On site	<b>Listed buildings</b> Not applicable	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> Not applicable	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> Not applicable
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There are no known archaeological issues.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: No comments.

HES: No comments.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: 15 – 20 units with a concentration on exploiting views west and north west over town.

SNH: No comment due to size and location.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: May impact on position of existing 30 mph limit. Braid Road is narrow and restricted at the moment and development may offer scope for improving the adjacent end section.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: Not in favour of this site being zoned for housing. The excessive gradient of Wellogate Brae and the site itself means that it is not a logical extension to the settlement.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No comments.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have been developed as allotment gardens. There is no evidence to indicate that its historic uses may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Sufficient width of access road/pavement/path along Braid Road(Core path 120) and the unclassified road the continuation of Wellogate Brae ( Right of Way BR114) for continued use by walkers cyclists horse riders on the local wider path network.

EDUCATION: No objections.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Robertson WTW has sufficient capacity. A Flow and Pressure test is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Hawick WwTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity for waste in network.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network.

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	20

### Conclusions

The site is unacceptable from a roads point of view due to the excessive gradient of Wellogate Brae. Furthermore, the site is allocated within the Local Development Plan 2016 as a protected Key Greenspace. The site has been previously used as allotments although this use has now ceased and the site is now a grazing field. The submission notes that there was a lack of interest in allotment holders coming forward. Whilst no response has been received from Neighbourhood Services in this respect, there is an insurmountable constraint in respect of access to the site in any event. It is therefore concluded that the site should be excluded from the Proposed LDP.

---

<b>Site reference</b> RHA12B	<b>Site name</b> Summerfield 1	<b>Settlement</b> Hawick	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 40	<b>Ha</b> 1.7	<b>PP status</b> Retain LDP Site
---------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------

---

## Initial assessment

**Floodrisk**      **SAC**      **SPA**      **SSSI**      **Ramsar**

### Initial assessment summary

This is an existing housing allocation within the LDP, which was subject to a review as part of the MIR process.

---

## Background information

**Minerals and coal**    **NNR**      **Prime Quality Agricultural Land**    **Current use/s**    **Planning history references**

---

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

**Access to public transport**      **Access to employment**      **Access to services**      **Wider biodiversity impacts**      **Site aspect**

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

**Conservation area**    **Open space**    **Listed buildings**    **Scheduled Monument**    **Ancient woodland inventory**    **Archaeology**    **Garden and designed landscape**

### Local impact and integration summary

---

## Landscape assessment

**NSA**      **SLA**      **Over 200 metres?**       **Over 12 degree slope**       **Wild Land**

### Landscape summary

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

Right of way

TPOs

Contaminated land

Water supply

Sewerage

Gas Supply

Education provision

Planning & infrastructure summary

---

## Overall assessment

**PP status**

**Overall assessment**

**Site capacity**

Retain LDP Site

40

### Conclusions

The site is currently allocated for housing within the LDP, with an indicative site capacity of 40 units. All existing allocations were subject to review, as part of the MIR process. The site has been allocated since at least the Roxburgh Local Plan 1995 and there has been no planning history on the site to date. A planning brief was produced for the site in 2007. Given the length of time the site has been allocated, a letter was sent out to the landowner requesting whether there is a realistic likelihood of the site being developed.

The Executor of the land in question has responded confirming that he would wish to retain the existing allocations for housing, with a view to future development. The Executor would not wish the Council to consider the removal of the sites from the LDP.

It is acknowledged that there has been no recent interest in the housing allocation, however, the housing market has been particularly slow since the recession, particularly in Hawick in comparison with other areas.

Given this information, it is considered that the site should remain allocated for housing within the LDP2.

---

<b>Site reference</b> RHA13B	<b>Site name</b> Summerfield 2	<b>Settlement</b> Hawick	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 60	<b>Ha</b> 2.7	<b>PP status</b> Retain LDP Site
---------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------

---

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b>	<b>SAC</b>	<b>SPA</b>	<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
------------------	------------	------------	-------------	---------------

### Initial assessment summary

This is an existing housing allocation within the LDP, which was subject to a review as part of the MIR process.

---

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b>	<b>Planning history references</b>
--------------------------	------------	--------------------------------------------	----------------------	------------------------------------

---

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b>	<b>Access to employment</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b>	<b>Site aspect</b>
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
--------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------------------	--------------------	------------------------------------------

### Local impact and integration summary

---

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
------------	------------	--------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	------------------

### Landscape summary

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

Right of way

TPOs

Contaminated land

Water supply

Sewerage

Gas Supply

Education provision

Planning & infrastructure summary

---

## Overall assessment

**PP status**

**Overall assessment**

**Site capacity**

Retain LDP Site

60

### Conclusions

The site is currently allocated for housing within the LDP, with an indicative site capacity of 60 units. All existing allocations were subject to review, as part of the MIR process. The site has been allocated since at least the Roxburgh Local Plan 1995 and there has been no planning history on the site to date. A planning brief was produced for the site in 2007. Given the length of time the site has been allocated, a letter was sent out to the landowner requesting whether there is a realistic likelihood of the site being developed.

The Executor of the land in question has responded confirming that he would wish to retain the existing allocations for housing, with a view to future development. The Executor would not wish the Council to consider the removal of the sites from the LDP.

It is acknowledged that there has been no recent interest in the housing allocation, however, the housing market has been particularly slow since the recession, particularly in Hawick in comparison with other areas.

Given this information, it is considered that the site should remain allocated for housing within the LDP2.

---

<b>Site reference</b> RHAWI017	<b>Site name</b> Former Peter Scott Building	<b>Settlement</b> Hawick	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Redevelopment	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> N/A	<b>Ha</b> 0.6	<b>PP status</b> Included
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

**Flood Risk and Coastal Management:** Part of the site (SE and S side) has been approved by Council in planning app 18/00498/FUL. A Flood Risk Assessment was submitted in support of this site. The other part of the site, the Northern section, is shown to be at higher risk due to its closer proximity to the River Teviot. In both SEPA's Flood Mapping and our Hawick FPS Flood Mapping, the building is shown to be at risk during a 1 in 200 year flood event. Therefore, would require a Flood Risk Assessment to support this application.

**Scottish Environment Protection Agency:** As the area is at significant flood risk from the River Teviot and Slitrig Water, it is essential that any new development will have a neutral impact on flood risk. We would only support redevelopment of a similar use in line with our land use vulnerability guidance. The FRA is required to inform the area of redevelopment, type of development, finished floor levels and ensure that the development has a neutral impact on flood risk. Furthermore flood resilient and resistant materials should be used. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Site will be heavily constrained as a result.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Buildings	<b>Planning history references</b> There have been a number of planning applications relating to these premises in the past, relating to various alterations and fittings. The most significant planning applications are as follows: 18/00498/FUL - Change of use from former mill and alterations to form 10 no. residential flats with associated parking (PERCI) 18/00499/LBC - Internal and external alterations to form 10 no. residential flats (PERCI)
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

**Ecology Officer:** No comments received although the Ecology Officer requested information during the process of a recent planning application for the site in respect of potential impacts on legally protected species including European Protected Species (EPS) bats, as well as breeding birds would require to be assessed and mitigated.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

On site

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

On site

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

Archaeology Officer: Historic Building recording will be required in advance of re-development.

Design & Heritage Officer: The mill complex is category C listed and lies within the Hawick conservation area. Redevelopment of the site should be encouraged; the council had undertaken an option appraisal for the redevelopment of the site with Aitken and Turnbull employed as consultants.

Historic Environment Scotland: HES would be supportive of redevelopment that retains the special interest of the C-listed buildings.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

Landscape Architect: No comments received.

Scottish Natural Heritage: No comment due to location and nature of site.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Network Manager: May be parking implications.

Passenger Transport: No objections.

Roads Planning: I would not be opposed to the redevelopment of this site given its prime location within the town centre boundary. The site benefits well from its location in respect of the towns amenities and access to public transport. The main consideration for redeveloping this site would be parking. The demand for on-street parking is high in this location and the availability is limited. Any redevelopment proposal will have to take into consideration parking issues that exist and how the development will impact on this. A Transport Assessment, or Transport Statement, dependant on the level of development, will be required. The comments of Transport Scotland may also be required depending on how development integrates with the adjacent A7 Trunk Road.

Transport Scotland: No comments.

### Near a trunk road?

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

On site

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

Contaminated Land Officer: The site appears to have been developed as a Hosiery Factory. The site is brownfield land and its use may present development constraints.

Countryside Rangers: No comments.

Development Management: No objections in principle.

Economic Development: Fully support the redevelopment and regeneration of this site. The current building is in poor condition and does not meet modern standards for business use.

Education: No objections.

Environmental Health: No comments.

Estates: No objections.

Housing Strategy: No objections.

NHS: No objections.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency: Foul drainage must be connected to the foul sewer. Depending on the use of the site there may be a requirement for permissions to be sought for certain activities from SEPA. Potential for land contamination and for lades/culverts to be present within site, given previous use. Potential de-culverting opportunity.

Scottish Water: There is sufficient capacity at the waster water treatment works. There is sufficient capacity at Robertson WOA. No concerns however it would depend on anticipated water consumption.

Waste Manager: No comments.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Included	Acceptable	N/A

### Conclusions

The site was identified through the duration of the MIR process, via consultation working groups. The site was subsequently included within the MIR as a potential redevelopment site. However, a site assessment and consultation were not undertaken at that time. Further to the 'MIR Consultation' process, a full consultation, site assessment and SEA have now been undertaken for the site.

The site comprises former mill buildings associated with the Former Peter Scott Knitwear company. The site is located within the Hawick Town Centre and within the Conservation Area. The building is also Category C listed. Further to the site assessment, the following constraints have been identified:

- Flood Risk Assessment is required.
- There is potential for breeding birds and bats within the existing building, appropriate mitigation required.
- The site is located within the Hawick Conservation Area.
- The building is Category C listed.
- Potential archaeology within the site, mitigation may be required.
- The site is brownfield land and its use may present development constraints in respect of contamination

It is not considered that there are any insurmountable issues which cannot be addressed through appropriate mitigation measures.

Given the location of the site within the Conservation Area and the Category C listing of the building, careful consideration and thought will need to be given to any alterations to the external appearance of the building, to ensure that they respect the wider Conservation Area and townscape setting. The Council welcomes the re-use of long term vacant buildings within such locations. The redevelopment of such buildings can help ensure that the character and appearance of the town centre is retained and enhanced, whilst bringing buildings back into use again. It is considered that the redevelopment of this

site would have a positive impact upon the wider area.

In conclusion, the redevelopment site will be included within the Proposed Plan. The site is a vacant former mill building, located within the Hawick town centre. Subject to a number of issues being taken into account, it is considered to be an appropriate redevelopment site for allocation within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b> RHAWI018	<b>Site name</b> Buccleuch Mill	<b>Settlement</b> Hawick	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Redevelopment	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> N/A	<b>Ha</b> 0.1	<b>PP status</b> Included
-----------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

Flood Risk and Coastal Management: This site is not shown to be at risk of flooding within the SEPA or Hawick FPS flood mapping at a 1 in 200 year event. I would therefore have no objections to this re-development on the grounds of flood risk.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency: Require an FRA which assesses the risk from the River Teviot. Redevelopment to a similar or less sensitive use would be supported by SEPA. An increase in vulnerability would only be supported if a detailed FRA can demonstrate the site is free from flood risk and there is safe access/egress available. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Site will likely be constrained due to flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Buildings	<b>Planning history references</b> 05/01602/CON - Partial demolitions (Withdrawn) 05/01603/COU - Change of use and alterations to form 10 dwellinghouses (Withdrawn) 15/01196/SCO - Flood Protection Scheme 15/01197/SCR - Flood Protection Scheme
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

Ecology Officer: No comments received although it is expected that due to the derelict nature of the buildings that potential impacts on legally protected species including European Protected Species (EPS) bats, as well as breeding birds would require to be assessed and mitigated.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> On site	<b>Open space</b> Not applicable	<b>Listed buildings</b> Not applicable	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> On site	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

## Local impact and integration summary

Archaeology Officer: Historic Building recording will be required in advance of re-development.

Design & Heritage Officer: The site lies within the Hawick conservation area, so any redevelopment of the site involving demolition of the historic mill buildings (the power knitting mill and the adjacent hand knitting building) will require formal CAC. There is considerable scope for redevelopment of all or part of the existing building and this would be a preferred route rather than complete site clearance.

Historic Environment Scotland: No objections.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

Landscape Architect: No comments received.

Scottish Natural Heritage: No comment due to location and nature of site.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Network Manager: No observations.

Passenger Transport: No objections.

Roads Planning: Parking in the vicinity of this building is very limited and the road network is fairly restrictive. However, I would not be opposed to a small scale redevelopment which is sympathetic to these issues. Any parking that can be provided within the site would be welcomed.

Transport Scotland: No comments.

Near a trunk road?

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

On/adjacent to sit

### Contaminated land

On site

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

Contaminated Land Officer: The site appears to have been developed as a mill. The site is brownfield land and its use may present development constraints.

Countryside Ranger: The Green Lane is shown on the Scottish Path Record continuing to the West of the site.

Development Management: No objections in principle.

Economic Development: Fully support the redevelopment and regeneration of this site. The current building is in very poor condition and does not meet modern standards for business use. However, we consider that the zoning should include all land within this ownership (see plan).

Education: No objections.

---

Environmental Health: No comments.

Housing Strategy: No objections.

NHS: No objections.

Scottish Water: There is sufficient capacity within the Waste Water Treatment Works. There is sufficient capacity at Robertson WOA WTW. No concerns regarding water treatment works however it would depend on anticipated water consumption.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency: Foul drainage must be connected to the foul sewer. Depending on the use of the site there may be a requirement for permissions to be sought for certain activities from SEPA. Potential for land contamination and for lades/culverts to be present within site, given previous use.

Waste Manager: No comments.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Included	Acceptable	N/A

### Conclusions

The site was identified through the duration of the MIR process, via consultation working groups. The site was subsequently included within the MIR as a potential redevelopment site. However, a site assessment and consultation were not undertaken at that time. Further to the 'MIR Consultation' process, a full consultation, site assessment and SEA have now been undertaken for the site.

The site comprises former Buccleuch Mill buildings. The site is located within the Hawick Conservation Area. Further to the site assessment, the following constraints have been identified:

- Flood Risk Assessment is required.
- There is potential for breeding birds and bats within the existing building, appropriate mitigation required.
- The site is located within the Hawick Conservation Area.
- Potential archaeology within the site, mitigation may be required.
- The site is brownfield land and its use may present development constraints in respect of contamination

It is not considered that there are any insurmountable issues which cannot be addressed through appropriate mitigation measures.

Given the location within the Conservation Area, careful consideration and thought will need to be given to any alterations to the external appearance of the building, to ensure that they respect the wider Conservation Area and townscape setting. The Council welcomes the re-use of long term vacant buildings within such locations. The redevelopment of such buildings can help ensure that the character and appearance of the town centre is retained and enhanced, whilst bringing buildings back into use again. It is considered that the redevelopment of this site would have a positive impact upon the wider area.

In conclusion, the redevelopment site will be included within the Proposed Plan.

# Heiton

<b>Site reference</b> AHEIT003	<b>Site name</b> Sunlaws (Phase 2)	<b>Settlement</b> Heiton	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 42	<b>Ha</b> 7.3	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

There are no initial constraints on the site which would preclude it from being developed.

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. No objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. Due to the size of the development and the ditches running within and next to the site, surface water runoff would require to be considered.

SEPA: Require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourse which flows through/ adjacent to the site. Consideration will need to be given to any culverts/ bridges which may exacerbate flood risk. Majority of site is likely to be developable.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> 02/00972/FUL - Residential development of 82 dwellinghouses (Allowed on Appeal) 05/02057/FUL - Variation to planning previous consents 02/00972/FUL and 05/00737/FUL by removing footpath (Approved) 07/00694/FUL - Erection of 54 dwellinghouses (Withdrawn)
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Note: 02/00972/FUL and 05/02057/FUL also include additional land to the north-west of AHEIT003.

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Limited	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Limited	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGICAL OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate. Site appears to be improved grassland with an area of mature lowland mixed deciduous woodland and parkland habitat on the boundary. Site adjacent to an old curling pond. Potential for connectivity with River Tweed SAC/SSSI (River Teviot). Potential for EPS (bats). Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC. Protect mature woodland and parkland, safeguard curling pond and mitigation for protected species including potentially bats, badger and breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is not part of a settlement and so there are very limited services with walking distance and poor public transport links. The Main settlement of Kelso is nearby, where there are good services and employment opportunities. Allocations on rural sites such as this should not be encouraged. There is a moderate ecological impact.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Adjacent to site

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

On/adjacent to site

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY: There are no known archaeological issues.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Nearest part of the site lies within 200m of the category B listed former Sunlaws House and Stables (now The Roxburghe). Careful design and screening will be needed to avoid potential impact on the setting.

HES: No comments.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site has little relationship/integration with the nearby settlements of Heiton or Roxburgh. Any allocation here should be considered as an extension of the Sunlaws housing development as Sunlaws Phase 2 ( this is also the stated position of the proposer). It would be likely that this would then require a settlement boundary for Sunlaws encompassing the two phases of development.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: Potential issue with impacts of housing on views from the driveway to Sunlaws House but, from desk assessment, this appears to be screened by existing tree cover. There also appears to be a potential access point from the upgraded Sunlaws road into the site at the north east corner. The site is on a gentle hill crown so visibility from surrounding areas would need to be considered also. However, with care and good design, this site does look feasible. We should require suitable buffer zones to protect surrounding tree cover.

SNH: Seek reasonable alternative. The site could present significant and/ or adverse impacts on the natural heritage. Alternative sites may present less significant impacts and we recommend these are considered in advance of these sites.

We have a number of concerns in relation to this potential allocation. This is a site of distinctively rolling landform and it lies in proximity to Roxburghe House and its surrounding amenities. It is difficult to envisage development of this site without impacting on local landscape character and the visual amenity of the area. While these issues could in theory be reduced or mitigated through a carefully considered and detailed site development brief, we are at this stage uncertain of the likelihood for achieving successful development outcomes for this site through this process. We therefore advise that alternative sites should be considered.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: Main access road already improved and speed limit in place.

### Near a trunk road?

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Westbound bus stop improvement on A698

**Right of way**

Not applicable

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

Not applicable

**Water supply**

Yes

**Sewerage**

Yes

**Gas Supply**

No

**Education provision**

Good

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: No comment.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: 05/02057/FUL technically could be built as this approved layout without recourse to local plan or DM. Opportunity for a new layout placemaking and design / designing streets .

EDUCATION: No issues.

NHS: No comments.

SCOTTISH WATER: Waste: Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Water: Roberton WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. There is a watercourse along the north, east and south sides of this site. Opportunities should be taken to protect and enhance the watercourse which runs along the site boundary.

**Overall assessment****PP status**

Excluded

**Overall assessment**

Unacceptable

**Site capacity**

42

**Conclusions**

This is an isolated location for 42 units. There is little relation to the surrounding settlements, and Heiton and Roxburgh themselves are not very sustainable and accessible settlements. However, safe pedestrian connectivity is already provided to Heiton and a quiet cul de sac back road connects to Roxburgh. Also Heiton itself has been deemed suitable for an allocation in recent plans.

The existence of previous planning permissions and a masterplan related to a broader project in the area does not mean that this site should be allocated. However, there is a proven market for this type of development - as Sunlaws 1 demonstrates. The site is a distinctive rolling form of landscape but is broadly protected from surrounding viewpoints by virtue of this topography and by surrounding hedgerows and mature trees.

There are no physical constraints to development here. However, the site is detached from any settlement and is not therefore considered acceptable. It is therefore considered that site AHEIT003 will not be allocated within the Proposed Plan.

<b>Site reference</b> RHE2B	<b>Site name</b> Heiton Mains	<b>Settlement</b> Heiton	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 15	<b>Ha</b> 0.9	<b>PP status</b> Retain LDP Site
--------------------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------

## Initial assessment

**Floodrisk**      **SAC**      **SPA**      **SSSI**      **Ramsar**

### Initial assessment summary

The site is already allocated for the proposed use within the current Local Development Plan and it is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> 04/02167/OUT - Erection of thirty five dwellinghouses (Approved) - Note: this application also covers housing allocation RHE3B (Ladyrig).
--------------------------	------------	----------------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

**Access to public transport**      **Access to employment**      **Access to services**      **Wider biodiversity impacts**      **Site aspect**

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
--------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------------

### Local impact and integration summary

## Landscape assessment

**NSA**      **SLA**      **Over 200 metres?**       **Over 12 degree slope**       **Wild Land**

### Landscape summary

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

Right of way

TPOs

Contaminated land

Water supply

Sewerage

Gas Supply

Education provision

Planning & infrastructure summary

---

## Overall assessment

**PP status**

**Overall assessment**

**Site capacity**

Retain LDP Site

15

### Conclusions

The site is already allocated for the proposed use within the current Local Development Plan and it is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2.

---

<b>Site reference</b> RHE3B	<b>Site name</b> Ladyrig	<b>Settlement</b> Heiton	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 20	<b>Ha</b> 1.1	<b>PP status</b> Retain LDP Site
--------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------

## Initial assessment

**Floodrisk**      **SAC**      **SPA**      **SSSI**      **Ramsar**

### Initial assessment summary

The site is already allocated for the proposed use within the current Local Development Plan and it is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2.

## Background information

**Minerals and coal**    **NNR**      **Prime Quality Agricultural Land**    **Current use/s**    **Planning history references**

Greenfield      04/02167/OUT - Erection of thirty five dwellinghouses (Approved) - Note: this application also covers housing allocation RHE2B (Heiton Mains).

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

**Access to public transport**      **Access to employment**      **Access to services**      **Wider biodiversity impacts**      **Site aspect**

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

## Local impact and integration assessment

**Conservation area**    **Open space**    **Listed buildings**    **Scheduled Monument**    **Ancient woodland inventory**    **Archaeology**    **Garden and designed landscape**

### Local impact and integration summary

## Landscape assessment

**NSA**      **SLA**      **Over 200 metres?**       **Over 12 degree slope**       **Wild Land**

### Landscape summary

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

Right of way

TPOs

Contaminated land

Water supply

Sewerage

Gas Supply

Education provision

Planning & infrastructure summary

---

## Overall assessment

**PP status**

**Overall assessment**

**Site capacity**

Retain LDP Site

20

### Conclusions

The site is already allocated for the proposed use within the current Local Development Plan and it is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2.

---

# Hobkirk

<b>Site reference</b>	<b>Site name</b>	<b>Settlement</b>	<b>SDA</b>	<b>Proposed Use</b>	<b>Indicative Capacity</b>	<b>Ha</b>	<b>PP status</b>
RHOBK001	Site of Former Hobkirk Primary School	Hobkirk	Rest of Borders	Redevelopment	5	0.5	Excluded

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b>	<b>SAC</b>	<b>SPA</b>	<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
1:200	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

Flood Risk and Coastal Management: This site lies within the SEPA 1 in 200 year fluvial (river) flood extent. If this site is to be re-developed to residential property, a Flood Risk Assessment would require to be undertaken to assess whether the property is at risk and how to mitigate this risk. If this is to be a change of use to business use, the Officer would be unlikely to object.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency: SEPA require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Rule Water. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes SEPA would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at an increased risk of flooding. Site will likely be heavily constrained due to flood risk. There are water environment issues.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b>	<b>Planning history references</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Buildings	

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b>	<b>Access to employment</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b>	<b>Site aspect</b>
Poor	Poor	Limited	Moderate	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Old school building with slate roof and small number of broad-leaved trees adjacent to Rule water (River Tweed SAC). Potential for bat roosts (EPS) and breeding birds. Mitigation for protected species potentially including bats (loss of roosts and lighting), and breeding birds. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	On/adjacent to site	Not applicable

## Local impact and integration summary

Archaeology Officer: There is archaeological potential in the wider area. Some mitigation may be required for excavations into sub-soils.

Design & Heritage Officer: No specific heritage and design issues.

Historic Environment Scotland: No comments received.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

Landscape Architect: No response received.

Scottish Natural Heritage: No comment due to size and nature of site.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Network Management: No objections.

Passenger Transport: No objections.

Roads Planning: Would not be opposed to a small scale redevelopment of this site which reflects the rural nature of the site and the limited infrastructure available.

Transport Scotland: No objections.

Near a trunk road?

### Right of way

On/adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

On site

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

No

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

Contaminated Land Officer: The site appears to have been developed as a school. The site is brownfield land and its use may present development constraints

Countryside Ranger: Would request non-vehicular links along the entire roadside on the edge of this property on path link HOBK/81P. Separately the grounds include land used for public recreation. Other departments would comment regarding whether this is required to be available for public recreation in this area.

Development Management: No objections in principle.

Economic Development: No objections.

Education: No objections.

Estates Strategy: This school has now closed and been declared surplus and Estates support the inclusion of this site in the LDP.

---

Environmental Health: No objections.

Housing Strategy: No objections.

Scottish Water: There is no Waste Water Treatment Works within the vicinity. There is sufficient capacity at the Water Treatment Works (Roberton WOA). Scottish Water raise no major concerns although it would depend on anticipated water consumption.

Waste Management: No objections.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Doubtful	5

### Conclusions

Whilst the principle of the redevelopment of this site is considered to be acceptable, it is not considered appropriate to allocate a rural site of this nature, which is detached from any settlement and services. Issues relating to flooding and biodiversity would require to be investigated. The acceptability or otherwise of the site for redevelopment would be better explored through the process of a planning application.

---

# Jedburgh

<b>Site reference</b> AJEDB017	<b>Site name</b> Land east of Howdenburn Court	<b>Settlement</b> Jedburgh	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 15	<b>Ha</b> 0.8	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

There are no initial constraints on the site which would preclude it from being developed.

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

SEPA: Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues in this area. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Other	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no relevant planning history on the site.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> South
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	-----------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Low impact. Site appears to be rank neutral grassland with areas of scrub and remnant hedgerow and garden ground on the boundary. No obvious connectivity with River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the east of Howdenburn Court. It is approximately 500m east of Jedburgh town centre (direct measurement) where a range of local services, bus connections to the wider region, and employment opportunities exist. It is located within walking distance of the Hartrigge Park industrial area. Biodiversity impact is low.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

On site/adjacent to

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There are no known archaeological issues.

HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER: No specific comments.

HES: No comments.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Adjacent to site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: The northern part of the site has a width and depth that would allow development. Reflecting the density of adjacent housing to south and west this part of the site might accommodate 12/14 houses/ apartments. Given the topography and narrowness of site the narrow eastern wedge should not be developed but kept and as buffer between housing and adjacent countryside.

SNH: No comment due to size and location.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: Not clear where access road would be from.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: As always, the capacity of Oxnam Road to take additional traffic, without alternative access means, is a matter of concern. That said, this area of land is relatively small and effectively represents a missing link between the existing housing and the housing allocations RJ30B and RJ2B. I am therefore able to support this proposal however given the geometry of the site; it would be better served as part of/in conjunction with the adjoining sites rather than a stand-alone site. Pedestrian and cycle linkage would be required with Howden Park.

### Near a trunk road?

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Path link to housing development for non-vehicular access. To paths and roads in current application 16/01587/FUL to south to allow continued use of right of way BR259.

EDUCATION: no comments.

HOUSING STRATEGY: No comment - SHIP 2018 shows that there is development, by Eildon Housing Association at Howdenburn Dr programmed for 2019-2020.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Waste: Jedburgh WwTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the network. Water: Roberton WTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the network.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Acceptable	15

### Conclusions

The boundaries of this site have been extended and are now considered under AJEDB018. This proposal is therefore superseded and excluded.

---

<b>Site reference</b> AJEDB018	<b>Site name</b> Land east of Howdenburn Court II	<b>Settlement</b> Jedburgh	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 20	<b>Ha</b> 1.2	<b>PP status</b> Included
-----------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

There are no initial constraints on the site which would preclude it from being developed.

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is outwith both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. Due to the size of the development I'd recommend surface water runoff be considered.

SEPA: Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues in this area. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no relevant planning history on the site.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> South
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	-----------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Low impact. Site appears to be rank neutral grassland with areas of scrub and remnant hedgerow and garden ground on the boundary. No obvious connectivity with River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the east of Howdenburn Court. It is approximately 500m east of Jedburgh town centre (direct measurement) where a range of local services, bus connections to the wider region, and employment opportunities exist. It is located within walking distance of the Hartrigg Park industrial area. Biodiversity impact is low.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Not applicable	<b>Open space</b> On site/adjacent to	<b>Listed buildings</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> Not applicable
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

## Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There are no known archaeological issues.

HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER: From a built heritage perspective, there are designations either within or close to this site.

HES: Robust application of national and appropriate local policies should be able to mitigate any potential adverse impacts on heritage assets, and do not have any specific comments to offer. For those sites which are considered to be preferred or reasonable alternatives for allocation in LDP2, the environmental assessment should consider the likely effects and identify site specific mitigation where negative effects are identified.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Allocating this site could improve the integration and deliverability of existing LDP allocations. For this reason it would be a good idea to add this section to the overall development area at the east of Jedburgh. However, any allocation would have to integrate with, rather than necessarily be prioritised over, the existing allocations.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: The extended northern part of the site has a width and depth that would allow development. Reflecting the density of adjacent housing to south and west this part of the site might be accommodated up to 20 houses/ apartments.

SNH: Site appears to be infill between existing housing at Howdenburn Court and allocation RJ2B. The adopted Planning Brief for Lochend identifies pedestrian links between RJ2B and Howdenburn Court. These links should be designed into any allocation at AJEDB018. Design and landscape principles set out in the Planning Brief should be applied to this site.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: No comments.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments received.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: As always, the capacity of Oxnam Road to take additional traffic, without alternative access means, is a matter of concern. That said, this area of land is relatively small and effectively represents a missing link between the existing housing and the housing allocations RJ30B and RJ2B. I am therefore able to support this proposal however given the geometry of the site; it would be better served as part of/in conjunction with the adjoining sites rather than a stand-alone site. Pedestrian and cycle linkage would be required with Howden Park and Howdenburn Court.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Average

## Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: An area of the site appears to extend into a former refuse tip, the site also houses a former quarry which appears to have been infilled. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Path link to housing development for non-vehicular access. To paths and roads in current application 16/01587/FUL to south to allow continued use of right of way BR259. Also non-vehicular path link to recreational ground to North of area.

EDUCATION: No comments.

HOUSING STRATEGY: No comment - SHIP 2018 shows that there is development, by Eildon Housing Association at Howdenburn Dr programmed for 2019-2020.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Roberton WTW has sufficient capacity as does the water network. Jedburgh WwTW has sufficient capacity as does the waste network for foul only flows.

SEPA: Foul must connect to SW foul sewer network.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Included	Acceptable	20

### Conclusions

There are no constraints that rule out development. The site is currently disused agricultural land/scrubland/ unadopted paths crossing it. The site would have to be considered for the development with the adjoining allocated housing sites ref RJ30B and RJ2B. Vehicular access to the site would be required from one or both of these sites. The developer states that access/permeability will be greatly enhanced by the allocation, but this is debatable as the site is already used informally for movement around the area and for recreation.

The following issues will require to be considered:

- Surface water run-off would require to be considered
- Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds
- Contamination requires to be investigated
- Path link to housing development for non-vehicular access. To paths and roads in current application 16/01587/FUL to south to allow continued use of right of way BR259. Also non-vehicular path link to recreational ground to North of area.
- The site would be better served as part of/in conjunction with the adjoining sites rather than a stand-alone site. Pedestrian and cycle linkage would be required with Howden Park and Howdenburn Court.

This site requires vehicular access from one of the surrounding RJ30B or RJ2B sites. The site would offer the securing of pedestrian connectivity between RJ30B/RJ2B and the surrounding area. Housing and footpaths/open space would need to be considered in a revised masterplan.

Following the public consultation period on the Main Issues Report it is considered that this site should be taken forward into the Proposed Plan. The site is within the Jedburgh development boundary and is within the ownership of an active Registered Social Landlord.

---

<b>Site reference</b> RJ27D	<b>Site name</b> Wildcat Cleuch	<b>Settlement</b> Jedburgh	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 6	<b>Ha</b> 1.7	<b>PP status</b> Retain LDP Site
--------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------

---

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b>	<b>SAC</b>	<b>SPA</b>	<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
------------------	------------	------------	-------------	---------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site is already allocated for the proposed use within the current Local Development Plan and it is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2.

---

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no relevant planning history on the site.
--------------------------	------------	--------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

---

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b>	<b>Access to employment</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b>	<b>Site aspect</b>
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
--------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------------------	--------------------	------------------------------------------

### Local impact and integration summary

---

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
------------	------------	--------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	------------------

### Landscape summary

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

Right of way

TPOs

Contaminated land

Water supply

Sewerage

Gas Supply

Education provision

Planning & infrastructure summary

---

## Overall assessment

**PP status**

**Overall assessment**

**Site capacity**

Retain LDP Site

6

### Conclusions

The site is already allocated for the proposed use within the current Local Development Plan and it is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2.

---

<b>Site reference</b> RJ2B	<b>Site name</b> Lochend	<b>Settlement</b> Jedburgh	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 43	<b>Ha</b> 3.1	<b>PP status</b> Retain LDP Site
-------------------------------	-----------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------

---

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b>	<b>SAC</b>	<b>SPA</b>	<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
------------------	------------	------------	-------------	---------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site is already allocated for the proposed use within the current Local Development Plan and it is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2.

---

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no relevant planning history on the site.
--------------------------	------------	--------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

---

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b>	<b>Access to employment</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b>	<b>Site aspect</b>
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
--------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------------------	--------------------	------------------------------------------

### Local impact and integration summary

---

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
------------	------------	--------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	------------------

### Landscape summary

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

Right of way

TPOs

Contaminated land

Water supply

Sewerage

Gas Supply

Education provision

Planning & infrastructure summary

---

## Overall assessment

**PP status**

**Overall assessment**

**Site capacity**

Retain LDP Site

43

### Conclusions

The site is already allocated for the proposed use within the current Local Development Plan and it is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2.

---

**Site reference** **Site name** **Settlement** **SDA** **Proposed Use** **Indicative Capacity** **Ha** **PP status**  
RJ7B Annefield Jedburgh Central Housing 40 2.0 Retain LDP Site

---

## Initial assessment

**Floodrisk** **SAC** **SPA** **SSSI** **Ramsar**

Initial assessment summary

---

## Background information

**Minerals and coal** **NNR** **Prime Quality Agricultural Land** **Current use/s** **Planning history references**

---

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

**Access to public transport** **Access to employment** **Access to services** **Wider biodiversity impacts** **Site aspect**

Accessibility and sustainability summary

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

**Conservation area** **Open space** **Listed buildings** **Scheduled Monument** **Ancient woodland inventory** **Archaeology** **Garden and designed landscape**

Local impact and integration summary

---

## Landscape assessment

**NSA** **SLA** **Over 200 metres?**  **Over 12 degree slope**  **Wild Land**

Landscape summary

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

Right of way

TPOs

Contaminated land

Water supply

Sewerage

Gas Supply

Education provision

Planning & infrastructure summary

---

## Overall assessment

**PP status**

**Overall assessment**

**Site capacity**

Retain LDP Site

40

### Conclusions

The site is already allocated for the proposed use within the current Local Development Plan and it is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2.

---

<b>Site reference</b> MJEDB002	<b>Site name</b> Land east of Hartrigge Park	<b>Settlement</b> Jedburgh	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Mixed Use	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> N/A	<b>Ha</b> 27.3	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

There are no initial constraints on the site which would preclude it from being developed.

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is in places within the 1 in 200 year surface water flood extent. No objections on the grounds of flood risk however due to the size of the development would require that surface water and SUDS is considered.

SEPA: Require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Tower Burn and tributaries that flow through/ adjacent to the site. Consideration will need to be given to any culverts/ bridges which may exacerbate flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map and steep topography indicates that there may be flooding issues adjacent to this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed development is not affected by surface runoff.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> 97/00156/FUL - Erection of 4 poultry units and office block (Approved) 99/00316/FUL - Erection of dwellinghouse (Approved)
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Limited	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Major	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
----------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: No comments received.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the north east of Jedburgh to the east of existing industrial uses. There has been some development of housing land allocations southwest of the site. The site is more than 800m from Jedburgh town centre, at its closest point. Jedburgh is a Main Settlement. There are currently no bus services within an easy walking distance of the site. Established deciduous and coniferous tree plantations making up around half the site area.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Adjacent to site

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

On site

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There is some potential within this site. The northern area is located near the former Hartrigge House, steading and walled garden. This area was known in the 18th century as Stewartfield, and a small farm or 'ferm toon' existed nearby. Prior to this, it seems, there was a tower-house in the area and the burn nearby still retains the name Tower Burn. The location of the tower is unknown, but it could have existed in the site. Some mitigation may be required.

HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER: No comments.

HES: No comments.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Developing this site would mean a significant shift north-east in the development pattern of Jedburgh and would come at the expense of existing better located sites.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: No comments received.

SNH: No comments received.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Existing roads infrastructure is limited – single track road with passing places. Access onto A68 would also need to be improved if significant numbers proposed as current left turn in and right turn out involve an acute turn.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: This represents a considerable extension of Business and Industrial Site BJEDB001 for a mixed use proposal and I am unable to support this allocation due to the limitations of Oxnam Road. Oxnam Road is a third class road which operates to a large extent as a cul-de-sac and is relatively steep in parts. It already serves more than would be expected for this standard of road. I am concerned that this site is too remote and detached from the rest of the town and would offer little scope for integration with the existing street network.

There may be scope in the future for a limited extent of development on part of this site and for means of vehicular access to be not only via the existing industrial road off Oxnam Road, but also via Hartrigge Park and the new road to serve the intergenerational learning campus. This could allow better street connectivity and dispersion of traffic. In summary, I am unable to support such an extensive allocation in this location at this time.

**Right of way**

Not applicable

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

Not applicable

**Water supply**

Yes

**Sewerage**

Yes

**Gas Supply**

No

**Education provision**

Average

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

**CONTAMINATED LAND:** The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. A sheepwash and poultry farm are present immediately adjacent to the site boundary however there is no indication these extended into the subject site. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

**COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM:** Core path 101 and Core path 107 and right of way / promoted paths and existing informal pathways within and adjacent to site. Scope to upgrade footways for walkers cyclists and horse riders. Routes include Jedburgh Circular riding route and link routes. Full path appraisal and coordinated path planning required to provide suitable accommodation of existing paths and take opportunity to provide path links and footway links – to be done in combination with planning for other land to East of site at Hartrigge Park.

**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT:** Amenity concerns with poultry sheds.

**EDUCATION:** No comments

**NHS:** No comments received.

**SCOTTISH WATER:** Waste: Jedburgh WwTW has sufficient capacity. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Water: Robertson WTW has sufficient capacity. Please note there is a 2" water main through site. Depending flow demand will determine if further investigation required.

**SEPA:** Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. It is not clear whether this is a proposal for housing or other type of development. The site appears to cross the Tower burn at the northern end. Opportunities should be taken to protect and enhance the watercourse. There should be no culverting for land gain. It should be noted that the development appears to surround existing poultry units. These are not regulated by SEPA but could give rise to dust, PM10s and odour.

**Overall assessment****PP status**

Excluded

**Overall assessment**

Doubtful

**Site capacity**

N/A

**Conclusions**

There is no requirement for allocations for housing and/or business and industrial land on this scale in Jedburgh.

An allocation at this site - at this scale - cannot be supported by SB Roads. The site is also within Hartrigge Designed Landscape area and the Alison Grant landscape assessment notes a 'constraint': 'Remnant Policies and Fringe Farmland'; Physical and perceptual distance from the existing settlement'. Around half the site is made up of long-established deciduous tree plantations and these would need to be retained. This leaves around half the site developable. However the site is detached from Jedburgh and there would be limited scope for integration.

The site might be suitable for future business and industrial land in Jedburgh. At present it is likely to be the case that there is a plentiful supply of such land in the town so no such allocation is required. As a housing site it is unsuitable for a number of reasons. First, there is a generous supply of housing land in Jedburgh on sites that are far better located. Second the site is too isolated and detached from the current settlement. Third, it is surrounded by industrial use and actually includes a poultry use - which is a very unsuitable neighbouring development. Fourth, the site contains a significant amount of deciduous woodland which would need to be retained and this makes the site quite a difficult future development area.

Depending on the situation in terms of employment land supply, part of the site could be suitable for a future employment allocation. There is no need for a housing allocation here as there are better sites available. Therefore, site MJEDB002 will not be included within the Proposed LDP.

<b>Site reference</b> MJEDB003	<b>Site name</b> Land at Edinburgh Road	<b>Settlement</b> Jedburgh	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Mixed Use	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> N/A	<b>Ha</b> 0.4	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Adjacent to site	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

SEPA: There is a water body immediately adjacent to the site. Therefore, SEPA advise that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

The site is within the public foul sewer network and hence must connect to the public foul sewer. The site is also immediately adjacent to the Jed water so care must be taken that any development does not impact on the watercourse. Depending on the intended future use of the site certain activities/ industrial type processes may require additional permissions from SEPA to operate. A surface water hazard has been identified at the site.

According to SEPA records this site includes or is immediately adjacent to a baseline waterbody (Jed Water (waterbody 5231) – MODERATE status).

As the area is at significant flood risk, it is essential that any new development will have a neutral impact on flood risk. We would only support redevelopment of a similar use in line with our land use vulnerability guidance. The FRA is required to inform the area of redevelopment, type of development, finished floor levels and ensure that the development has a neutral impact on flood risk. Furthermore flood resilient and resistant materials should be used. Site will likely be heavily constrained as a result. Consider removing from the LDP.

SBC FLOOD TEAM: This site is located within SEPA's 1:200 year flood map and is at risk of flooding from the Jed Water. We would require that a Flood Risk Assessment is undertaken to allow us to fully assess the flood risk of the site.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> On/Adjacent to site	<b>Current use/s</b> Buildings	<b>Planning history references</b> 10/01201/PPP - Erection of retail foodstore with associated parking and access infrastructure (Refused) 11/01455/PPP - Erection of retail foodstore with associated parking and access infrastructure (Refused) 11/01121/PPP - Erection of retail foodstore with petrol filling station, associated parking and access road (Refused)
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No comments received.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

On site/adjacent to

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE AND DESIGN: No specific Heritage and Design issues.

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: Nothing known.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: No comments.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SNH: Principle of development here is established in the LDP. No comment on proposed change of use.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: I have no objections to this site being allocated for mixed use development. The private access road from the A68 may have to be upgraded to an adoptable standard depending on the type of development proposed. Given the proximity of the site to the A68, Transport Scotland should be consulted regarding any development. A Transport Assessment, or Transport Statement, dependant on the level of development, may be required.

ROAD NETWORK MANAGER: No observations.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No comments.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: We do not support this as a mixed use site, especially if it includes housing. At present the site is prone to flooding, but it is also surrounded with other employment uses and we can only support continuation of its existing zoning.

EDUCATION: No issues raised regarding the proposal.

SCOTTISH WATER (WASTE): Sufficient capacity.

SCOTTISH WATER (WATER): No real concerns however it would depend on anticipated water consumption.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Core path 107 is on the existing riverside pathway beyond the fence on the edge of this location and continuing beyond. Should be taken into account when assessing vehicle access.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have been developed as a railway sidings and a factory. The site is brownfield land and its use may present development constraints.

WASTE MANAGEMENT: No comments.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

PROJECTS MANAGER: No comments.

---

## Overall assessment

### PP status

Excluded

### Overall assessment

Acceptable

### Site capacity

N/A

### Conclusions

This site was submitted as part of the Main Issues Report consultation process. The site is allocated as a business and industrial safeguarded site within the existing Local Development Plan. The site is within the Jedburgh Development Boundary and sits alongside the A68 trunk road. The site was previously used as a factory and the building remains on site and is currently in use as a garage.

This proposal seeks to change the status of the site from a safeguarded business and industrial site to a mixed use allocation. There is a significant supply of business and industrial land within Jedburgh which is immediately available and free of constraints. The Economic Development Team would not be supportive of any housing as part of a mixed use allocation as the existing surrounding land uses are established business and industrial uses.

The Roads Planning Team state that given the proximity of the site to the A68, Transport Scotland should be consulted regarding any development. A Transport Assessment, or Transport Statement, dependant on the level of development, may be required.

SEPA have also stated that as the area is at significant flood risk, it is essential that any new development will have a neutral impact on flood risk. SEPA would only support redevelopment of a similar use in line with their land use vulnerability guidance.

The proposed changes to Policy ED1: Protection of Business and Industrial Land will allow for Use Classes 4, 5 and 6 on a site such as this. The updated policy recognises that there may be circumstances whereby ancillary uses could be supported within both categories if it enhances the quality of the estate as an employment location and is specifically intended to support and provide services for those working there. In the case of business and industrial land as well as the aforesaid ancillary uses, uses other than Class 4, 5 and 6 may be considered if certain tests are met. Proposals other than Class 4, 5 and 6 would require to be assessed to establish first and foremost if suitable alternative sites are available.

This site is within an established industrial estate and through the revision of Policy ED1 a wider range of uses will be permitted on sites such as this. There are a number of mixed use sites identified within the Proposed Plan however it is not felt that there is justification for changing this allocation from business and industrial safeguarding to a mixed use allocation. The proposal can be tested via the planning application process. Therefore the site will not be included within the Proposed LDP.

---

<b>Site reference</b> RJEDB003	<b>Site name</b> Howdenburn Primary School	<b>Settlement</b> Jedburgh	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Redevelopment	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> N/A	<b>Ha</b> 2.2	<b>PP status</b> Included
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

There are no initial constraints on the site which would preclude it from being developed.

SEPA: We have reviewed historic maps and cannot find any evidence of a small watercourse. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues in this area. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.

Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. It is not clear whether this is a proposal for housing or other type of development.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: Small sections of the site lie within the surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. However, due to the potential size of the development I'd require surface water runoff be considered.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Combination	<b>Planning history references</b> No relevant planning history on the site.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> South-west
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate. Site includes school buildings, amenity grassland, small number of trees and garden ground. Potential for EPS (bats) and breeding birds. Mitigation for protected species including potentially bats and breeding birds.

SNH: No comment

GENERAL COMMENTS: Moderate biodiversity risk that can be mitigated. This is a well located site in terms of connectivity with the town of Jedburgh and the facilities it offers. It is a brownfield site which is located within an existing neighbourhood. It is within walking distance of the town centre, with local service bus stops within the neighbourhood.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

On site/adjacent to

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Adjacent to site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: The site is within a predominantly two storey maximum residential area. There is scope for redevelopment but scale and massing will be important and a development brief should be agreed.

ARCHAEOLOGY: The site is on the edge of a suspected Moot Hill (Doom Hill) where external courts, parliaments and executions took place. Archaeological evidence for related activities may extend into the site. Some mitigation may be required.

HES: No comments.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Redevelopment would replace Howdenburn School with predominantly residential use. The surrounding neighbourhood has the type of facilities required of an existing community and so new development could integrate quite easily. Development would have to carefully ensure that the loss of open space and green space associated with the school use is minimised and that building heights and massing respect the surrounding neighbourhood.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No comments

SNH: No comment due to size and location.

GENERAL COMMENTS: This is a brownfield site where a primary school is already located and so, compared to greenfield sites, there is scope to minimise the landscape impact of development overall. While it is also surrounded by existing development, the site is quite exposed and in a fairly prominent position sitting above neighbouring residential developments on its western side. Landscape impact will have to be mitigated and some planting/ screening would offer benefits of site integration, wind protection and landscaping mitigation.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

I have no objections to the redevelopment of this site.

Access to Howdenburn Drive is readily available and the development layout should include a strong street frontage onto this road. Good internal street connectivity will be required.

A pedestrian link between the north western corner of the site and the end of Grieve Avenue will need to be explored as this would help integrate the development site with the existing street network.

All of the traffic signage, road markings, speed control etc. associated with the existing school would need to be removed or at least be adjusted to suit a school no longer being present.

A Transport Statement will be required to address accessibility and sustainable travel.

**Right of way**

Not applicable

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

On site

**Water supply**

Yes

**Sewerage**

Yes

**Gas Supply**

Yes

**Education provision**

Good

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Opportunity for mixed used /supermarket/ tertiary industry. Scale must be cognisant of town centre.

EDUCATION: No issues raised regarding the proposal.

NETWORK MANAGER: Increased pressure on Oxnam Road.

SCOTTISH WATER - WASTE: Jedburgh WwTW has sufficient capacity. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER - WATER: Robertson WTW has sufficient capacity. Depending flow demand will determine if further investigation required

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Scope to include recreational link path through site as part compensation for part loss of recreational open space.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site is developed as a school. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ESTATES TEAM: This site will be closed as a primary school from April 2020. In advance of this the site is being advertised for sale and Estates support the inclusion of this site in the LDP2.

GENERAL COMMENTS: As a functioning primary school and playing fields this currently provides an important neighbourhood function for the south of Jedburgh. Primary school provision is set to move to Jedburgh intergenerational community campus which is within walking distance of the site. There are no planning and infrastructure issues which rule out redevelopment of the site, at this point, but that would depend on the site's final end-use. A residential reuse would appear most appropriate at this stage and so it is within this framework that the site has been assessed.

**Overall assessment****PP status**

Included

**Overall assessment**

Commended

**Site capacity**

N/A

**Conclusions**

In line with a brownfield-first strategy, the site should be given as much policy support as possible. There are no constraints on this site. As such, the site was included as a Preferred redevelopment opportunity within the Main Issues Report.

The site is quite exposed but is partly developed and is surrounded by residential development, so there is a clear precedent for development here. Development would lead to a loss of amenity in terms of a reduction in the amount of greenspace that is currently on site. New development would have to be at a suitable scale in order to integrate with the surrounding housing areas and would need to retain a suitable portion of the greenspace.

Following the public consultation period on the Main Issues Report it is considered appropriate to take forward this site for inclusion in the Proposed Plan. The site is currently being marketed by Scottish Borders Council as the Primary School is due to be vacated in Autumn 2020.

<b>Site reference</b> RJEDB004	<b>Site name</b> Parkside Primary School	<b>Settlement</b> Jedburgh	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Redevelopment	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> N/A	<b>Ha</b> 0.6	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

There are no initial constraints on the site which would preclude it from being developed.

SEPA: We have reviewed historic maps and cannot find any evidence of a small watercourse. Site is sufficiently elevated above the Jed Water. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues in this area. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.

Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. It is not clear whether this is a proposal for housing or other type of development.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: Small sections of the site lie within the surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. However, due to the potential size of the development I'd require surface water runoff be considered.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Combination	<b>Planning history references</b> No relevant planning history on the site.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate. Site includes School buildings and hard surfaces, adjacent to garden ground. Proximity to River Tweed SAC (Jed Water) but no obvious drainage connectivity. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC. Potential for EPS (bats) (although none found in recent IGC surveys) and breeding birds. Mitigation for protected species including potentially bats and breeding birds

SNH: No comments.

GENERAL COMMENTS: This is a well located site in terms of connectivity with the town of Jedburgh and the facilities it offers. It is within easy walking distance of the planned intergenerational campus at Hartrigge Hill. It is a brownfield site which is located within an existing neighbourhood. It is within walking distance of the town centre and there are local service bus stops serving the neighbourhood. Biodiversity risk is moderate, primarily due to the potential for EPC and breeding birds in existing buildings. If development land is sought for car-parking for the new intergenerational campus, then this would be a suitable brownfield site. However, it would also be a suitable site for housing redevelopment.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: The site is just outside the Conservation Area within a predominantly two storey maximum residential area. There is scope for redevelopment but scale and massing will be important and a development brief should be agreed.

ARCHAEOLOGY: There are no known archaeological issues.

HES: No comments.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is quite tucked away, sheltered from the south by large well established deciduous trees and from the north by the lip of Forthill which overlooks the town. It is surrounded by existing development. Residential development would quite easily integrate with the surrounding neighbourhood. Use as a car park and access for the intergenerational campus would be suitable. Use for access specifically is harder to judge without specific routes identified.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No comment.

SNH: No comment due to size and location.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

ROADS PLANNING SERVICE:

This site is included as parking and access for the proposed new Jedburgh Intergenerational Campus, currently under consideration. That said, I would have no objections to the site being allocated as a redevelopment site.

All of the traffic signage, road markings, speed control etc. associated with the existing school would need to be removed or at least be adjusted to suit a school no longer being present.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

On site

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Site to be used for intergenerational campus parking.

EDUCATION: No issues raised regarding the proposal.

NETWORK MANAGER: No comments.

SCOTTISH WATER - WASTE: Jedburgh WWTW has sufficient capacity. Please note there is a Sewer within site. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER - WATER: Robertson WTW has sufficient capacity. Depending flow demand will determine if further investigation required

STRATEGIC TRANSPORT:

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Core path 101 and Core path 107 and right of way to South of site. Scope to upgrade footways for walkers, cyclists and horse riders. Routes 101 and 107 are Jedburgh Circular riding route and link route from Canongate Bridge.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site is developed as a school. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES:

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH:

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

---

## Overall assessment

### PP status

Excluded

### Overall assessment

Commended

### Site capacity

N/A

### Conclusions

The site is relatively well contained, nestled behind established deciduous trees and a small hilltop. The site could accommodate development but should recognise the surrounding uses. This is a brownfield site and an allocation for redevelopment would further encourage its redevelopment.

There have been suggested uses at this point. Redevelopment for car parking for the intergenerational campus and residential use both supported by the Roads Planning Team. Either use could be accommodated and there are no significant constraints.

Following the Main Issues Report consultation process it is considered that this site should not be included within the Proposed Local Development Plan as a redevelopment opportunity. It is intended that the site will be used to provide access and a parking area for the new intergenerational campus within the town. The site is included within planning application 17/01363/FUL which has an anticipated completion of Spring 2020.

<b>Site reference</b> RJEDB005	<b>Site name</b> Former Tennis Court/Ski Slope	<b>Settlement</b> Jedburgh	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Redevelopment	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> N/A	<b>Ha</b> 1.3	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Adjacent to site	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

There are constraints on the site which may affect the future developed of the site.

SEPA: Redevelopment is noted as the land use type. We would not support development where there is an increase in vulnerability at this site. For other uses, we require an FRA which assesses the flood risk from the Jed Water, Skiprunning Burn, and small watercourses which flow through/ adjacent to the site. The flood risk is very complex at this location. Consideration should be given to any upstream and downstream structures and culverts which may exacerbate flood risk. It is important to consider sensitivity of use in line with our land use vulnerability guidance. Site will be heavily constrained due to flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues in this area. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Given clear risk to site, the most sustainable solution here would be to revert this area to open space.

Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. It is not clear whether this is a proposal for housing or other type of development. The site adjoins the Jed water on the northern edge. Opportunities should be taken to protect and enhance the Jed water as part of any development.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site lies within the 1 in 200 year flood extent for the Jed Water. I would require a Flood Risk Assessment for this site. SBC has undertaken a recent FRA in this area so much of this information could potentially be used.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Combination	<b>Planning history references</b> There have been various planning applications for alterations to the sports facilities. None of these are relevant to the potential redevelopment of the sites.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> South
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	-----------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate. Site includes School buildings and hard surfaces, small number of trees in site and trees and Jed water on boundary and adjacent to garden ground. Potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC (Jed water) and large part of site in SEPA 1 in 200 year flood risk. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC. Potential for EPS (bats) and breeding birds. Mitigation for protected species including potentially bats and breeding birds.

SNH: No comments.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Flood risk covers the developable area of the site. This has implications for Jed Water and River Tweed SAC. Other parts of the site should not be developed because of ecological impact. These constraints severely restrict the type of redevelopment that could take place here.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
Adjacent to site	On site	On/adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	On site	Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: The site lies outside the conservation area and now after the recent review by HES no longer contains any listed buildings. The site is sensitive being alongside the category A listed church and a development brief should be agreed for the site. Scale, mapping and edge treatment of the site will be important issues.

ARCHAEOLOGY: There is some potential within the site. While the bulk of the site has been developed, there may be pockets of surviving archaeology related to medieval and post-medieval activity on the site. In particular, the current school was preceded by a cottage, steading and orchard of likely 18th century date. Elements of this may survive. It is also likely that the Anna saw some use during the medieval period. Some mitigation may be required.

HES: Site includes LB35537 Jedburgh Grammar School (C listed). Site within Jedburgh CA - We are content with the principle of development here (and on the adjacent site RJEDB006). The policy presumption is for the retention and conversion of the listed building. We would also be happy to provide advice on the unlisted buildings in terms of their contribution to the character of Jedburgh Conservation Area.

GENERAL COMMENTS: There are numerous issues but none of these are insurmountable. However, in terms of integration with the settlement, it should be remembered that while this is a well located site and there is a plan to replace sports facilities (not yet defined), the redevelopment of the site still involves the loss (without replacement) of the Jedburgh dry ski slope and the loss of centrally located tennis courts on land which has limited scope for uses due to flood risks. The local impact is likely, therefore, to be negative.

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable			Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No comments.

SNH: No comment due to size and location.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

<b>Physical access/road capacity</b>	<b>Near a trunk road?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------

ROADS PLANNING: I have no objections to the redevelopment of this site. The site is well located in terms of sustainable transport. Access to the site must come from the Pleasance, as no access is available onto Sharplaw Road due to the difference in level.

All of the traffic signage, road markings, speed control etc. associated with the existing school would need to be removed or at least be adjusted to suit a school no longer being present.

**Right of way**

Not applicable

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

On site

**Water supply**

Yes

**Sewerage**

Yes

**Gas Supply**

Yes

**Education provision**

Good

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Flooding and course of Skiprunning burn culvert require cognisance.

EDUCATION: No issues raised regarding the proposal.

NETWORK MANAGER: No comments.

SCOTTISH WATER - WASTE: Jedburgh WwTW has sufficient capacity. Please note there is a Sewer within site. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER - WATER: Robertson WTW has sufficient capacity. Depending flow demand will determine if further investigation required.

STRATEGIC TRANSPORT:

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Scope to include a section of footway for use by public that includes access to river edge view and section of riverside path.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site is developed as a school. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES:

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH:

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ESTATES TEAM: A consultation event has been held in Jedburgh where the Community were advised that the Council will undertake a feasibility study to look at redevelopment options for the site. Estates support the inclusion of this site in the LDP2.

**Overall assessment****PP status**

Excluded

**Overall assessment**

Acceptable

**Site capacity**

N/A

**Conclusions**

Redevelopment for housing is classed as doubtful overall. Its location, adjacent the Jed Water, leaves around half the site affected by 1:200 flood risk and a smaller part of the site is constrained by slope gradient. This only leaves a relatively small proportion of the site as developable for many uses.

The land could revert to white land, and be considered for appropriate infill development, rather than forming a specific redevelopment allocation for housing.

Following the Main Issues Report consultation process it is considered that this site should not be included within the Proposed Local Development Plan as a redevelopment opportunity. Comments from SEPA state 'the site would be heavily constrained due to flood risk and due to the clear risk the most sustainable solution would be to revert the site back to open space'. However, it is still considered that this site could be developed for a range of uses which is still achievable through the development management process if the site is not formally allocated as the site is within the Jedburgh development boundary.

Taking the above into consideration, site RJEDB005 will not be included within the Proposed LDP.

---

<b>Site reference</b> RJEDB006	<b>Site name</b> Jedburgh Grammar School	<b>Settlement</b> Jedburgh	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Redevelopment	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> N/A	<b>Ha</b> 0.8	<b>PP status</b> Included
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

There are constraints on the site which may affect the future developed of the site.

SEPA: Redevelopment is noted as the land use type. We require an FRA which assesses the flood risk from the Jed Water, Skiprunning Burn, and small watercourses which flow through/ adjacent to the site. The flood risk is complex at this location. Consideration should be given to any upstream and downstream structures and culverts which may exacerbate flood risk. It is important to consider sensitivity of use in line with our land use vulnerability guidance. Site will be constrained due to flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues in this area. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.

Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. It is not clear whether this is a proposal for housing or other type of development. It appears that Meikle cleugh may be culverted through this development site. Opportunities should be taken to de-culvert this as part of any development.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. Due to the size of the development I'd recommend surface water runoff be considered. If "RJEDB005" and "RJEDB007" progresses it would be prudent to undertake a joint FRA for both sites to ensure any surface water runoff is highlighted.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Buildings	<b>Planning history references</b> Planning history relating to school uses.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate. Site includes School buildings and hard surfaces, small number of trees in site and trees and Jed water on boundary and adjacent to garden ground. Proximity to River Tweed SAC (Jed water) but no obvious drainage connectivity. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC. Potential for EPS (bats) and breeding birds. Mitigation for protected species including potentially bats and breeding birds.

SNH: No comments.

GENERAL COMMENTS: This is a suitable site for redevelopment in terms of accessibility and sustainability. It occupies a well located and well connected site in the centre of Jedburgh which could be redeveloped sympathetically. There is a moderate biodiversity risk associated with the potential for surface water flooding (River Tweed SAC) and potential for EPS.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
On site	Not applicable	On site	Not applicable	Not applicable	On site	Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: There is scope for redevelopment of this site once the existing Grammar School becomes redundant. HES has recently reviewed the listing of the grammar school and this has been regraded as category C and the extent of the listing has also been reduced to cover the old part of the original school building and the gatepiers only. The site lies wholly within the conservation area and any redevelopment should be guided by a development brief. The scale and massing of the buildings and the edge treatment of the site in particular are important issues.

ARCHAEOLOGY: There is potential for archaeology within the site boundary. The site was formerly occupied by a medieval hospital called the Maison Dieu. This gave a name to a later house to occupy the site. While there has been extensive re-development since the late 19th century, pockets of archaeological deposits may still exist. Mitigation is likely to be required.

HES: Site includes LB35537 Jedburgh Grammar School (C listed). Site within Jedburgh CA - We are content with the principle of development here (and on the adjacent site RJEDB005). The policy presumption is for the retention and conversion of the listed building. We would also be happy to provide advice on the unlisted buildings in terms of their contribution to the character of Jedburgh Conservation Area.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is well located for redevelopment. It is located within a conservation area with a mix of buildings. The retention of the C Listed Grammar School and Rector's House would be strongly encouraged as part of any development. With careful attention to retention, and new design, this site offers a good opportunity for redevelopment that is well located and contributes to the amenity of Jedburgh.

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable			Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No comments.

SNH: No comment due to size and location.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

<b>Physical access/road capacity</b>	<b>Near a trunk road?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------

ROADS PLANNING SERVICE: I have no objections to the redevelopment of this site. The site is well located in terms of sustainable transport and there are opportunities for multiple access points.

All of the traffic signage, road markings, speed control etc. associated with the existing school would need to be removed or at least be adjusted to suit a school no longer being present.

<b>Right of way</b>	<b>TPOs</b>	<b>Contaminated land</b>	<b>Water supply</b>	<b>Sewerage</b>	<b>Gas Supply</b>	<b>Education provision</b>
Not applicable	On site	On site	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Listed school for conversion, including gates and piers.

EDUCATION: No issues raised regarding the proposal.

NETWORK MANAGER: No comments.

SCOTTISH WATER - WASTE: Jedburgh WwTW has sufficient capacity. Please note there is a Sewer within site. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER - WATER: Robertson WTW has sufficient capacity. Depending flow demand will determine if further investigation required.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: No comment.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site is developed as a school. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ESTATES TEAM: A consultation event has been held in Jedburgh where the Community were advised that the Council will undertake a feasibility study to look at redevelopment options for the site. Estates support the inclusion of this site in the LDP2.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Included	Commended	N/A

### Conclusions

The site should be allocated as a specific redevelopment opportunity that incorporates the retention and reuse of the C listed school building and school house, the loss of which would have a detrimental impact on Jedburgh. Wider development in the site would need to fit with the Conservation Area status which covers the site. The site is very well located in terms of accessibility, sustainability and local impact and integration. There are no planning or infrastructure issues which preclude development. There is a potential issue with development viability which arises from the need to retain the listed buildings within a location where the market has been subdued in recent years.

Following the public consultation period on the Main Issues Report it is considered appropriate to take forward this site for inclusion in the Proposed Plan as a redevelopment allocation.

---

<b>Site reference</b> RJEDB007	<b>Site name</b> The Anna II	<b>Settlement</b> Jedburgh	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Redevelopment	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> N/A	<b>Ha</b> 0.1	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Adjacent to site	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

There are constraints on the site which may affect the future developed of the site.

SEPA: Redevelopment is noted as the land use type. We would not support development where there is an increase in vulnerability at this site. For other uses, we require an FRA which assesses the flood risk from the Jed Water, Skiprunning Burn, and small watercourses which flow through/ adjacent to the site. The flood risk is very complex at this location. Consideration should be given to any upstream and downstream structures and culverts which may exacerbate flood risk. It is important to consider sensitivity of use in line with our land use vulnerability guidance. Site will be heavily constrained due to flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues in this area. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Given clear risk to site, the most sustainable solution here would be to revert this area to open space.

Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. It is not clear whether this is a proposal for housing or other type of development. The site is close to the Jed water - care should be taken to protect the watercourse during development.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site lies within the 1 in 200 year flood extent for the Jed Water. I would require a Flood Risk Assessment for this site. SBC has undertaken a recent FRA in this area so much of this information could potentially be used.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b> Brownfield	<b>Planning history references</b> 96/00810/FUL - Temporary car park use  07/01495/FUL - Erection of broadband dish, equipment cabin and fencing (unclear if this would need to be retained on site or if it serves the sports complex)
--------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------	------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate. Site includes small built structure, hard surfaces, riparian trees immediately adjacent to Jed water and adjacent to garden ground. Potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC (Jed water) and all of site in SEPA 1 in 200 year flood risk. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC. Potential for EPS (bats) and breeding birds. Mitigation for protected species including potentially bats and breeding birds.

SNH: No comments.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Adjacent to site

### Open space

### Listed buildings

### Scheduled Monument

### Ancient woodland inventory

### Archaeology

On site

### Garden and designed landscape

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Currently outwith the conservation area. There is some scope for redevelopment.

ARCHAEOLOGY: This is the former site of a 19th century gas works and tannery. In addition to the likelihood of contaminated land, both complexes will have left an archaeological trace. The tannery in particular is potentially much older and buried tanning vats could contain well-preserved materials. Mitigation is likely.

HES: No comments.

GENERAL COMMENTS:

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No comments

SNH: No comment due to size and location.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

ROADS PLANNING SERVICE: I have no objections to the redevelopment of this site. The site is well located in terms of sustainable transport. The access lane to the site, which is outwith the site boundary, will require to be upgraded to an adoptable standard should more than 4 residential properties be proposed (5 if the number of dwellinghouses permitted off a private access is increased from 4 to 5, in line with the National Roads Development Guide, through the LDP process). This site would benefit from being developed at the same time as RJEDB005.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

On site

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Flooding – Skiprunning burn culvert issues.

EDUCATION: No comments.

NETWORK MANAGER: No comments.

SCOTTISH WATER - WASTE: Jedburgh WwTW has sufficient capacity. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER - WATER: Roberton WTW has sufficient capacity. Depending flow demand will determine if further investigation required.

STRATEGIC TRANSPORT:

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Scope to include a section of footway for use by public that includes section of riverside path.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site was developed as a gasworks and was subsequently developed as a depot. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES:

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH:

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

---

## Overall assessment

### PP status

Excluded

### Overall assessment

Acceptable

### Site capacity

N/A

### Conclusions

This site forms part of RJEDB001. This site came through as part of the schools review in Jedburgh along with other potential redevelopment sites. However, given that the site forms part of an existing Redevelopment allocation within the current Local Development Plan, it is the intention of the Council to retain site RJEDB001 within the Local Development Plan 2.

---

# Kelso

---

<b>Site reference</b> BKELS006	<b>Site name</b> Wooden Linn II	<b>Settlement</b> Kelso	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Employment	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> N/A	<b>Ha</b> 17.1	<b>PP status</b> Included
-----------------------------------	------------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------	------------------------------

---

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Woodend Burn and tributary. Consideration should be given to any culverts/bridges which may exacerbate flood risk. Due to the steepness of the site we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at an increased risk of flooding.

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site lies within the SEPA's 1 in 200 year pluvial (surface water) flood extent.

There is a small ditch that runs along the North Western border of the site and may flood along that border. Any flood risk from this ditch should be considered within any application for this site.

If the applicant cannot suitably show there is no flood risk to buildings on the site from this ditch/ burn then a FRA may be required.

Please note that the adjacent new industrial development has been affected by sewer flooding – it is unknown whether this is due to poor drainage installation or lack of maintenance. Foul water would have to be suitably planned before any proposal was approved.

---

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> On site	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b>
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------

---

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> South
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	-----------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No comments received.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the south of Kelso and there is a bus route which passes the site and goes into the town centre. Within Kelso there are a range of services and shops

---

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Adjacent to site

### Garden and designed landscape

Adjacent to site

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: Nothing known, but given number of known sites and find-spots in the area we would want some evaluation of the site.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: There are no listed buildings either within the site or nearby that may have their setting impacted by the inclusion of this site. It lies well outside the Kelso Conservation Area.

The proposed site does encompass two complete fields with hedgerows which help to form a boundary. The inclusion of the site would obviously extend the start of the “built up area” of Kelso and therefore the boundary treatment, especially to the south will be important to help make the transition between open countryside and the new development.

HES: It is considered that significant adverse impacts on heritage assets within our statutory planning remit are unlikely. Consequently we do not have any specific comments to offer. For those sites which are considered to be preferred or reasonable alternatives for allocation in LDP2, the environmental assessment should consider the likely effects on both designated and non-designated heritage assets, and should identify site specific mitigation where negative effects are identified.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SNH: A small watercourse runs along the north-western boundary of the site. This watercourse is a tributary of the River Tweed Special Area of Conservation (SAC). The possibility of Likely Significant Effects on the SAC due to this proximity was considered during assessment of BKELS003 during the Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA) of the LDP. This was avoidable through application of Policies EP1 and EP15. If these policies are unchanged, a similar conclusion could be reached for BKELS006.

Given its proximity to existing allocations zEL206 and BKELS003, we recommend that if BKELS006 is allocated in LDP2, site requirements should be based on those used for these existing allocations.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: I have no objections to this land being allocated for Business and Industrial use. Access is achievable off the end of the new Pinnaclehill Industrial Estate road network. A further access onto the B6352 is desirable, however the only potential suitable location for this would be by way of a roundabout at the southernmost point of the site, to tie in with where the B6436 meets the B6352. This will require the existing private access opposite this junction to be rerouted onto the new industrial estate access road.

The existing street infrastructure, including the speed limit, would have to be extended to beyond the proposed roundabout as appropriate.

A Transport Assessment will be required which will address sustainable transport matters including public transport provision.

**Highway**

Not applicable

**PP**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

Not applicable

**Water supply**

Yes

**Coverage**

Yes

**Gas supply**

No

**Education provision**

Good

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: No comments.

EDUCATION: N/A.

HOUSING STRATEGY: No comments.

WASTE MANAGEMENT: This site is around 200-250m south of the Community Recycling Centre and Council combined depot. I'm presuming as this is for business and industrial use you don't see any conflict of interest? We just need to ensure that these strategic facilities are not compromised in any way. Waste and other Council activities are not always appreciated in the local area. That said I am not aware of any complaints from local businesses so far.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No issue with the site as it is sufficiently far enough away from the A68(T) not to be of any concern.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained largely undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed with the exception of a small mill pond at the northern site boundary which appears to have subsequently been infilled. The site incorporates an element of brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

SCOTTISH WATER (WATER): Site free of existing assets. However, caution must be exercised as there is a 12" and 8" water mains on the access road on the Western boundary. Sufficient water capacity.

SCOTTISH WATER (WASTE): Capacity at our wastewater works but it would depend on the nature of the proposed development.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: A preliminary design report on this site was undertaken by the Council's engineers in 2002 which showed how the site could be best laid out. The Economic Development service supports this proposal as a longer term site once BKELS003 has been developed.

**Overall assessment****PP status**

Included

**Overall assessment**

Acceptable

**Site capacity**

N/A

**Conclusions**

Question 4 of the Main Issues Report asked for suggested sites for business and industrial uses within Kelso. Following discussions with the Economic Development Team this site was identified.

This site adjoins the Kelso development boundary and is adjacent to the existing Industrial Estate at Pinnaclehill. Consideration must be given to landscaping of the site to help make the transition between open countryside and the new development as well as establishing a new settlement edge.

Access to the site can be achieved off the end of the new Pinnaclehill Industrial Estate road network with a further access onto the B6352 is desirable.

It is considered that this is an appropriate site for business and industrial use due to its close proximity to the existing Industrial Estate. Therefore the site will be included within the Proposed Plan.

<b>Site reference</b> AKELS024	<b>Site name</b> Land adjacent to Harrietfield Cottages	<b>Settlement</b> Kelso	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 12	<b>Ha</b> 0.6	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

There are no initial constraints on the site which would preclude it from being developed.

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

SEPA: Review of OS Map indicates a very small drain located approximately 30m away from the site. The drain has limited catchment area and flow paths are likely to be away from the site. However, this may require additional consideration during the detailed design.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> On site	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no relevant planning history on the site.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Poor	<b>Access to employment</b> Poor	<b>Access to services</b> Poor	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> South
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	-----------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site appears to be improved grassland with hedgerow, stone dyke and small number of trees on the boundary. Timber framed slate-roofed barn within site- potential for bats (EPS) and breeding birds. No obvious connectivity with River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Adjacent to Newton Don HGDL. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including bats (EPS) and breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Developing the site would have a moderate impact in terms of ecology. The site is however located within a rural area where public transport, services and employment is lacking.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Not applicable	<b>Open space</b> Not applicable	<b>Listed buildings</b> Not applicable	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> Not applicable	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> Not applicable
--------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

## Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There are no known archaeological issues.

HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER: No specific comment.

HES: No comments.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site does not relate to any settlement and therefore constitutes housing in the countryside.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: 10 -12, if style and scale of houses were similar to existing adjacent cottages. Any layout should make full use of south east aspect and should be located in such a way as to allow garden ground to both sides.

SNH: No comment due to size and location.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Extent of housing would raise expectation for a new speed limit at location but short length of settlement would probably preclude in terms of criteria.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Possible bus infrastructure (Bus stop, hard standing).

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: The site lies out with any recognised settlement. In principle, not in favour of a site of this extent being allocated for housing in this location due to its remote nature in respect of service provision. Developments need to be in locations that allow accessibility to local amenities by sustainable transport modes such as walking and public transport. Furthermore the junctions of the minor public road with the A6089 and the B6364 are below the standard I require in terms of junction visibility with no room to improve.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

No

### Sewerage

No

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Average

## Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped pasture ground with an animal shelter building. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Site is adjacent to Borders Abbeys Way. A designated route for Core path 01 suitable for walkers cyclists and horse riders to be provided along the north edge of the site. Route to be agreed with Roads planning to allow sufficient room along the road corridor for parking, off road pavement and road and verge use by road users and those on the long distance route.

EDUCATION: No issues.

NHS: No comments received.

---

SCOTTISH WATER: Waste: There are no sewers within the area. Water: Roberton WTW has sufficient capacity. There are no water mains in the area.

SEPA: Private foul drainage would be required as no SW foul network in vicinity. This however could be problematic as there are no watercourses in the vicinity.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Doubtful	12

### Conclusions

The location does not relate to any designated settlement. As such, housing here would create a new small settlement. The proposal should be tested under the Council's Housing in the Countryside policy. The Roads Planning service have raised serious concerns. It is unlikely that junction improvements of the scope required could viably be provided through the scale of development. This site is not acceptable for a housing allocation.

---

<b>Site reference</b> AKELS029	<b>Site name</b> Nethershot (Phases 1 & 2)	<b>Settlement</b> Kelso	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 240	<b>Ha</b> 10.3	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b>	<b>SAC</b>	<b>SPA</b>	<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
------------------	------------	------------	-------------	---------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site is already allocated for the proposed use within the adopted Local Development Plan (Phase 1) (AKELS021) and the Adopted Supplementary Guidance on Housing (Phase 2) (AKELS026). It is the intention of the Council to retain these allocations within the Local Development Plan 2. It should be noted that the site capacities included within the LDP are only indicative, any increased capacity would be tested through the development management process at that time.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> 13/01080/PAN - Residential development with associated roads, footpaths and landscaping 13/00427/PPP - Mixed use development including housing, site for school, community facilities and associated landscaping, roads and footpaths (Approved) 98/00395/OUT - Erection of superstore, filling station and car wash (Refused)
--------------------------	------------	----------------------------------------	------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b>	<b>Access to employment</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b>	<b>Site aspect</b>
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
--------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------------

### Local impact and integration summary

## Landscape assessment

NSA

SLA

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

Wild Land

Landscape summary

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

Right of way

TPOs

Contaminated land

Water supply

Sewerage

Gas Supply

Education provision

Planning & infrastructure summary

---

## Overall assessment

**PP status**

**Overall assessment**

**Site capacity**

Excluded

240

### Conclusions

The site is already allocated for the proposed use within the adopted Local Development Plan (Phase 1) (AKELS021) and the Adopted Supplementary Guidance on Housing (Phase 2) (AKELS026). It is the intention of the Council to retain these allocations within the Local Development Plan 2. It should be noted that the site capacities included within the LDP are only indicative, any increased capacity would be tested through the development management process at that time.

The submission shows a proposed increase in the indicative capacity by four units. This is an indicative capacity only and would be pursued through the planning application stage.

---

<b>Site reference</b> RKE12B	<b>Site name</b> Rosebank 2	<b>Settlement</b> Kelso	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 20	<b>Ha</b> 1.4	<b>PP status</b> Retain LDP Site
---------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------

## Initial assessment

**Floodrisk**      **SAC**      **SPA**      **SSSI**      **Ramsar**

### Initial assessment summary

The site is already allocated for the proposed use within the current Local Development Plan and it is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> 97/00500/OUT - Erection of superstore with associated access, parking, servicing and landscaping (Approved)
--------------------------	------------	--------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

**Access to public transport**      **Access to employment**      **Access to services**      **Wider biodiversity impacts**      **Site aspect**

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
--------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------------------	--------------------	------------------------------------------

### Local impact and integration summary

## Landscape assessment

**NSA**      **SLA**      **Over 200 metres?**       **Over 12 degree slope**       **Wild Land**

### Landscape summary

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

Right of way

TPOs

Contaminated land

Water supply

Sewerage

Gas Supply

Education provision

Planning & infrastructure summary

---

## Overall assessment

**PP status**

**Overall assessment**

**Site capacity**

Retain LDP Site

20

### Conclusions

The site is already allocated for the proposed use within the current Local Development Plan and it is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2.

---

# Kirkhope (Nr Ettrickbridge)

<b>Site reference</b> RKIRK001	<b>Site name</b> Site at Old Kirkhope Steading	<b>Settlement</b> Kirkhope (Nr Ettrickbridg a\	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 6	<b>Ha</b> 0.6	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Adjacent to site	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is outwith both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. No objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

SEPA: Based on LiDAR, site is approximately 188-190mAOD. The Ettrick Water is approximately 173-175mAOD. As such site is sufficiently elevated above the Ettrick Water. There are small watercourses adjacent to the site and it is unclear whether these flow through or adjacent to the site. As such, SEPA would recommend an FRA to assess the risk from these sources.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Brownfield	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no planning application history.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Poor	<b>Access to employment</b> Poor	<b>Access to services</b> Poor	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site appears to be steading, farmyard with improved grassland with stone dyke and mature broad-leaved trees on the boundary. Stone-built slate-roofed steading within site- potential for bats (EPS) and breeding birds. Adjacent to Ettrick water (River Tweed SAC/SSSI). Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including bats (EPS) and breeding birds.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Not applicable	<b>Open space</b> Not applicable	<b>Listed buildings</b> Not applicable	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> Not applicable	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> Not applicable
--------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------

## Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There are no known archaeological issues.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: In principle the current steadings could be redeveloped; any redevelopment should take account of the best practice guide for the redevelopment of farm buildings.

HES: No comments.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: The character and pattern of existing steading should be respected and adapted to provide attractive residential units with associated garden ground. 4-6 units including conversion of steading buildings.

SNH: This appears to be reuse of an existing site but as the potential allocation is adjacent to Tweed SAC/SSSI we recommend it is screened into HRA.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: No comments.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: Not opposed to some form of redevelopment on this site. The existing access would have to be upgraded to a suitable standard in terms of construction and in terms of improvements to the visibility splays. The field access to the south is unsuitable for residential development as it would require a significant level of engineering works to achieve adequate visibility splays. Any new builds proposed to supplement the conversion of the steading buildings must not exceed four (5 if the number of dwellinghouses permitted off a private access is increased from 4 to 5, in line with the National Roads Development Guide, through the LDP process) as this would then require the road to be upgraded to an adoptable standard, which is undesirable in this location.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No comments.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

On site

### Water supply

No

### Sewerage

No

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site is developed as an agricultural steading and is understood to have included petroleum storage. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: No non-vehicular route to Ettrickbridge which would be difficult to achieve. Also some link to the existing path network would be beneficial.

EDUCATION: No objections.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: No water infrastructure in the area. There are no sewers within the area.

SEPA: Private foul drainage would be required as no SW foul network in vicinity. It appears that the unnamed burn may be culverted through this development site. Opportunities should be taken to de-culvert this as part of any development. The site is close to the Ettrick water and care should be taken to protect this during any development.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	6

## Conclusions

The LDP would not allocate areas of land in rural locations such as this which should otherwise be tested under the Council's Housing in the Countryside policy. The site is detached from public transport, services and employment.

Issues relating to contamination, flooding, biodiversity and drainage would require to be investigated further as part of any application submission.

---

# Lanton

<b>Site reference</b>	<b>Site name</b>	<b>Settlement</b>	<b>SDA</b>	<b>Proposed Use</b>	<b>Indicative Capacity</b>	<b>Ha</b>	<b>PP status</b>
ALANT002	Land east of Lanton Village	Lanton	Central	Housing	6	1.1	Excluded

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b>	<b>SAC</b>	<b>SPA</b>	<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

There are no initial constraints on the site which would preclude it from being developed.

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

SEPA: A tributary of the Red Sheuch issues adjacent to the site but review of historic maps does not show the presence of any small watercourses on site. But there are two wells. May require additional investigation during detailed design stage.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b>	<b>Planning history references</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	10/00089/FUL - Change of use of agricultural land to incorporate into garden ground and formation of access (retrospective) (Approved)

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b>	<b>Access to employment</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b>	<b>Site aspect</b>
Poor	Limited	Limited	Moderate	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: No comments received although the site was considered during the process of the LDP 2016 and the following comments were received:

Biodiversity Risk: Moderate. Phase 1 habitat (aerial interpretation) improved pasture (B4). Field boundaries: Garden ground, mature trees. Biological records: amphibian, breeding birds, protected species. Mitigation: Protect and enhance boundary features. Potential protected species surveys (badger). Enhance hedgerow network. Site clearance outside breeding bird season. Flood Risk (Fluvial 1 in 200): No.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On/adjacent to site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: The site is near a known archaeological enclosure, and at the edge of a medieval village. Some mitigation may be required.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: No comments.

HES: No comments.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

On site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: No comments received.

SNH: No comments.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: This site may impact on the location of the 30 mph limit.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: Not in favour of this site being allocated for housing. The infrastructure within Lanton is very limited and is not ideally suited to supporting further development. In addition the single point of access to this backland site is fairly remote from the settlement; therefore any development would not properly integrate.

STRATEGIC TRANSPORT: No response received.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

EDUCATION: No objections.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: - WASTE: Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. Please note there are Foul and surface sewer within site. WATER: Roberton WTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity for network.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network however it is likely that this would require upsizing for any new development. SW should confirm. There appear to be 2 wells to the west of the site and an unnamed trib to the north. We are unsure if these are linked - there maybe a culvert under the site? This should be investigated before development.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	6

### Conclusions

Lanton is characterised by a largely linear form of development with properties being arranged around the public roads. The Scottish Borders Local Development Plan 2016 states that development beyond the plan period in Lanton should be kept to a minimum and limited to small scale infill. Development which would negatively impact on the character and setting of the village will be resisted. It is considered that development at the location proposed would not integrate well with the character and setting of the village.

There are issues in terms of obtaining an acceptable visibility splay from the site on to the main road. The location of the access would require to be remote from the settlement. There are moderate biodiversity issues which would require to be addressed as well as archaeology matters to be considered. It is therefore concluded that the site should be excluded from the Proposed LDP.

---

# Lilliesleaf

<b>Site reference</b> ELI6B	<b>Site name</b> Muselie Drive	<b>Settlement</b> Lilliesleaf	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 7	<b>Ha</b> 0.7	<b>PP status</b> Remove LDP Site
--------------------------------	-----------------------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site is already allocated for the proposed use within the Adopted Supplementary Guidance on Housing (November 2017). It is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2. The proposal seeks to increase the indicative capacity of the site from 7 units to 20 units.

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is outwith both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. No objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

SEPA: No known flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> 04/01742/FUL - Erection of six dwellinghouses (withdrawn) 15/00711/FUL - Erection of ten dwellinghouses with associated car parking and landscaping (pending decision) 15/00712/PPP - Erection of six dwellinghouses with associated car parking and landscaping (pending decision)  The site is a longstanding allocation dating back to at least the Ettrick and Lauderdale Local Plan 1995.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Limited	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Limited	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: No comments received.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: The site is within the medieval village core. Archaeological investigation of the site is required.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: Boundary treatment and in particular the frontage to the main street will require careful consideration – fronts of some houses must face the main street to avoid the scheme not integrating.

HES: No comments.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: No comments received.

SNH: No comment due to size and location.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Potential to improve on existing narrow footway provision. Ideally access should not dissect this.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: This site is currently allocated in the Local Development Plan with an indicative capacity of 7 units. Recent planning applications for development on this site in two phases has yet to be determined but was for 16 units. The concern with increasing the site capacity further is the ability to provide the required road infrastructure and appropriate parking provision within the land available. Given the above, the Roads Officer is opposed to the increase in capacity unless it can be clearly demonstrated that suitable infrastructure including appropriate parking standards can be achieved.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No comments.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed with the exception of assumed field shelters. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Existing development and safeguarding proposals ( EL16B ) cover the relevant points. Existing path link from the village linking to the Ale Water located along north eastern boundary of site to be maintained. A pedestrian link to be provided through the site linking with the path access.

EDUCATION: No objections.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Roberton WTW has sufficient capacity. A Flow and Pressure test is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Lilliesleaf WwTW has sufficient capacity. Please note there is a Sewer running through site. Sufficient capacity in the network.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network - SW should confirm the position with capacity.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Remove LDP Site	Unacceptable	7

### Conclusions

The site is already allocated for the proposed use within the Local Development Plan 2016. It is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan. The proposal seeks to increase the indicative capacity of the site from 7 units to 20 units. This is not acceptable however, due to concerns raised by the Roads Planning Officer who has advised that the size of the site would not allow for the required road infrastructure and parking. This would require to be tested through the process of a planning application.

#### UPDATE FOLLOWING MAIN ISSUES CONSULTATION:

The Lilliesleaf, Ashkirk and Midlem Community Council made a representation to the MIR advising that the site has now been purchased by the community in order to create a village green and sought that the housing allocation on the site is removed from the LDP. As a village, Lilliesleaf has lacked a central village green and this is a use and focus to be welcomed in the village. On this basis, it is considered that the housing allocation should be removed and replaced with a formal Key Greenspace allocation (GSLILL002). Thomson Cooper in their capacity as Administrators for Murray and Burrell Ltd have confirmed that the site has now been sold and now remove their previous support for the retained allocation of the site for housing development.

# Maxton

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
AMAXT003	Land and buildings at East End Farm	Maxton	Central	Housing	25	2.0	Excluded

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
1:1000	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

There are no initial constraints on the site which would preclude it from being developed.

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: A very small portion of the site is within the 1:200 year surface water flood map however I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

SEPA: No detailed comments on flood risk. Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network however it is likely that this would require upsizing for any new development. SW should confirm.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Combination	96/01025/OUT - Residential Development (Approved)

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Limited	Limited	Limited	Minor	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: No comments.

SNH: No comments

GENERAL COMMENTS: Cognisance of nearby River Tweed SAC, which is 240m north of site, but no mitigation requirements have been highlighted by SBC or SNH. The village of Maxton has no public services and there are no bus services within 800m. St Boswells is 2.5km away and offers services including bus connections, shop, primary school, post office, coffee shop, church, and sports clubs and facilities. In terms of access to employment, the nearest Main Settlement is Kelso which is just over 9 miles away, while Galashiels is just over 10 miles away. This means that Maxton score as 'limited' in terms of access.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Adjacent to site

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There are a large number of archaeological discoveries from the north of Maxton, and the boundary is within the medieval village core. Archaeological investigation will be required.

HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER: No specific comment.

HES: No comments.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The allocation would represent the amalgamation of two existing greenfield allocations brought together through the redevelopment of agricultural sheds which are now redundant. Maxton has been built out in a irregular linear fashion, with the farm building dominating the eastern side of the settlement. The loss of the agricultural sheds would represent a significant change in the character of the village, however these are of no particular design or heritage value and their redevelopment for housing could arguably represent an improvement in design terms. The redevelopment would mean the loss of agricultural land and farming facilities but the soil is not prime agricultural quality and the landowner has stated that the farm buildings are redundant. There is a need for archaeological mitigation associated with any development.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

On site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: No comments received.

SNH: No comment due to size and location.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Around half of the site (the greenfield sections) on agricultural land are already allocated. The western section would represent an infill development and the eastern section would take the village further east, continuing its linear development along the main road. Mitigation might included the planting of hedgerows as boundary treatment - responding to a recommendation of the SLA designation. The site, and village, are currently dominated by large agricultural sheds. These would be removed through this new allocation. These buildings form part of this low lying agricultural landscape, but they are of no intrinsic value and their demolition and replacement with housing would not harm the landscape setting of the village. The farmhouses should be retained and there is no mention of their removal in the developer's proposal.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: Direct access should be from the existing junction only.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: I have no objections in principle to this site being included for housing. Any site design would have to take into consideration the junction of the C67 and the A699. Should the existing steading building not be removed, this junction shall require relocation to provide adequate visibility. A secondary access may be required at the western end of the site depending on layout. The site

### Near a trunk road?

gives the potential to create an impressive street frontage along both the A699 and the C67 due to the combination of AMAXT001 and AMAXT002 and this should be encouraged. A Transport Statement may be required depending on the scale of development.

<b>Right of way</b>	<b>TPOs</b>	<b>Contaminated land</b>	<b>Water supply</b>	<b>Sewerage</b>	<b>Gas Supply</b>	<b>Education provision</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Yes	Yes	Yes	Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

**CONTAMINATED LAND:** The site is developed as an agricultural steading which appears to also include a sheepwash. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

**COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM:** No comment.

**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT:** Logical infill site between two allocated housing sites; Would remove the agricultural use/potential conflict of uses/traffic from the village; Contamination would need investigation/mitigation.

**EDUCATION:** Extension or new school may need to be considered.

**NHS:** No comments received.

**SCOTTISH WATER:** Waste: Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. Water: Roberton WTW has sufficient capacity. A Flow and Pressure test is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

**GENERAL COMMENTS:** The education service has stated that there is a education capacity issue arising from this re-allocation. Maxton is within St Boswells Primary School catchment area. The allocation is for 25-30 units replacing the existing allocations which have a site capacity of 15 units. This needs to be clarified before any re-allocation is made. There are no other planning and infrastructure constraints which raise serious concerns. In terms of roads, the enlarged allocation incorporating the demolition of agricultural sheds offers scope for improved access for the existing allocated sites (AMAXT001 and AMAXT002). There are some minor concerns regarding the previous use of the site for agricultural uses and there is a possibility of contamination which will have to be investigated. This amalgamation of two sites and the redevelopment of brownfield land has the potential to deliver a better overall development site in planning terms by resolving neighbouring land-use conflicts and by improving accessibility and deliverability of the two allocated sites.

## Overall assessment

<b>PP status</b>	<b>Overall assessment</b>	<b>Site capacity</b>
Excluded	Acceptable	25

### Conclusions

While there is no ecological constraints associated with the proposal, there is a question around the overall sustainability of allocating 25 units in a village with no services. The allocation would be made up of two existing allocations brought together through one new allocation which is currently made up of redundant modern agricultural buildings as well as two farmhouses/dwellings which would be retained. There is an issue regarding education capacity which needs to be clarified. Otherwise, there are no constraints which rule out development. The market for 25 units in Maxton over the course of the plan period is questionable, however it could be argued that this re-allocation would make delivery more likely as the single site will be simplified, roads access improved, and there will be potential for an improved development in design terms. The proposal would remove some large agricultural buildings which have no design value, but the development would still have to address potential impact on the Tweed Lowlands SLA; boundary treatments might include planting of hedgerows.

Having considered the case for the reallocation, no change is necessary because the farm buildings already fall within the envelope of the settlement boundary and could be redeveloped as infill development in any case. The 25 unit allocation over two separate sites should simply remain and there is nothing stopping a proposal incorporating all sites coming forward through the planning application process. Therefore, this site will not be allocated within the Proposed Plan.

# Melrose

<b>Site reference</b> AMELR008	<b>Site name</b> Land at Dingleton Mains	<b>Settlement</b> Melrose	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 50	<b>Ha</b> 3.2	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The site is within SEPA 1:200 year surface water flood map and is adjacent to the Malthouse Burn. A Flood Risk Assessment would require to be undertaken for this site as the burn is not included within SEPA's fluvial flood map.

SEPA: Require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Malthouse Burn and tributaries. The Surface Water Flood Map indicates a potential flow path through the site from the Malthouse Burn which will require investigation. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map and steep topography indicates that there may be flooding issues at this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed development is not affected by surface runoff.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no planning application history. The site was considered as part of the Local Plan Amendment (AMELR001 and AMELR004).
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> South-west
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	----------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: No comments received.

The site has good access to local services and facilities in the settlement. It has good access to employment particularly in Galashiels, 4 miles or less than 15 minutes drive away. This is because the settlement is on the A6091(T) which is also part of the strategic public transport network.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There are no known issues, although a possible holy well exists to the south-east. Some assessment may be required.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: No comments.

HES: No comments.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

On/adjacent to site

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: No comments received.

SNH: No comments.

The site is constrained for the most part within the Scottish Borders Development and Landscape Capacity Study (March 2007) although the report does state that there is an option for a very tiny area of development within the extreme northern part of the site. This site is effectively 'infill', but offers the opportunity to establish a robust, wooded settlement edge as part of the development plan. Due to the extensive woodland which is desirable, the site was identified as a 'potential' site for development. Development elsewhere within the 'undulating Terraced Landform' is severely constrained by the visual impact which development would have on the lower slopes of the Eildon Hills, which are a focal point of the NSA and already appear to be slightly 'hemmed in' by encroaching development. In addition, development is further constrained by steeper slopes, the presence of the golf course and the general robustness of the settlement edge, which is largely supplemented by woodland.

This site was the subject of an objection at the 2006 Local Plan Inquiry and was considered again as part of the LPA. At the LPA the Reporters assessment was that one reason why the site should not be developed was the adverse impact on the National Scenic Area. Development is severely constrained by the visual impact which development would have on the lower slopes of the Eildon Hills, which are a focal point for the National Scenic Area and already appear to be slightly "hemmed in" by encroaching development. In addition, development is further constrained by steeper slopes and the general robustness of the settlement edge, which is largely supplemented by woodland.

The site is located within the CAT policy area which aims to ensure the high quality living environment is protected and to prevent piecemeal development, which would detract from the area's environment. The scale of the development at this location would not adhere to the requirements of the CAT policy.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: AS PER PREVIOUS COMMENTS - WHERE ARE THESE??

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Possible shelter required.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: Any development on this site will rely on vehicular access to Dingleton Road just south of Eildonburn Cottage. Land required to achieve this appears to be outwith the site

### Near a trunk road?

boundary. Furthermore junction sight-lines are difficult to achieve and to gain appropriate visibility to the south for exiting drivers would require full control over the garage opposite 6 Eildon Terrace and land in front of the garage. Access at this location is further complicated by the need to cross Malthouse Burn close to Dingleton Road. For the development of the whole site street connectivity would be required with Site EM4B. This may affect third party land and would be difficult to achieve due to the lie of the land. Such connectivity would cross Dingleton Loan.

The site is relatively steep and the access location just south of Eildonburn Cottage is not ideal for serving a significant extent of development. My preference would be for a smaller stand-alone development on the lower part of the site. The access issues referred to in my first paragraph would still apply. A Transport Assessment would be required which would highlight any improvements required to Dingleton Road as a result of the additional traffic associated with the development of this site. It would also have to address how any connectivity between this site and Site EM4B would impact on Dingleton Loan and the associated traffic movements of that road.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No comments.

#### Right of way

Adjacent to site

#### TPOs

Not applicable

#### Contaminated land

Not applicable

#### Water supply

Yes

#### Sewerage

Yes

#### Gas Supply

Yes

#### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Connecting paths to right of way BE192 (south-west of the site) and BE229 (north-east of the site) and non-vehicular access to existing pavements are required.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Site is well contained by existing development and woodland, though has the potential to be prominent from further afield due to sloping nature of the ground. Conflicts with policy EP6, though the area to the north east is allocated for housing. Well related to development boundary. Potential impact on trees. Archaeological implications.

EDUCATION: No objections.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. 355mm Trunk main running through site. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. It should be noted that there is a sewer running through the site. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. SW should confirm any issues with capacity. There are 2 burns close to the north east and western edges of the site. These should be protected as part of any development.

---

## Overall assessment

#### PP status

Excluded

#### Overall assessment

Unacceptable

#### Site capacity

50

### Conclusions

This site was the subject of an objection at the 2006 Local Plan Inquiry and was considered as part of the Local Plan Amendment process. The site is identified as constrained within the Landscape Capacity Study. The Reporters assessment at the Inquiry was that the site should not be developed because it would have an adverse impact on the National Scenic Area. This site is unacceptable because the site would have an adverse impact on the landscape of the National Scenic Area and the setting of the settlement.

The site is located within the CAT policy area which aims to ensure the high quality living environment is protected and to prevent piecemeal development, which would detract from the area's environment. The scale of the development at this location would not adhere to the requirements of the CAT policy.

<b>Site reference</b> AMELR012	<b>Site name</b> Bleachfield	<b>Settlement</b> Melrose	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 40	<b>Ha</b> 3.2	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site lies within the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extent and a small ditch/drain is shown to be running through the middle of the site. A Flood Risk Assessment for this site would be required.

SEPA: Require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Huntly Burn and the interaction with the River Tweed. There would also appear to be a culverted watercourse through the site which will require further investigation. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues at this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Site will likely be constrained due to flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> On/Adjacent to site	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no planning application history. The site was considered through the process of the Housing Supplementary Guidance 2017 but was an excluded site.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site appears to be improved grassland, mature broad-leaved trees, residual hedge/hawthorn bushes, garden ground on the boundary. Some connectivity to River Tweed SAC/SSSI northern part of site in 1 in 200yr flood risk (SEPA). Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including bats (EPS) and breeding birds.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Open space</b> Not applicable	<b>Listed buildings</b> Not applicable	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> On site	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> Not applicable
----------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

## Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: General Roy's Map suggests a small farmstead existed at the north-east corner of the proposed area. This may have been obliterated by road realignment, but there is a possibility for encountering medieval or post-medieval settlement remains. The proposal is also with the Darnick Inventory Battlefield. Mitigation is likely. Development proposals also need to take into account the setting of the battlefield.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: Adjacent to the Melrose conservation area to the south. Currently open space which makes a positive visual contribution to the approach to Melrose from the west, by providing a clear break between Darnick and Melrose.

HES: No comments.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

On site

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: It is suggested that to avoid Melrose and Darnick settlement coalescence there should be no further development of this low lying open space.

SNH: The site lies within the Eildon & Leaderfoot Hills NSA, in a prominent location to the south of Waverley Road and in line with views of the Eildon Hills from this road. In the absence of details regarding the overall extent of the area for built development, the site access arrangements, the potential scale and layout of the built development, or the retention of existing landscape features and the incorporation of new planting, we highlight the potential for this development to have significant and adverse effects on the Special Qualities of the NSA. SNH could however envisage a scenario whereby a clear set of site design requirements reduce or mitigate adverse effects to an acceptable level. SNH would wish to ensure that if this site is to be allocated within the NSA that a site brief is produced to identify the key natural heritage assets of the site to be protected and the key opportunities for the integration of green infrastructure within future development.

Scottish Borders Development and Landscape Capacity Study: The site is constrained within the Scottish Borders Development and Landscape Capacity Study (March 2007), the Study states the following: Development within the 'Low Lying Fields' would encroach upon the separation required to maintain the sense of individual identity for both Melrose and Darnick. The size and irregularity of the space is particularly important in creating a landscape of fine quality between the settlements. Development in this area focuses on the more elevated land, and this distinct relationship with land form would be lost if development. Extended onto low lying fields. The space between the settlements also allows the more historic character of Melrose to be revealed on arrival, as the older houses are encountered almost immediately on arrival and are visually dominant.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: May impact on existing interface point between 30 & 40 mph limits.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: No objections to this site being developed for housing. Vehicular access off Waverley Road should be towards the western end of the frontage where levels are most favourable and where appropriate junction visibility splays can be easily achieved. A footway will be required along the frontage of the site on the south side of Waverley Road from the new junction to connect to the existing pedestrian facility near the eastern extremity of the site. A pedestrian link would be required up to Waverley Road at the eastern extremity of the site. Consideration can be given to relocating the existing 30/40 mph speed limit location. Consideration can be given to extending the site to allow a street connection with High Cross Avenue just west of the existing private junction at the corner of the rugby pitch though this may impact on third party land and would directly impact on the rugby pitch. Support for this development site is not conditional on this street connectivity being provided. A Transport Assessment or Transport Statement will be required depending on the scale of development.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No comments.

**Right of way**

Not applicable

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

On site

**Water supply**

Yes

**Sewerage**

Limited

**Gas Supply**

Yes

**Education provision**

Good

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained largely undeveloped however appears to have possibly housed a water course (possibly culverted) and which may have been infilled. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Connecting paths to existing pavements required.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Conflicts with policy EP6 by infilling the gap between Melrose and Darnick. Archaeological/battlefield implications. Part is prime agricultural land.

EDUCATION: No objections.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. SW should confirm any issues with capacity. There is a burn which appears to run through the site and also be culverted through part of the site. This should be de-culverted as part of any development.

**Overall assessment****PP status**

Excluded

**Overall assessment**

Unacceptable

**Site capacity**

40

**Conclusions**

The site was considered as part of the Housing SG which concluded that the site was unacceptable.

The site is located within one of the most sensitive parts of the CAT policy area, where coalescence between Darnick and Melrose is of key concern. The proposal cannot be considered further due to the unacceptable harm to the distinct identities of these settlements the proposed development would result in. Furthermore, development at this location would have a detrimental impact upon the setting and sense of arrival to Melrose; an unacceptable impact upon the Eildon and Leaderfoot National Scenic Area; a detrimental impact upon the character of the Melrose Conservation Area; and a potential adverse impact upon the special qualities of the Eildon & Leaderfoot Hills NSA.

In summary, it is not considered that this site is acceptable for development.

<b>Site reference</b> AMELR013	<b>Site name</b> Harmony Hall Gardens	<b>Settlement</b> Melrose	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 5	<b>Ha</b> 0.8	<b>PP status</b> Included
-----------------------------------	------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT: A portion of this site is within SEPA's 1 in 200 year flood map of the River Tweed. A Flood Risk Assessment would require to be undertaken.

SEPA: Require an FRA which assesses the risk from the River Tweed. There was previously a mill lade which flowed along the northern boundary which will also require consideration.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> 10/00158/LBC - Alterations to wall to widen access and erection of gates - Withdrawn 10/00159/FUL - Alterations to wall to widen access and erection of gates - Approved subject to conditions and informative
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site appears to be improved grassland, (old orchard?) and garden ground, mature broad-leaved trees and stone wall on the boundary. Stone built, slate-roofed building within site potential for bats (EPS) and breeding birds. Some potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC/SSSI via run off to burn/lade to east. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including bats (EPS) and breeding birds.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> On site	<b>Open space</b> Not applicable	<b>Listed buildings</b> On/adjacent to site	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> On/adjacent to site	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> On/adjacent to site	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: The eastern 1/3 of the site is within the Melrose Abbey Scheduled Monument Area. Any development proposals would need to satisfy HES requirements and Policy EP8. The western 2/3 are within an area of high archaeological potential because of the proximity to the SM, and discoveries previously made nearby. Proposals outside the SM would require archaeological

evaluation. All proposals would need to respect the setting of the SM.

**HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER:** Lies within Melrose conservation area and close to the category B listed Harmony House and the category C listed former stables and St Marys School. There may be some scope for small scale redevelopment within the site, but any development will need to be kept low in height and respect the character of the conservation area.

**HES:** Development of this site, which is partially within SM90124 Melrose Abbey would raise issues of national significance. The eastern and northern edges of the proposed development site overlap into, and directly adjoin parts of the scheduled monument. No development directly affecting (i.e. within the boundary of) the scheduled monument would be permitted. Consequently, any development of this site would need to avoid the monument entirely and retain it in an appropriate setting. HES consider that the proposed level of development would be likely to affect the setting of the monument. Additionally, there are significant known unscheduled archaeological remains in the area and development of this site would be likely to encounter unscheduled archaeological remains. The Council's archaeological adviser should be consulted for further advice on this.

**SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE:** The site lies within the Eildon & Leaderfoot Hills NSA. While well contained, the site makes an important contribution to the character of St Mary's Road. The boundary wall, mature trees and orchard combine to give a strong sense of place. SNH have concerns regarding the allocation of the site as shown in the shapefiles provided with this consultation. Our advice is that the western, slightly elevated, area of orchard should be retained and enhanced through the creation of a new orchard around the remaining trees. Other existing assets such as the boundary wall on the south edge and the mature beeches on the north edge should also be retained for their contribution to sense of place. Promoting higher density of development within the remainder of the site could create a development that is in keeping with the wider area, establishing a place that could be adaptable for all stages of life and which is well connected to the town centre. SNH would wish to ensure that if this site is to be allocated within the NSA that a site brief is produced to identify the key natural heritage assets of the site to be protected and the key opportunities for the integration of green infrastructure within future development. Modification to the proposed extent of the allocation would avoid or reduce likely natural heritage impacts.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

On/adjacent to site

### SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

**LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT:** A mix of house types, from detached / semi-detached to terraced/ courtyard developments but limited to 1½ storeys to reflect the style and scale of surrounding residential properties and buildings. It is important that the 'genius loci' is retained and enhanced by a high quality development with attention to building pattern and detail.

**GENERAL COMMENTS:** The site is constrained within the Development and Landscape Capacity Study (March 2007) which states that the site is within the 'Level Fields' character area which is limited by the contribution it makes to the historic setting of the Abbey and other nearby buildings, and to the setting of the River Tweed, which is characterised by its lack of immediate development.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

**NETWORK MANAGER:** Existing roads infrastructure not ideal in this area.

**PASSENGER TRANSPORT:** No comments.

**ROADS PLANNING TEAM:** No objections to the principle of housing on this site, however, there are some issues to resolve: The carriageway in St Mary's Road is only around 4.5m wide, with a roadside wall on the north side, so that two-way traffic flow is very difficult. Furthermore, the wall is of a height that it would not afford safe junction visibility for any new junctions unless it was lowered or set back. A solution could be to lower the wall in height and to form at least two new junctions which would double up as passing opportunities. Some concerns regarding the pedestrian network surrounding the site. The existing route to the town centre via Abbey Street is particularly narrow in parts and arrangements for pedestrians at the junction of St Mary's Road with Abbey Street are poor. The site serves as a pedestrian way between the private school and the sports fields as well as a pedestrian way between Melrose and Gattonside any development on the site would need to respect this and incorporate such movement. A Transport Statement can address all of the issues raised.

**TRANSPORT SCOTLAND:** No comments.

**Right of way**

Not applicable

**TPOs**

On/adjacent to sit

**Contaminated land**

Not applicable

**Water supply**

Yes

**Sewerage**

Yes

**Gas Supply**

Yes

**Education provision**

Good

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have been developed as a residential property with associated garden ground. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: No comments.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Appears to be a logical addition within the development boundary but is an attractive area of parkland. A high quality, low density development would be required as the site is within the Conservation Area. Archaeological/Scheduled Ancient Monument implications. Potential impact on the setting of the Listed Building. Access along St Mary's Road may be a problem.

EDUCATION: No objections.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. A Flow and Pressure test is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. Surface water sewer just within site boundary.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. It appears that the mill lade may be culverted through this development site. Opportunities should be taken to de-culvert this as part of any development.

**Overall assessment****PP status**

Included

**Overall assessment**

Acceptable

**Site capacity**

5

**Conclusions**

There are clearly sensitive issues which require to be addressed such as the location of the site within the Conservation Area and its proximity to listed buildings. The eastern third of the site is within the Melrose Abbey Scheduled Monument Area and would be excluded from development. Furthermore, archaeological remains are likely within the remainder of the site which would require investigation. It is likely an acceptable access on the western part of the site could be formed with minimal disturbance to the existing walls. It is considered that the development of this sensitive site would be acceptable in principle subject to the following:

- A Flood Risk Assessment is required which should take cognisance of a mill lade which previously flowed along the northern boundary and the River Tweed.
- Retain and protect the existing boundary features and trees, where possible
- Assessment of ecology impacts and provision of mitigation, as appropriate
- Mitigation required to ensure no significant adverse effects upon integrity of River Tweed Special Area of Conservation
- Archaeological assessment (including archaeological evaluation) is required, with any associated mitigation as identified
- Development must respect the setting of the Scheduled Monument. No development within the Melrose Abbey Scheduled Monument (SM90124) would be permitted
- The design and layout of the site should take account of the Conservation Area, the setting of the Scheduled Monuments and trees on/adjacent to the site
- Access to the site should be in a location which results in the least disruption to the existing stone wall along the southern boundary of the site. A Transport Statement would be required
- Existing trees/hedging within and on the boundaries of the site must be retained and protected
- In order to safeguard the character of the Conservation Area and adjacent listed buildings, dwellinghouses should be restricted to single storey.

<b>Site reference</b> AMELR014	<b>Site name</b> Land to West of Ormiston Terrace	<b>Settlement</b> Melrose	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 20	<b>Ha</b> 1.9	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designation constraint.

SEPA: SEPA do not hold any records or evidence of flooding to the site. Elevated finished floor levels may reduce any residual flood risk. There is surface water adjacent to the site. SEPA advise that flooding to Highcross Avenue recorded however it is understood that flooding occurs to the west of the development. The surface water flow path to the west has been observed from the adjacent Huntly Burn.

This site is immediately adjacent to the Scottish Water foul sewer network and as such foul drainage must connect to the foul sewer.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is not located within the SEPA 1 in 200 year fluvial (river) or pluvial (surface water) flood extents. I would have no objections to this site on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no planning application history on the site.  Local Plan (2005/06): A larger part of the site was considered as part of the Local Plan 2005/6 (EM22)
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response received.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the west of Melrose and lies immediately outwith the settlement boundary. Melrose has good access to public transport, employment and services and is within close proximity to Tweedbank train station, which provides good connections to Edinburgh.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Adjacent to site

### Open space

Adjacent to site

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On/adjacent to site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE AND DESIGN: No specific heritage and design issues identified. There is real risk taken account of the current development being undertaken by Crawfords at the site at the junction of Chiefswood Road and High Cross Avenue, that Darnick and Melrose would begin to visually coalesce if this site were to be developed.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Part of the site is within the Inventory Battlefield of Darnick, and both physical remains and setting must be taken into account. Evaluation will be required.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

On site

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: We note that the settlement profile for Melrose states: 'The Plan does not propose any further development sites within Melrose as there has been significant recent development at Dingleton Hospital and owing to the sensitivity of the location, it has not been possible to define preferred areas for future expansion beyond the period of this Local Development Plan.'

We understand that the area between Darnick and Melrose is also protected from development by Policy EP6 Countryside Around Towns, primarily to avoid coalescence and retain individual character.

In reference to the settlement profile, Policy EP6 and the site's location within the Eildon and Leaderfoot NSA, we consider that this site would be very prominent, blocking existing views to the Eildon Hills and changing the character of this location as a gateway site. It appears likely to be highly visible from the B6394, potentially also altering the more rural character of the fringes of Melrose.

Allocation of this site appears likely to increase perception of coalescence between these settlements. We have concerns that it would also set a precedent for further development in this area.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No response received.

Scottish Borders Development and Landscape Capacity Study: Development within the 'low lying fields' would encroach upon the separation required to maintain the sense of individual identity for both Melrose and Darnick. The size and irregularity of the space is particularly important in creating a landscape of fine quality between the settlements. Development in this area focuses on the more elevated land, and this distinct relationship with land form would be lost if development extended only low lying fields. The space between the settlements allows the more historic character of Melrose to be revealed on arrival, as the older houses are encountered almost immediately on arrival and are visually dominant.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: Further access off Main Street at poorly aligned section. Otherwise no observations.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I have no objections in principle to this land being zoned for housing development. Front facing dwellings, similar to those on the rest of Highcross Avenue, would create a sense of entry to the town as you travel eastwards and I am not opposed to some direct access for individual dwellings so long as car turning can be made available internally. A main point of entry for a new public road would be acceptable midway along the Highcross Avenue road frontage on the outside of the bend in the road, thereafter the internal service road layout should follow the principles of 'Designing

### Near a trunk road?

Streets' allowing for internal street connectivity and future external connectivity while creating a distinct place. A pedestrian route will be required from the site along the southern side of Highcross Avenue to join up with the existing footway at the junction with Ormiston Terrace. Similarly, appropriate pedestrian connectivity will be required for westbound pedestrian traffic in High Cross Avenue. A pedestrian link will also be required to the path adjacent to the A6091 to the south. Depending on the scale of development a Transport Statement may be required.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

<b>Right of way</b>	<b>TPOs</b>	<b>Contaminated land</b>	<b>Water supply</b>	<b>Sewerage</b>	<b>Gas Supply</b>	<b>Education provision</b>
Adjacent to site	On site	Not applicable	Yes	Limited	Yes	Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: The site is within the Countryside Around Towns (CAT) area that seeks to prevent the coalescence of settlements, in this case Melrose and Darnick. Whilst it appears a logical extension to the Development Boundary of Melrose, given the house to the north, inclusion of this site would reduce the gap between the two settlements considerably.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): There is limited capacity at the Melrose WWTW. Already been requested for 30 units and will require growth project.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): There is sufficient capacity at the Howden WTW. Flow and pressure test would be required.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: The access authority would request non-vehicular access to core path 10.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

EDUCATION OFFICER: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

NHS: Did not provide any site specific comments.

## Overall assessment

<b>PP status</b>	<b>Overall assessment</b>	<b>Site capacity</b>
Excluded	Unacceptable	20

### Conclusions

The site (AMELR014) was submitted for housing, at the MIR Consultation stage. This site formed part of a larger site, which was considered as part of the Local Plan 2005/6 (EM22), however was not included within the Local Plan. This site lies to the west of the Melrose development boundary and adjacent to the Conservation Area. Melrose has good access to public transport, employment & services and is within close proximity to Tweedbank train station, which provides good connections to Edinburgh. There are a number of constraints identified, which are outlined below;

- MOD Safeguarded area;
- The site lies adjacent to the Melrose Conservation Area;
- Potential archaeology within the site, evaluation and mitigation required;
- Part of the site is within the Inventory Battlefield of Darnick;
- Site is located within the Eildon & Leaderfoot Hills National Scenic Area;
- Site is constrained within the Landscape Capacity Study;
- Limited capacity at Melrose WWTW; and
- Requirement for non-vehicular access to Core Path 10.

Furthermore, the site is located within one of the most sensitive parts of the CAT policy area, where coalescence between Darnick and Melrose is of a key concern. The proposal cannot be considered further due to the unacceptable harm to the distinct identities of these settlements the proposed development would result in.

In conclusion, taking the above into consideration, it is not considered that this site is acceptable for development and will not be included within the Proposed Plan.

---

# Midlem

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
AMIDL003	Townhead	Midlem	Central	Housing	5	0.5	Excluded

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable				

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is outwith both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. No objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

SEPA: No known flood risk.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	12/00237/FUL- Erection of Stable Block (approved). Site was considered through the Housing SG 2017 (AMIDL003) and was part of AMIDL002 through the Local Plan Amendment process.

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Limited	Limited	Limited	Minor	South

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: No comments received.

Midlem has little in the way of service or employment provision. The village has limited public transport options. Selkirk is located just under 5 miles away and Galashiels is 8.5 miles away; these settlements provide the main employment and service options.

## Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area	Open space	Listed buildings	Scheduled Monument	Ancient woodland inventory	Archaeology	Garden and designed landscape
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	On site	Not applicable

## Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: The proposed site is at the edge of the medieval village, but has been partly developed. There is a low to moderate potential for encountering archaeological deposits. Some mitigation may be necessary.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: Midlem has a very tight knit historical boundary, which was used to define the conservation area; this proposed site lies outwith this boundary and care would be needed not to have an adverse impact on the conservation area.

HES: No comments.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: No comments received.

SNH: No comment due to size and location.

Allocating this site would extend the settlement further west at an elevated location and result in the site being prominent within the landscape. It should be noted that this site formed part of the Local Development Plan 2016 Examination. The Reporter stated "development at this location would not integrate well with the village in terms of appearance and character. Significantly, I believe it would not contribute to "place-making", a central guiding principle in Scottish Planning Policy". The Reporter goes on to state that "extending the development boundary at this location would provide the potential for additional development over currently vacant land with little relationship to the Conservation Area. Indeed, as the council argues, the land is elevated and would be prominent in the landscape. This could reduce the value of the setting of the Conservation Area within the wider landscape".

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: No comments.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: Provided the access is upgraded to a suitable standard, this private access road has the ability to serve a further two new builds (three if the number of dwellinghouses permitted off a private access is increased from 4 to 5, in line with the National Roads Development Guide, through the LDP process). Any development over and above this would require the road to be upgraded to an adoptable standard, which is unlikely to be achievable due to the engineering works required.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No comments.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

On site

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: An area of the site appears to have been previously developed with an agricultural building. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Appropriate boundary treatment and surfacing for BE168 to west of site to accommodate recreational and agricultural use is required.

EDUCATION: No objections.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Robertson WTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the network. Midlem WwTW has sufficient capacity in the network.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. SW should confirm any capacity issues.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Doubtful	5

### Conclusions

The site was considered as part of the Housing SG. An initial stage 1 RAG assessment was undertaken, however this concluded that the site should not be taken forward as part of the Housing SG. The conclusion of the assessment is as follows, this remains relevant to this current site assessment:

Midlem has little in the way of service or employment provision and has limited public transport options. The site is located on the western edge of the village beyond recently built housing. Allocating this site would extend the settlement further west at an elevated location and result in the site being prominent within the landscape; in addition, it was judged that the site was not suitable for roads access and that a pedestrian route would not be able to be provided from the site to the rest of the village.

It should be noted that this site formed part of the recent Local Development Plan Examination. The Reporter stated "development at this location would not integrate well with the village in terms of appearance and character. Significantly, I believe it would not contribute to "place-making", a central guiding principle in Scottish Planning Policy". The Reporter goes on to state that "extending the development boundary at this location would provide the potential for additional development over currently vacant land with little relationship to the Conservation Area. Indeed, as the council argues, the land is elevated and would be prominent in the landscape. This could reduce the value of the setting of the Conservation Area within the wider landscape".

The Roads Officer could only support two dwellinghouses at this location. This is too low for a housing allocation which would normally be 5 units or more. It is therefore concluded that the site should be excluded from the Proposed LDP.

---

<b>Site reference</b> AMIDL004	<b>Site name</b> West of Springfield	<b>Settlement</b> Midlem	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 1	<b>Ha</b> 0.1	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is outwith both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. No objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

SEPA: Due to steep topography above the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> 00/00807/OUT - Outline planning application for erection of dwellinghouse (refused) due to the interests of road safety in that visibility from the proposed access is inadequate and is not capable of being improved to the appropriate standard.  13/01208/PPP - Erection of dwellinghouse and garage (refused) due to the site being outwith the development boundary of Midlem, the need for a new dwellinghouse on the site has not been adequately substantiated, the site is not related to any building group, and the development would not have a sympathetic visual relationship to existing buildings and boundaries that would otherwise justify it as an exception to development plan policies.  The site was considered during the Housing SG 2017 and was excluded.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Limited	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Limited	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> South
----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	-----------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGICAL OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site appears to be improved grassland and site includes stone-built dwelling and steading with potential for bats (EPS) and breeding birds. Potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC/SSSI via run off (site adjacent to River Teviot). Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including bats (EPS) and breeding birds.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

On/adjacent to site

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: The proposed site is at the edge of the medieval village, but has been partly developed. There is a low to moderate potential for encountering archaeological deposits. Some mitigation may be necessary.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: Just outside the Conservation Area; some scope for limited development.

HES: No comments.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: 1-2 units if scale and due consideration is given to reflecting surrounding density and character.

SNH: No comment due to size and location.

The small site has little landscape feature and to some extent is semi-derelict in nature due to the redundant farm buildings to the south.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Network Manager: No comments.

Passenger Transport: No comments.

Roads Planning Service: No objections to a single unit being constructed on this plot. The access will have to be upgraded to an acceptable standard.

Strategic Transport: No comments received.

Transport Scotland: No comments.

### Near a trunk road?

### Right of way

On/adjacent to site

### TPOs

On/adjacent to sit

### Contaminated land

On site

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: An area of the site appears to have been previously developed with an agricultural building. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Appropriate boundary treatment and surfacing for BE168 to west of site to accommodate recreational and agricultural use is required.

EDUCATION: No objections.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Robertson WTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the network. Midlem WwTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the network.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. SW should confirm any capacity issues.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Doubtful	1

## Conclusions

The site was considered at the Local Development Plan Examination in 2016 under site code SBMID001. The Reporter stated that "development at this location would not integrate well with the village in terms of appearance and character. All-in-all, I find little merit in extending the settlement boundary as proposed". This position has not changed however the site was re-considered as part of the Housing SG Call for Sites and an initial stage 1 RAG assessment was undertaken, the site assessment concluded that the site should not be taken forward as part of the Housing SG. The conclusion of the assessment was as follows and remains relevant:

This site would potentially accommodate a single dwellinghouse, however, a dwellinghouse on the site would not relate well to the generally linear form of the village. Although the site adjoins the existing settlement boundary, the proposed boundary does not follow any distinct physical or natural features on the ground and is not therefore regarded as a logical extension of the settlement.

It is also not the purpose of the Local Development Plan to identify single plots for development only sites with a capacity of five or more units will be allocated.

In view of the above, it is not considered that this proposal can be supported.

---

# Morebattle

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
AMORE002	Land west of Primary School	Morebattle	Rest of Borders	Housing	8	1.1	Excluded

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable				

### Initial assessment summary

There are no initial constraints on the site which would preclude it from being developed.

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is outwith both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. No objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

SEPA: OS Map indicates a sufficient height difference between site and Kale Water.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	On site	Greenfield	98/01345/OUT - Formation of industrial site with road and plot layout (Approved) 00/01383/FUL - Erection of storage building (Approved) 00/00055/REM - Formation of access to industrial site with drainage and plot layout (Approved)

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Limited	Limited	Limited	Minor	South

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: No comments.

GENERAL COMMENTS: No ecological concerns have been raised. The site is currently farmed arable land. The site gently slopes down towards the Kale Water, which is part of the River Tweed SAC, so there would have to be standard mitigation. Morebattle has relatively good local services for a settlement of its size including a hotel/pub, post office/shop, primary school. There are four bus services serving Morebattle: the 81 and 81a - Kelso - Yetholm circular; K12 - Kelso - Morebattle circular; K13 - Kelso - Eckford. It is 9 miles from Kelso which offers more services and transport connections as well as some employment opportunities.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Adjacent to site

### Open space

Adjacent to site

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: No known issues.

HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER: The site lies just to the west of the Morebattlle Conservation Area and adjacent to the Primary School (which whilst not listed is a significant historic building). Care would be needed over the scale and massing of any development to respect the conservation area.

HES: No comments.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The industrial/business allocation BMORE002 was made with the intention of providing an extension opportunity to the industrial/business function on BMORE001. It accepted that there has not been interest in its extension onto BMORE002, but this allocation does still provide an opportunity for small scale rural business development in the area. The allocation was made in such a way as to maintain a separation between the residential village and the small industrial park in order to avoid any problems occurring between these neighbouring uses. Changing BMORE002 to a housing allocation and extending it up to the Primary School would mean the loss of the potential industrial/business extension opportunity as well as the boundary separating the two land uses. It would also take the residential development of the village in a westerly, linear fashion away from its centre. Given that there is limited developer interest in the village and existing, better placed, housing allocations, in the village it does not make sense to allocate this site for housing.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: No comments received.

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to the size and location.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: The site is likely to impact on the location of the 30 mph limit.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comment.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: Not opposed to this site being allocated for housing. A strong street frontage will be required and the existing footway, lighting and 30mph limit will have to be extended. Pedestrian/cycle linkage with the existing employment land to the west would be required.

### Near a trunk road?

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Average

Central HMA

Morebattlle

AMORE002

## Planning & infrastructure summary

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Footways within site required to provide link to riverside path Right of way BR215 that runs East to West beyond the North of the site.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: There has been informal interest in site BMORE002 for industrial uses. There would be potential amenity issues if reallocated for housing.

EDUCATION: No issues.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Waste: There is an on-going project for WwTW there will be sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the network. Water: Robertson WTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the network.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. SW should confirm any capacity issues.

GENERAL COMMENTS: There are no planning and infrastructure constraints which would rule out development. Development Management have raised amenity issues around the close location of industrial and housing, as well as concerns around the unnecessary loss of an industrial/employment site which might service the local rural economy. Roads Planning Service have stated that footway, lighting and 30mph limit would need to be extended along the length of the roadway; at 170m in length this would not be an insignificant cost to fund from 8 houses which would likely be delivered over quite a protracted period.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Doubtful	8

## Conclusions

The site was considered as part of the Housing SG. An initial stage 1 RAG assessment was undertaken, however this concluded that the site should not be taken forward as part of the Housing SG. The conclusion of the assessment was as follows:

"A large proportion of this site is allocated as a district business and industrial site and remains undeveloped although the safeguarded site to the west is fully developed and is in use. This site allows for potential expansion of the business and industrial site in the future. Although the majority of the site is Prime Agricultural Land, the site is relatively free of constraints. There are also two undeveloped housing allocations within Morebattle, one of which was allocated as part of the Local Plan Amendment. It is not considered that there is a requirement for an additional housing site within the settlement at this point in time."

The arguments set out in the RAG 1 Assessment still hold. Although the landowner/proposer has been unable to attract industrial/business development on allocation BMORE001, this does not mean it should be reallocated for housing. There appears to be a lack of developer interest in Morebattle. In recent years only very small scale development has taken place. This might be expected for a small settlement outside the rural Strategic Development Area. There is no developer identified for the proposed allocation and there is no reason to believe that there will be market interest in the site (located adjacent existing industrial development) than the existing more suitably allocated sites in Morebattle. This proposal would involve the reallocation of BMORE001 for housing development, but there is no good case for such a reallocation. This would involve the loss of a future employment/business opportunity in a rural area for housing, when there are already two existing sites, RMO6B and AMORE001 offering a plentiful supply of housing in Morebattle. The development for housing would mean the westerly linear development of the village and would require appropriate access to the village through footpaths, lighting and redesignation of the village's 30mph zone. Such work is not required at the existing allocations.

It is therefore considered that the proposed site AMORE002 will not be taken forward into the Proposed Local Development Plan as a housing site. It is considered that there are other more appropriate sites that can be allocated within the Proposed Plan.

<b>Site reference</b> AMORE003	<b>Site name</b> Land West of Teapot Bank	<b>Settlement</b> Morebattle	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 5	<b>Ha</b> 0.6	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	----------------------------------------------	---------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

SEPA: We require an FRA to assess the flood risk to the site from the Kale Water. There are potential uncertainties in the flood map here and hence lower parts of the site may be at risk of flooding. This site is immediately adjacent to the Scottish Water foul sewer network and as such foul drainage must connect to the foul sewer.

SBC FLOOD TEAM: This site does not lie within the SEPA 1 in 200 year fluvial (river) or pluvial (surface water) flood extents. As such, I would have no objections to this site on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> On site	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no planning history for this site.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Limited	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Limited	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> South
----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	-----------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site appears to consist of an arable field with hedgerow and some trees on the boundary. Potential for bat (EPS) (foraging/commuting), badger and breeding birds. Potential connectivity with River Tweed SAC, 40m to Kale water. Mitigation for protected species potentially including bats (lighting), badger and breeding birds. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Open space</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Listed buildings</b> Not applicable	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> Not applicable	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> Not applicable
----------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE AND DESIGN: Outside the development boundary and outwith the conservation area boundary. Whilst no specific Heritage and Design issues, the access road/ drive may have an adverse impact especially if this introduces street lighting to the edge of the village.

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: On the edge of medieval village, some mitigation may be required.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: No comments.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to size and location of site.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: A small scale housing development of 5 or less units served by a private access is likely to be acceptable in this location. Any development greater than this would require a public road provision and this site does not lend itself to a good street layout as it will require a fairly significant length of access road to get to the site. A pedestrian link to Teapot Bank is required along with a small section of footway on the B6401 to tie in with the existing provision.

ROAD NETWORK MANAGER: New access onto main road but only 5 houses.

### Right of way

On site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: No comments.

EDUCATION: No issues raised regarding the proposal.

SCOTTISH WATER (WASTE): Limited capacity.

SCOTTISH WATER (WATER): Sufficient capacity - no concerns.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Awkward relationship of what appears to be the proposed access road with the village boundary.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Right of Way BR215 crosses the site . The Access authority will require non-vehicular links to the existing path network and the main road B6401; specifically links to enable access to the riverside path BR215 and other existing routes from Teapot Bank and Teapot Street. Safe routes to school is also relevant. These links are important in terms of facilitating access to the existing path network and mitigating against irresponsible access through farmland.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

WASTE MANAGEMENT: No comments.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

PROJECTS MANAGER: No comments.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Doubtful	5

### Conclusions

This site was submitted as part of the Main Issues Report consultation process. The proposed site is on a greenfield site to the west of Teapot Bank. The long proposed vehicular access along the existing development boundary appears awkward and does not integrate well with existing settlement.

There are two undeveloped housing allocations within Morebattle, one of which was allocated as part of the Local Plan Amendment in 2011, there is also an approved planning brief covering both of these sites. Therefore it is not considered that there is a requirement for an additional housing site within the settlement at this point in time.

In conclusion, the site will not be taken forward for inclusion within the Proposed Local Development Plan for housing.

---

# Newmill (Nr Hawick)

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
RNEWM001	Site at Newmill Steading	Newmill (Nr Hawick)	Rest of Borders	Housing	8	0.8	Excluded

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
1:200	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: Parts of the North Eastern side of this site are at risk of flooding at a 1 in 200 year flood event. The River Teviot is shown to come out of bank upstream of this site and the Newmill Burn runs very close to the site. Therefore, a Flood Risk Assessment would require to be undertaken for this site.

SEPA: Require an FRA which assesses the risk from the River Teviot and the Newmill Burn. Based on historic maps, there is potentially a mill lade/ lead through the site which should be investigated further. Due to steep topography adjacent/ through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and the proposed development is not affected by surface runoff. Site may be constrained due to flood risk.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Combination	97/05352/FUL - Change of use from stables to tyre store.

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Good	Limited	Limited	Moderate	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site appears to be improved grassland and site includes stone-built dwelling and steading with potential for bats (EPS) and breeding birds. Potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC/SSSI via run off (site adjacent to River Teviot). Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including bats (EPS) and breeding birds.

SNH: This appears to be part reuse but as the site is adjacent to Tweed SAC/SSSI SNH recommend it is screened into HRA.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: A mill has existed here since at least the middle of the 18th century. In addition to a potential for buried archaeology, the standing buildings are sensitive to redevelopment. Some mitigation is likely.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: Potential for redevelopment, best of the standing buildings should be retained and converted.

HES: No comments.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: The location next to A7 and on an important entry route into the Borders means that the site is highly visible and sensitive and every effort should be made to retain the character and features that make this building group special. Any development on this site should reflect the standing type layout with linked courtyards and houses – avoiding detached properties as far as possible. A standing type layout should turn its back on, but not ignore, the A7 running along the north west boundary.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: Likely to require introduction of a new 30 or 40 mph speed limit.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Possible bus infrastructure required on both sides.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: This is not the most sustainable of locations in respect of easy access to local amenities; however public transport is available in close proximity. It does seem a logical infill site and it benefits from having indirect vehicular access available to the trunk road via the minor public road to the north east of the site. All things considered the Roads Planning Service is not opposed to a modest scale of development at this location. The site is adjacent to the A7 trunk Road and the comments of Transport Scotland would be required should any development be considered, especially with regards to the existing direct vehicular access to the trunk road. Good pedestrian linkage to the A7 footway would be required and provision of enhanced public transport provision and pedestrian crossovers in the A7 would be a consideration.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Access is recommended from the local road. Early discussion with Transport Scotland is advised.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

On site

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

### Near a trunk road?

## Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have been previously developed as a corn mill, saw mill and horticultural nursery. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Scope to provide pedestrian link though or along South and West edge of boundary of site to provide pedestrian access avoiding the A7.

EDUCATION: No objections.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Robertson WTW has sufficient capacity. Please note there is a Water main just within site boundary. Sufficient capacity in the network. Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network however it is likely that this would require upsizing for any new development.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	8

## Conclusions

The allocation of a re-development site at such a location would not comply with the principles of the Local Development Plan as it is not appropriate to allocate the site for re-development which should otherwise be tested under the Council's Housing in the Countryside policy. Should the applicant wish to pursue the matter, a planning application could be submitted for consideration against the Council's Housing in the Countryside Policy.

---

# Newstead

---

<b>Site reference</b> ANEWS005	<b>Site name</b> The Orchard	<b>Settlement</b> Newstead	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 6	<b>Ha</b> 0.3	<b>PP status</b> Retain LDP Site
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------

---

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b>	<b>SAC</b>	<b>SPA</b>	<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
------------------	------------	------------	-------------	---------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site is already allocated for the proposed use within the Adopted Supplementary Guidance on Housing (November 2017). It is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2. The proposal seeks to increase the indicative capacity of the site from 6 units to 18 units.

---

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b>	<b>Planning history references</b>
--------------------------	------------	--------------------------------------------	----------------------	------------------------------------

---

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b>	<b>Access to employment</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b>	<b>Site aspect</b>
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
--------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------------------	--------------------	------------------------------------------

### Local impact and integration summary

---

## Landscape assessment

---

NSA

SLA

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

Wild Land

### Landscape summary

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

Right of way

TPOs

Contaminated land

Water supply

Sewerage

Gas Supply

Education provision

### Planning & infrastructure summary

---

## Overall assessment

**PP status**

**Overall assessment**

**Site capacity**

Retain LDP Site

6

### Conclusions

The site is already allocated for the proposed use within the Adopted Supplementary Guidance on Housing (November 2017). It is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2. The indicative capacity of the site is 6 units, this is considered appropriate given the location of the site within the Newstead Conservation Area. An indicative site capacity of 18 for this site is considered to be exceptionally high. However, the capacity of the site would be established through the planning application process.

---

<b>Site reference</b> ANEWS007	<b>Site name</b> Newstead East	<b>Settlement</b> Newstead	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 18	<b>Ha</b> 0.9	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is within the surface water 1 in 200 year flood extent. No objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. Would, however, ask that surface water flooding is considered and it is ensured that any water would be routed around the housing.

SEPA: There is a watercourse immediately downstream of the site and a surface water flow path through the site. There may be a culverted watercourse through the site which should be investigated further. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues at this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Site may be constrained due to flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> 01/01262/FUL - Alterations to ground to form rampart and erection of information boards.  The site was considered through the process of the Housing SG 2017 (ANEWS007) and the Local Development Plan 2016 (MNEWS001).
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response received.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Open space</b> Not applicable	<b>Listed buildings</b> Not applicable	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> On/adjacent to site	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> Not applicable
----------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

## Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: This site is in close proximity to the Scheduled site of Newstead Roman Fort complex. There are cropmarks through the site that may be related. It is likely that archaeology exists within the site, and this requires some evaluation. Any development must respect the setting of the Scheduled Monument.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: This site lies just outside the Newstead conservation area. There is potential housing development within the site, but care will be needed to ensure a high quality design is adopted to respect the character of the conservation area. An Award winning housing scheme was delivered at the west end of the village a number of years ago setting the standard to be achieved.

HES: Affecting setting of SM 12869 Newstead Roman Military Complex: HES consider that the impact on the setting could be mitigated by application of policy. The proposed site is, however, immediately adjacent to the scheduled monument, in an area which has known archaeological remains, probably relating to the Roman military complex. The likelihood of encountering unscheduled archaeology during development is extremely high. For advice on this, you should consult your Council's archaeological adviser.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

On/adjacent to site

### SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: No comments received.

SNH: No comments.

The Scottish Borders Development and Landscape Capacity Study (March 2007) identifies the site as a 'marginal' area, appropriate for relatively dense, energy efficient clustered housing no more than one and a half stories high. A generous and well designed approach to the village should be designed along the road front.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: May impact on location of 30 mph limit.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: This is a straightforward site for development with easy access onto the B6361 along with the opportunity for a secondary access onto Back Road to allow good street connectivity and proper integration with the rest of the village. The site benefits from easy access to the main road network and its close proximity to public transport provision. The creation of a strong frontage onto the B6361 is desirable and this would help reinforce the 30 mph speed limit and may necessitate a slight extension of the limit. A footway would be required on the B6361 frontage. For vehicular access off Back Road, the initial length of Back Road from the B6361 to the site entrance will have to be upgraded to an adoptable standard which will include improving the junction and incorporating pedestrian provision. Any development approved should take cognisance of the potential expansion of the Border Railway, particularly along the southern boundary of the site. A Transport Statement may be required depending on the scale of development.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No comments.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

Near a trunk road?

## Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Connecting path to the permissive path running along the west side of the proposed site is required.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Prominent site at the entrance to the village from the bypass and an inappropriate addition to it. Conflicts with policy EP6. Potential impact on trees; Archaeological implications. Seems out of scale with the size of the village.

EDUCATION: No objections.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. A Flow and Pressure test is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the SW network in Newstead (which pumps to Melrose stw). There may be a culverted watercourse running through the western part of this site. The development should seek to de-culvert to make a feature of this and no further culverting for land gain should be allowed.

---

## Overall assessment

### PP status

Excluded

### Overall assessment

Unacceptable

### Site capacity

18

## Conclusions

Development at this location would have an adverse impact upon the form of the settlement as it would elongate it and cross the existing boundaries formed by roads. It is considered that any development of the site would affect the rural setting of the conservation area, west of it. The site was previously rejected by the Reporter at the examination of the Local Development Plan on the following grounds:

'... I believe that the site is a valuable element in the landscape setting of Newstead. Indeed, in this respect, I concur with the Newstead settlement profile in stating that the fields to the east should be protected from future development as they are considered to form part of the character of the village'. 'Despite the planning permission granted for some limited development at the eastern edge of Newstead, I believe the boundary at this location to be clear and worthy of retention. The current sense of entry to the village would be lost should the suggested development take place. This would be contrary to the principle of place-making set out in Scottish Planning Policy'.

Overall, it is not considered that this site can be accepted for a housing allocation within the Proposed LDP.

---

<b>Site reference</b> ANEWS008	<b>Site name</b> Newstead North I	<b>Settlement</b> Newstead	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 25	<b>Ha</b> 1.2	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Adjacent to site	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is outwith both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. No objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

SEPA: Contours indicate a sufficient height difference between site and River Tweed.

General Comments: There are no flood issues identified. The site is adjacent to the River Tweed SAC and SSSI.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no history of planning applications on the site. The site was considered through the process of the Housing SG 2017 (ANEWS006) and the Scottish Borders Local Plan Amendment (ANEWS002).
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Minor. Improved pasture with some mature tree cover within site. Woodland strip on N boundary. Garden ground with mature tree cover on boundary. No significant biodiversity issues.

General comments: The site has good access to local services and facilities in Melrose, one mile or less than 15 minutes drive away. It has good access to employment particularly in Galashiels, 6 miles or less than 15 minutes drive away. The settlement is on the A6091(T) which is also part of the strategic public transport network.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> On/adjacent to site	<b>Open space</b> On site	<b>Listed buildings</b> Not applicable	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> On/adjacent to site	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

## Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: The site is within an area of high archaeological potential with the Roman site of Newstead to the east, and the medieval village to the south. The projected line of a Roman road runs through the site. Archaeological evaluation of the site is required.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: There is limited potential for some limited development – but scaled back from an indicative capacity of 23 units.

HES: No comments.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

On site

### SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: Indicative site capacity of 23 units unlikely to be achieved given mature trees on the western half of site and severe constraints to access. If access constraints from the east can be overcome it should be possible to develop the eastern half of the site. Any further development to the western half is severely constrained by the location of mature and high value amenity trees along historic field boundaries. Given above comments capacity is likely to be about half of suggested capacity. The paddocks are an attractive and valuable local open space which contrasts with the complex pattern of development in the historic core of the village and the newer residential developments to the south east of the site. If access could be overcome a more limited development of the eastern portion of the site would be possible if adequate buffer zones were identified to woodland and mature trees.

SNH: From SNH's response of 03 August 2016 for allocation reference ANEWS006:

While this site was not considered by the Reporter, their comments on Newstead in relation to Issue 250 are relevant. Newstead's position within the Eildon & Leaderfoot National Scenic Area (NSA) and a Countryside Around Towns (CAT) area demonstrates the sensitivity of the landscape and the quality of place of the existing settlement. If SBC is minded to allocate this site, the special qualities of the NSA and policy of the current Countryside Around Towns Supplementary Planning Guidance should be used to establish site requirements and secure delivery of a high quality place that respects this setting.

General Comments (TO COMPLETE): The site sits with Eildon and Leaderfoot National Scenic Area, but is well screened to the north, and to some degree to the west. The Landscape Capacity Study (2007) found the southern-most portion of the site to be suitable for a small cluster of houses, but the remainder of the site to be within a wider area of constrained land to the north of Newstead.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Junction of Eddy Road and Main Street has very poor visibility to right. Adding additional vehicle movements to this junction would be a concern.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: Able to support this site for development, but only on the basis that significant upgrading work is undertaken in the public road known as Rushbank leading to the site. Similarly the private road known as Eddy Road leading to the site needs to be upgraded to an adoptable standard. In both cases third party land owners are directly affected. For Rushbank part of the road needs to be widened and provision for on-street parking needs to be improved. For Eddy Road the junction with Main Street needs to be improved to the west in terms of junction visibility by lowering the roadside wall and shifting street furniture and dealing with vegetation. The road itself needs to be upgraded to an adoptable standard in terms of construction, drainage, lighting etc. and it needs to be widened and on-street parking provision formalised. The two buildings on the west side of the road combined with the high roadside wall on the east side create pinch-points which appear too narrow and a minimum width of 3.4m (wall to wall) is required. In conclusion, if this off-site work can be achieved along with the creation of an internally connected street network, including pedestrian links to St. John's Wynd and Townhead Way, then the Roads Officer would be able to support an indicative number of 23 houses on the site. A Transport Statement is required to address accessibility and sustainable travel.

Transport Scotland: No comments.

**Right of way**

Adjacent to site

**TPOs**

On/adjacent to sit

**Contaminated land**

Not applicable

**Water supply**

Yes

**Sewerage**

Limited

**Gas Supply**

Yes

**Education provision**

Good

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: The core path running by the west of the site (called Eddy Road) should not be used as vehicular access. A connecting path between the proposed site and Eddy Road is required to connect to the path network.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Not clear how this site would be accessed. Small scale development on parts of the overall site may be appropriate and would be a logical extension to the development boundary. Potential impact on trees.

EDUCATION: No objections.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. Water main running through site. A Flow and Pressure test is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment ahe WWTW.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the SW network in Newstead (which pumps to Melrose stw).

**Overall assessment****PP status****Excluded****Overall assessment**

Doubtful

**Site capacity**

25

**Conclusions**

The site was considered through the process of the Housing SG under ANEWS006. The notable changes are now an increased proposed capacity of 25 units (from 23) and the demolition of the existing Tweedwood Cottage and the incorporation of a small area of garden ground of 14 Rushbank in order to achieve access.

The following site assessment from the earlier Housing SG proposal still remains relevant to the assessment of this site (ANEWS006):

The site sits on the northern periphery of Newstead, partly within the settlement boundary. Similarly the site is partly within both Newstead Conservation Area, and partly within the Countryside Around Towns (CAT) policy area. The CAT policy does not preclude development, and this particular part of the CAT is less sensitive than other areas, as the risk of coalescence in this location is minimal.

The settlement's relationship with Newstead Conservation Area is a key consideration. The site is large relative to the size of the settlement and sensitive integration into the settlement would be essential. The site sits on the edge of Eildon & Leaderfoot National Scenic Area (NSA) and adjacent to the River Tweed SSSI and SAC. The applicant has submitted an indicative site layout proposing 23 units. Due to the need to protect healthy trees on the site it is likely if the site was to be allocated this figure would be reduced considerably.

A portion of the proposed site was considered and rejected on access grounds at the time of the Local Plan Amendment. Roads access has been reassessed and is not opposed in principle by the Council's Road section, as in this instance further investigation is being sought with regards to the possibility of forming a road link between Rushbank and Eddy Road. However, key issues remain to be resolved: significant upgrading work is required in the pubic road known as Rushbank; and the private road known as Eddy Road needs to be upgraded to an adoptable standard. In both cases third party land owners are directly affected. For the whole site to be developed, access would be required from both. It remains to be seen whether the developer is in a position to address these points and that the Council can consequently be satisfied the requirements can be resolved. A Transport Statement would also be required for any development.

The applicant has not demonstrated that the requisite road improvements can be implemented as they involve land outwith their control. In view of this, it is not considered that this proposal can be supported.

---

# Newtown St Boswells

<b>Site reference</b>	<b>Site name</b>	<b>Settlement</b>	<b>SDA</b>	<b>Proposed Use</b>	<b>Indicative Capacity</b>	<b>Ha</b>	<b>PP status</b>
<b>BNEWT002</b>	Land NW of The Holmes Barns	Newtown St Boswells	Central	Employment	N/A	1.8	<b>Excluded</b>

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b>	<b>SAC</b>	<b>SPA</b>	<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

Flood Risk and Coastal Management: This site does not lie within the SEPA 1 in 200 year fluvial (river) or pluvial (surface water) flood extents. The Holmes Burn lies to the South East of the site but appears to lie higher than this burn. The applicant should show the heights of the burn within their topographical survey to outline that there is no significant flood risk from this burn.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency: SEPA require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Howden Burn and tributary which flows adjacent to the site. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b>	<b>Planning history references</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	The site formed part of a large scale planning application for the erection of 900 dwellinghouse including associated infrastructure, highway works, ancillary works and landscaping. Highway works to include formation of new roundabout on A68 trunk road and realignment of Whitelee Road (09/01005/OUT). The application is pending decision.

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b>	<b>Access to employment</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b>	<b>Site aspect</b>
Good	Good	Good	Moderate	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

Ecology Officer: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site appears to be improved pasture with hedgerow, mature broadleaf trees on the boundary. Potential connectivity with River Tweed SAC/SSSI via adjacent Holmes burn. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats (lighting), badger and breeding birds. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Adjacent to site

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

Archaeology Officer: No known issues.

Heritage & Design Officer: Whilst no specific heritage and design issues, the potential allocation of this site needs to be carefully considered in the light of the other competing development sites in the NSB area and the existing nearby Tweed Horizons.

Historic Environment Scotland: No objections.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

On site

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

Landscape Architect: No response received.

Scottish Natural Heritage: This site sits adjacent to a proposal (your ref 19/00210/PPP) we have recently responded to. SNH's response included an objection in relation to the Eildon & Leaderfoot NSA. As this site lies within the NSA and would represent many of the same issues as the recent application, we have concerns regarding allocation of this site. SNH consider that BNEWT002 should be considered as part of a strategic piece of a bigger puzzle that will require a coordinated approach to business and industrial development to the east of A68 if that is where Scottish Borders Council considers Newtown St Boswells should next grow to. SNH suggest that a key part of this will be revisiting the existing development brief and including new site(s).

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Network Management: No observations.

Passenger Transport: No objections.

### Near a trunk road?

Roads Planning: Whilst I have no objections to the principle of this site being allocated for business and industry, it should be noted that the access serving the site is served via the A68 Trunk Road and the comments of Transport Scotland will be critical. That said, there is already a substantial junction on the A68 which may well be suitable for such a proposal. Furthermore, the area of land opposite this site is currently allocated for similar use and has yet to have any development commence within it. It would make more sense to complete the currently allocated land prior to allocating further land for the same use. Any development of this site would be limited by the area that would be required for the provision of the roundabout required as part of the development of the land on the west of the A68. Were it to be allocated, contributions should be sought towards the roundabout required on the A68 associated with the larger scale development of the area.

Depending on the nature and scale of development, A Transport Assessment, or Transport Statement, may be required.

Transport Scotland: It is recommended that access to this site is taken from the local road network and not the A68(T).

**Right of way**

On/adjacent to site

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

Not applicable

**Water supply**

Yes

**Sewerage**

No

**Gas Supply**

No

**Education provision**

Good

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

**CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER:** The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

**COUNTRYSIDE RANGER:** There are existing pathways on the edge of the public roads adjacent to the site. Non vehicular links to nearby settlements would be required.

**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT:** The land is included in the site boundary for 09/01004/OUT for the expansion of Newtown St Boswells and was required to accommodate the new roundabout on the A68. There is already a large area of land allocated for business and industrial use (BNEWT001) adjacent to Tweed Horizons that has not yet been taken up. Allocating this area of land would bring such uses closer to residential properties and so a potential conflict of uses could occur. The land is within the CAT area between Newtown and St Boswells.

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT:** This site very prominent and would need to be suitably screened from the A68. It also has a large HV electricity cable running above it which would be expensive to relocate and make the development costs high. However, the main issue with the site is that it is full of fill from the Newtown by-pass to quite an extent. The waste material was not laid appropriately to construction standards, therefore making any development problematic and expensive to build on. Economic Development could not support this proposal.

**EDUCATION:** No objections.

**ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH:** Existing residential dwellings are present approximately 40m to the southwest of the site. A further 40 dwellings are consented on the site approximately 40m to the west, beyond the A68. Specific class uses and site layout need to be carefully considered to avoid having a detrimental effect on residential amenity. Industrial use of the site (i.e. class 5 or 6) may be difficult to support.

**HOUSING STRATEGY:** No objections.

**SCOTTISH ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AGENCY:** This site is not within the existing sewered catchment and hence unless the sewered catchment were to be extended the site would require private foul drainage arrangements. It however appears unlikely that it would be possible to achieve a drainage solution at this location as there is no suitable watercourse nearby and the site is constrained by the main A68 road on one side and a minor road on the other. The small burn running to the south of the site appears too small to be suitable for a discharge. Depending on the intended future use of the site certain activities/ industrial type processes may require additional permissions from SEPA to operate.

**SCOTTISH WATER:** No Waste Water Treatment Works network. There is sufficient Water Treatment Works capacity (Roberton WOA). A WIA would probably be required.

**Overall assessment****PP status**

Excluded

**Overall assessment**

Acceptable

**Site capacity**

N/A

**Conclusions**

Whilst the principle of business land at this location is considered to be acceptable, there is already a substantial area of land designated for business use within the Local Development Plan 2016 (BNEWT001) to the immediate north of the site. Furthermore, any development of this site would be limited by the area that would be required for the provision of a roundabout required as part of the Newtown St. Boswells Development Framework.

The site is located within the Countryside Around Towns area as defined by Policy EP6. It is not however considered that the development of this site would have an unacceptable harm on the neighbouring settlements due to the proximity of existing sites earmarked for development.

There is a high voltage electricity cable running across the site which would require to be relocated and it is understood there is waste material under the site which may make construction more expensive. These matters would require to be considered as part of any development.

Due to the proximity of the site to existing residential properties and the potential conflict of uses, use classes 5 or 6 may be difficult to support from an Environmental Health point of view.

There is no Waste Water Treatment Works to serve any development at this location.

It is considered that given the extensive existing business allocation at Tweed Horizons (BNEWT001) and the potential issue of any development on this site interfering with any future roundabout required as part of the Newtown St. Boswells Development Framework this site is not currently appropriate for development. It is not considered that the submission has justified the need for business land at this location.

---

<b>Site reference</b> ANEWT009	<b>Site name</b> Land South of Whitehall	<b>Settlement</b> Newtown St Boswells	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 500	<b>Ha</b> 37.0	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Adjacent to site	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

Flood Risk and Coastal Management: This site does not lie within the SEPA 1 in 200 year fluvial (river) or pluvial (surface water) flood extents. The West Burn lies to the South East of the site but does not appear to be of risk to the site. The applicant should provide topographical information showing the height of the burn with respect to the site to confirm that there is no significant flood risk from the burn. Due to the size of the site, surface water runoff will require to be considered.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency: SEPA require an FRA which assesses the risk from the West Burn and Holmes Burn which flow through the site. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues at this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Combination	<b>Planning history references</b> 09/01005/OUT - Erection of 900 dwellinghouses including associated infrastructure, highway works, ancillary works and landscaping. Highway works to include formation of new roundabout on A68 trunk road and realignment of Whitelee Road. This application covers land to the north of the proposed allocation but does include an area of land to the north east of ANEWT008.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

Ecology Officer: Although no response has been received from the Council's Ecology Officer, the following was a response received for the same site (with a slightly different boundary) during the process of LDP1: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate. Phase 1 habitat (aerial interpretation) Arable (J1.1), Improved pasture (B4), coniferous shelter belts (A1.2.2), Scrub (A2.2). Field boundaries: strip of upland birchwood on west boundary. Lines of broad-leaved trees, hedgerow network, old railway. Parkland trees (featured on OS 1st ed). Next to Bowden burn- connectivity with River Tweed SAC/SSSI, adjacent to Local Biodiversity Site (Bowden glen). Mitigation: Avoid significant adverse effect on River Tweed SAC/SSSI,. Protect and enhance boundary features. Safeguard parkland and old railway features. Flood Risk (Fluvial 1in 200): No.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On/adjacent to site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

Archaeology Officer: Projected line of Roman road runs through the site, as well as former railway. There is also the former site of a recreation ground and one cropmark of unknown origin. Evaluation will be required.

Heritage & Design Officer: No specific heritage and design issues.

Historic Environment Scotland: No objections.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Adjacent to site

### SLA

Adjacent to site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

Scottish Natural Heritage: SNH understand that this site was previously submitted as part of the Housing SG but have no record of giving previous advice. SNH note that it appears to accord with the Settlement Profile for Newtown St Boswells which directs new residential development to the west of the existing settlement. ANEWT009 is contiguous with the southern part of the existing allocation at ANEWT005. Our advice is that if allocated in the next LDP, it should be as safeguard till ANEWT005 is delivered as it appears likely that progress ahead of ANEWT005 would lead to an isolated settlement. From our brief appraisal we consider that the allocation would obscure views to the Eildon Hills from A699. However, this could be resolved through an approach to layout and massing / height of buildings that is based on avoiding this outcome. SNH also note that allocating ANEWT009 would lead to a doubling of the developable area to the south of Newtown St Boswells, leading almost to coalescence with St Boswells. Treatment of the boundary along the A699 will be an important element of avoiding perceived coalescence. We also suggest that a clear purpose is established for the remaining unallocated land around Hawthorndene is established in LDP2 in order to prevent further coalescence of these settlements. If Scottish Borders Council's long-term vision for these places is that coalescence would be acceptable, an approach to managing this in a sustainable manner that maintains existing character should be established.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Network Management: Essentially a new satellite village. Need more detail to be able to comment.

Passenger Transport: Contribution under s75 to improve bus services which are already at capacity at certain times of the day. Road layout should include provision for bus turning area and bus stop infrastructure.

Project Management: Safeguarding of possible extension of Borders Railway to be considered.

Roads Planning: The main expansion of Newtown St Boswells, as identified in the current Local Plan (Site ANEWT005) is likely to require the construction of a new roundabout onto the A68 Trunk Road with a leg off the roundabout serving as a main access into the site (ANEWT005). There is also a requirement for full integration with the existing street network in the village. Achieving such integration is less certain now that safeguarding the possible extension of the Borders Railway has become a higher priority, meaning that the previously anticipated road link into the core of the village via the former railway line is uncertain. With this uncertainty in mind it would seem inappropriate to allocate this site (ANEWT009) for residential development at this time, but the street layout for Site ANEWT005 will have to allow for possible future connectivity with the land in question here.

### Near a trunk road?

There is some concern that the development of this site will effectively result in the coalescence of Newtown St Boswells and St Boswells with little integration between the two.

A detailed Transport Assessment (TA) would be required to demonstrate how integration and street connectivity with Site ANEWT005 (and both villages) can successfully occur and to confirm all improvements that will be required to the existing road infrastructure to ensure this site can be incorporated appropriately. The outcome of such a TA will confirm what access and connectivity will be required to satisfactorily link this site to the existing infrastructure. Such linkage will include vehicular links to the A699 to the south and pedestrian linkage from the proposed site, along the A699 to the adjoining residential development (The Kennels) and on into St Boswells. This is likely to include improved pedestrian facilities to enable safe crossing of the A68. The comments of Transport Scotland will also be key when considering any works on, or in the vicinity of, the A68 and in terms of the increase in traffic that will ensue at the existing trunk road junctions.

The overall development area (ANEWT005 and ANEWT009) is so extensive that local services will be an expectation and so part of the site may have to be considered for mixed use. Such service provision needs to be only local in nature so as not to detract from the existing services in the two villages. Public transport provision will be a further consideration. In summary the allocation of this site for development would seem premature at this time.

Transport Scotland: The potential cumulative impact of 500 units on the A68(T), alongside other potential developments, would require to be determined prior to the publication of the proposed Plan. Information relating to any required mitigation measures and how these will be funded and delivered would require to be identified within the plan.

<b>Right of way</b>	<b>TPOs</b>	<b>Contaminated land</b>	<b>Water supply</b>	<b>Sewerage</b>	<b>Gas Supply</b>	<b>Education provision</b>
On/adjacent to site	Not applicable	On/adjacent to site	Limited	Limited	No	Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

**CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER:** A portion of the site is developed as an agricultural steading/ mill and was also intersected by railway running lines. The site is brownfield land and its use may present development constraints.

**COUNTRYSIDE RANGER:** BE 181 is on the edge of this site. The access authority will request non-vehicular links from within this site to the existing path network and recreation areas. Specifically links to paths to nearby existing settlements and adjacent sites with plans. These links are important in terms of facilitating access to the existing path network and mitigating against irresponsible access through farmland.

**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT:** Sites have already been allocated for housing in Newtown for 500 houses; the outline Planning Permission applied for in 2009 has not yet been granted as the Section 75 Agreement has not been completed. There seems to be little demand for so many houses in this location; only affordable housing has been developed to date. A further site with a capacity of 500 houses would erode the distance between Newtown and St Boswells and change the character of the village significantly.

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT:** The Economic Development section fully supports the reinstatement of the railway south to Carlisle, and the route through Newtown is a key part of that strategy. We consider it premature to allocate this site without clear allowance for the railway to be able to be delivered on the route of the former line as indicated by policy IS4.

**EDUCATION:** No objections.

**HOUSING STRATEGY:** No objections.

**SCOTTISH ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AGENCY:** This site is geographically remote from both St Boswells and Newtown St Boswells sewerage networks and as such has no foul sewerage provision readily accessible. For a development of this scale connection to the public foul sewer is essential and hence significant sewer network and STW upgrading works would be required in order to facilitate such a development. There is no possibility of achieving a private sewage discharge at this scale of development given the site has no high dilution watercourses nearby. It also appears from the map that there is a culverted watercourse (unnamed trib of R Tweed) running through the site and any development should seek to de-culvert this watercourse to make it a feature of the development. There are water environment issues.

**SCOTTISH WATER:** There is limited capacity at the Waste Water Treatment Works (St Boswells). Not served by WW network, not sure it it would gravitate to Newtown or St Boswells, both would require growth project. There is sufficient capacity at the Waste Treatment Works (Roberton WOA). A WIA would be required. This will likely require the developer to fund network upgrades.

## Overall assessment

### PP status

Excluded

### Overall assessment

Unacceptable

### Site capacity

500

### Conclusions

The majority of this site was considered as part of the previous Local Plan 1 and the Local Development Plan Examination under site code ANEWT008. The LDP Reporter's conclusions raised the following concerns:

"As local considerations are concerned, the council has drawn attention to the findings of the report into the inquiry of the current local plan. That report emphasised the importance of the settlement identities of Newtown St Boswells and St Boswells to the south. Taking into account the proposed housing land allocation at site ANEWT005, the separation distance is some 600 metres. This is a narrow but sensitive strip which I agree is important in visually containing the two settlements. The contours of the land within the strip, particularly the low hillock, assist in providing visual separation.

The findings of the previous inquiry also attached importance to the need to retain the northern side of the A699 free from development. I agree that, despite the tree belt shown on the indicative plan, the degree of urban encroachment on the A699 would be unacceptable and result in an adverse landscape character impact on this area of essentially rural character.

Having regard to the local adverse impact that would result as a consequence of the proposed enlarged expansion area, despite the strategic housing land assessment; I conclude that the additional housing land allocation is not justified".

The site is centrally located within the Scottish Borders and benefits from good access to public services and access to employment. It is generally out with the 1 in 200 year flood envelope although small parts beside the West Burn and the Bowden Burn. There may be a need for surface water management to be employed in this area.

Biodiversity Risk is moderate due to location next to Bowden Burn and its connectivity with River Tweed SAC/SSSI.

The site is located to the south of Newtown St Boswells and directly south of the planned expansion of Newtown St Boswells (ANEWT005). Development of the site would be stretching into the fields south of the village towards Charlesfield and St Boswells. There is a risk of coalescence with St Boswells as well as potential for archaeology in the area. This is a large site which requires detailed development/landscape appraisal. There would also be a potential impact upon the safeguarding of any future extension of the Borders Railway.

---

<b>Site reference</b> ANEWT010	<b>Site name</b> Newtown Expansion III	<b>Settlement</b> Newtown St Boswells	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 400	<b>Ha</b> 19.8	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

**Floodrisk**      **SAC**      **SPA**      **SSSI**      **Ramsar**

### Initial assessment summary

The site is already allocated (part of ANEWT005) for the proposed use within the current Local Development Plan and it is the intention of the Council to retain this existing allocation within the Local Development Plan 2. This proposed site (ANEWT010) would be excluded in view of the fact the site is already allocated under ANEWT005.

## Background information

**Minerals and coal**    **NNR**      **Prime Quality Agricultural Land**    **Current use/s**    **Planning history references**

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

**Access to public transport**      **Access to employment**      **Access to services**      **Wider biodiversity impacts**      **Site aspect**

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

## Local impact and integration assessment

**Conservation area**    **Open space**    **Listed buildings**    **Scheduled Monument**    **Ancient woodland inventory**    **Archaeology**    **Garden and designed landscape**

### Local impact and integration summary

## Landscape assessment

**NSA**      **SLA**      **Over 200 metres?**       **Over 12 degree slope**       **Wild Land**

### Landscape summary

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

Right of way

TPOs

Contaminated land

Water supply

Sewerage

Gas Supply

Education provision

Planning & infrastructure summary

---

## Overall assessment

PP status

Overall assessment

Site capacity

Excluded

400

### Conclusions

The site is already allocated (part of ANEWT005) for the proposed use within the current Local Development Plan and it is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2. This proposed site (ANEWT010) would be excluded in view of the fact the site is already allocated under ANEWT005.

---

# Nisbet

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
ANISB002	East of Nisbet	Nisbet	Central	Housing	6	0.3	Excluded

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
1:200	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site lies within SEPA's 1 in 200 year flood extent. A Flood Risk Assessment would be required.

SEPA: Would require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourse which is potentially culverted through the site. SEPA does not support development located over a culvert that is to remain active. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues at this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.

General Comments: Approximately one third of the site is at risk of flooding of a 1:200 year event. This significantly reduces the developable area of the site.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	On site	Greenfield	There is no relevant planning history on the site.

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Limited	Limited	Limited	Minor	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Minor. River Tweed SAC/SSSI (River Teviot) 200m to south (south of dismantled railway-unlikely to be drainage connection)). Phase 1 habitat (aerial interpretation) Improved pasture (B4). Field boundaries: Garden ground, mature trees. Biological records: breeding birds, protected species. Mitigation: Protect and enhance boundary features. Retain mature trees. Enhance hedgerow network. Site clearance outside breeding bird season. Flood Risk (Fluvial 1 in 200): No.

GENERAL COMMENTS: There is a minor biodiversity risk associated with the site. Much of this could be mitigated through means that would likely improve the design of any development, including the retention of mature trees and the enhancement of hedgerows. The settlement is within the rural growth area but there are no services in Nisbet. There is one bus service - the 20 Kelso-Jedburgh. It is an approximately 15 minute drive time to Jedburgh (5 miles) where there are more substantial services available.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

On site

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY: The site includes an old quarry which will have removed any archaeological material that formerly existed. No known issues.

HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER: The site lies within the recently designated Nisbet conservation area. The existing cottages on the N side of green are a picturesque group and care will be needed at the detailed design stage to ensure that any new development respects the character of the conservation area.

HES: No comments.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

On site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No comments received.

SNH: No comment due to size and location.

The site is located within the Tweed Lowlands Local Landscape Area. The village's setting within this lowland landscape contributes towards this designation, and Nisbet is covered by Conservation Area status. The site could be developed with mitigation. The roadside part of the site is relatively 'tucked-away ' reflecting its former quarry use, but the rear of the site - where the housing would be located - is relatively prominent. There is already development of differing forms surrounding it on three sides. Mitigation could include the planting of hedgrows and would need the retention of deciduous trees in order to mitigate impact on the Local Landscape Area character and the historic village's setting within this.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: No comments.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: I am not opposed to this land being allocated for residential development. More than 4 houses served by a single access would require a public road (5 if the number of dwellinghouses permitted off a private access is increased from 4 to 5, in line with the National Roads Development Guide, through the LDP process), but this may not be desirable at this location due to the urbanisation this could bring with it. A more suitable form of development would appear to be roadside dwellings in-keeping with the existing form of the village.

### Near a trunk road?

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

On site

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have previously housed a quarry which was subsequently infilled. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Opportunity to provide roadside footway.

EDUCATION: No issues.

NHS: No comments received.

NETWORK MANAGER: No comments.

SCOTTISH WATER: Waste: Nisbet Village WwTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the network. Water: Robertson WTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the network.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network in Nisbet. There is potentially a septic tank situated within the site serving the farm cottages. This should be confirmed prior to development and care taken to protect this asset or steps taken to connect the sewage from the cottages into the foul sewer.

GENERAL COMMENTS: There are no planning and infrastructure issues which would rule out development of 6 units on this site. There is an issue in terms of the site's former use as a quarry. As a result of its former use, the site topography undulates quite significantly. A roads issue has been raised regarding the need for a public road if the number of houses exceeds 4 units, with a related concern that this roads upgrade might represent undue urbanisation in the village. There is a suggestion, by the roads service, that housing should instead be located along the roadside in a linear fashion, however this portion of the site is subject to flood risk which limits the number of houses that could be built. The proposed development framework sets the houses back from the roadside with an access road linking to the main road. That makes sense because of the flooding issue which affects the northern half of the site. In design terms, setting the housing back with green space in front could be seen to allow a form of 'mirroring development' (as the proposal suggests) reflecting the built form of existing houses and open space opposite the site. The flooding issue and the scale of development means that there is a need for an access road. Less than 5 houses and the access road could be of a lower standard, and more than 4 and the access road would have to be of a public road standard. Recent development in Nesbit has demonstrated that public roads do not necessarily entail undue urbanisation, and so this could be accommodated sympathetically. If fewer than 5 houses were to be preferred then the site should not be allocated in the LDP and it would be better dealt with under development in the countryside policies or with a possible redrawing of the village development boundary to encompass this site.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Doubtful	6

### Conclusions

Nisbet is located within the Central Borders Strategic Development Area and is a village which has in recent times seen successful development of new housing which has been sympathetic to the Conservation Area status of the village.

The access roads issue raised is surmountable, and development of over 4 units with an associated adoptable road would not represent undue urbanisation. SEPA requires a FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourse which is potentially culverted through the site. SEPA do not support development located over a culvert that is to remain active. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there are flooding issues at the site. That flood risk covers around on third of the site area on its northern, street facing, part of the site. The developer's suggested layout accounts for the planning and infrastructure issues that have been raised. Two quarries were previously recorded on site, both of which appear to have been infilled, this requires further investigation, but the affected area is likely to be left as open space in any case. The developable part of the site does sit within a relatively prominent position in the village, but landscaping could help mitigate this.

While development here is not likely to be absolutely constrained by any particular issue and the site is within the Central Borders SDA, Nisbet is a very small village without services and one that has recently absorbed a relatively large scale of development. The allocation of a further 6 units could be seen to have negative cumulative impact.

The Roads Planning Team would only be able to support a maximum number of four units on the site. This is below the minimum number of five units required for allocation.

Taking the above into consideration, it is not considered appropriate to allocate site ANISB002 within the Proposed Local Development Plan, it is considered that there are other more appropriate sites available for allocation.

---

# Oxnam

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
<b>SBOXN001</b>	Oxnam Development Boundary	Oxnam	Rest of Borders	Development Boundary	N/A	10.2	<b>Included</b>

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
1:200	On site	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

SEPA: There is a water body within/immediately adjacent to this site. Therefore, SEPA advise that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

A culverted watercourse may run through this site. There may be opportunities to restore the water environment to its natural state by removing the culvert. We therefore recommend that a development requirement is attached to this site requiring a feasibility study including a flood risk assessment to be undertaken prior to development to assess the potential for channel restoration.

We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Oxnam Water and tributaries. Consideration should be given to any culverts/bridges might may exacerbate flood risk. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at an increased risk of flooding. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Development boundary may be constrained due to flood risk. A surface water hazard has also been identified at the site.

According to SEPA records this site includes or is immediately adjacent to a baseline waterbody (Oxnam Water (River Teviot to Newbigging Burn) (waterbody 5228) – MODERATE status).

Any development would need to connect to the SW foul sewer network. Any sites near watercourses would need to ensure that the watercourse is protected as part of any development.

SBC FLOOD TEAM: This site covers the majority of Oxnam. The Oxnam Water extends through the middle of Oxnam. Dependent on where and what type of development, a Flood Risk Assessment could be required. However, large parts of the site do not lie within the SEPA 1 in 200 year flood extents so the requirement of a FRA would, as above, be dependent on where and what type of development.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Other	Various planning applications within the development boundary.

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Limited	Limited	Limited	Minor	Not applicable

## Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No comments received.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Oxnam is located four miles east of Jedburgh and car travel is required to access any services.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
Not applicable	On site	On site	Not applicable	Not applicable	On site	Not applicable

## Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE AND DESIGN: It makes sense to try to establish a development boundary, but this is tricky in such a spread-out settlement as Oxnam where there is no real core.

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There are archaeological records within the development boundary.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: No comments.

---

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable			Not applicable

## Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: Establishment of a development boundary was included in the MIR consultation. Our advice was that any resulting Settlement Profile should clearly reference the River Tweed SAC as the boundaries are contiguous in places.

LANDSCAPE: No comments.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

<b>Physical access/road capacity</b>	<b>Near a trunk road?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: I have no objections to the formation of this development boundary.

ROAD NETWORK MANAGER: No observations other than may impact on 30 mph limits.

<b>Right of way</b>	<b>TPOs</b>	<b>Contaminated land</b>	<b>Water supply</b>	<b>Sewerage</b>	<b>Gas Supply</b>	<b>Education provision</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Yes	Limited	No	Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: No comments.

---

EDUCATION: N/A.

SCOTTISH WATER (WASTE): Limited capacity.

SCOTTISH WATER (WATER): Sufficient capacity - no real concerns however any proposed connection would need to be assessed due to location and elevation.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Potential to encourage ribbon development rather than coalescence as a group.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Core path 191 and Core path 192 are within this site and a width of path or pavement for non-vehicular access should be allowed. Housing on the locations in this plan would benefit greatly from a pavement to link the settlements in the village to each other and to the wider path network.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site has been widely developed with apparent residential properties as well as an agricultural steading and two blacksmiths. The site is brownfield land and its use may present development constraints.

WASTE MANAGEMENT: No comments.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

PROJECTS MANAGER: No comments.

---

## Overall assessment

### PP status

Included

### Overall assessment

Acceptable

### Site capacity

N/A

### Conclusions

The Council has been approached by Oxnam Community Council with a view to having a development boundary incorporated around the hamlet. This would effectively mean Oxnam would become a recognised settlement within the LDP. It is considered Oxnam is of a size which could justify inclusion within LDP2 and could ensure control of future development proposals within the current building group. A proposed boundary, suggested by the Community Council, was proposed within the MIR.

Following public consultation on the Main Issues Report, a number of comments were received however these were mostly positive and supported the creation of a development boundary for Oxnam.

As part of the site assessment process no significant constraints were identified however there are a number of site requirements to be included within the Oxnam Settlement Profile. A key greenspace has also been identified for safeguarding at Oxnam Green (GSOXNA001) which will be shown within the settlement profile and associated map. Therefore it is considered that this development boundary allocation should be included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b> AOXNA002	<b>Site name</b> Land to west of Oxnam Road	<b>Settlement</b> Oxnam	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 20	<b>Ha</b> 2.9	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	------------------------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: Parts of the Eastern part of this site are shown to be at risk of flooding at a 1 in 200 year fluvial flood event. Therefore, I would require that a Flood Risk Assessment is undertaken for this site.

SEPA: Require a FRA which assesses the risk from the Oxnam Water and small tributary which flows along the boundary. Due to steep topography adjacent/ through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and the proposed development is not affected by surface runoff.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no relevant planning history on the site.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Poor	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Limited	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> South-west
-------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site appears to be improved grassland with hedgerow and mature broad-leaved trees on boundary. Potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC via run off (site adjacent to Oxnam water). Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including bats (EPS) and breeding birds.

SNH: Advise that a site brief is produced to identify the key natural heritage assets of the site to be protected and the key opportunities for the integration of green infrastructure within future development. The site is within 50m of the River Tweed Special Area of Conservation (SAC). If you are minded to take this site forward into the plan, it should be included in the Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA). At present the site has a generally open character, with mature trees and well established hedgerows along the boundaries. To maintain the character of the settlement and the site itself, we recommend that these features are retained and appropriately integrated into any new development.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Oxnam is 4 miles (10 mins drive) from Jedburgh. There is a bus stop at Oxnam Green but services are extremely limited. Aside from the local village hall and Oxnam Kirk, there are no local services or facilities. Oxnam is not recognised as a settlement and is outside the Rural Growth Area, so there is very little policy support for a significant housing allocation here. Oxnam has experienced organic growth and in recent years development of housing has taken place through development in the countryside policies. There are no factors in terms of accessibility and sustainability that should rule out development on this site, but the scale of development suggested and the need for a site of this physical size in Oxnam is very questionable. For these reasons the site is considered to be doubtful in such terms.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: Oxnam dates from the medieval period. The extent and exact location of the settlement is unknown, but may coincide with the proposed LDP area. Mitigation in the form of archaeological evaluation will be necessary.

HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER: No comments.

HES: No comments.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Consultation has raised no major issues. There would be a need for archaeological mitigation as Oxnam is a settlement that dates back to the medieval period. There has been no comment from Heritage and Design and this reflects the fact that this is not a recognised settlement, rather than suggesting 20 houses could be easily integrated within Oxnam.

## Landscape assessment

### NASA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: Suggest the remoteness of site from local services makes this inappropriate for a development of this scale. A much smaller development of approximately 4-6 houses might be more appropriate and in proportion with the existing settlement.

SNH: Advise that a site brief is produced to identify the key natural heritage assets of the site to be protected and the key opportunities for the integration of green infrastructure within future development. The site is within 50m of the River Tweed Special Area of Conservation (SAC). If you are minded to take this site forward into the plan, it should be included in the Habitats Regulations Appraisal.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: No comments

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: Unable to recommend in favour of this proposal. Local and national policy encourages development close to local facilities and sustainable transport modes and unfortunately Oxnam suffers from an absence of all of these features. Furthermore, Oxnam is served predominately by the C Class road from Jedburgh which is unsuitable for serving any further significant development beyond the settlement boundary.

### Near a trunk road?

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

**CONTAMINATED LAND:** The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

**COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM:** Potential opportunity to improve pedestrian/cycle access into other parts of the village and to link with the wider path network to the West ( Core Path 192).

**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT:** Need to check WWT capacity for 20 units. Creates the need for a development boundary.

**EDUCATION:** No issues

**NHS:** No comments received.

**SCOTTISH WATER:** Waste: Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. Water: Robertson WTW has sufficient capacity. A Flow and Pressure test is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

**SEPA:** Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network however it is likely that this would require upsizing for any new development. The unnamed trib which runs adjacent to the site should be protected and enhanced as part of any development. The site is opposite the Oxnam STW. Probably unlikely to give rise to issues as septic tank and reedbed system.

**GENERAL COMMENTS:** The roads planning service have raised the issue of the inherent unsustainability of allocating 20 units in a location where there are no local facilities and sustainable transport modes. They also have concerns over the scale of development on the C class Jedburgh road. Scottish Water have stated a need to discuss the build out rate from any allocation in order to determine impact on the WWTW. These constraints and potential constraint point towards the overall unsustainability of an allocation for 20 units in Oxnam. As such, the planning and infrastructure classification is 'doubtful'.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	20

## Conclusions

Oxnam is currently not a recognised settlement. It is not considered necessary or sustainable to make an allocation for up to 20 self build plots in this location. The deliverability of such an allocation is doubtful. There are very few existing services and new residents would have to drive to Jedburgh for all basic daily services. There is a moderate biodiversity risk in this location because of the proximity of the River Tweed SAC. The settlement has been able to grow through development in the countryside policies in recent times. Further organic growth could take place this way or through the inclusion of a development boundary, but 20 units and a site of this size represents significant over-development. This allocation should not be included in the Proposed Plan. The site is located within a rural setting and does not relate to any existing settlement. It is therefore considered that this site should be excluded.

---

# Selkirk

<b>Site reference</b>	<b>Site name</b>	<b>Settlement</b>	<b>SDA</b>	<b>Proposed Use</b>	<b>Indicative Capacity</b>	<b>Ha</b>	<b>PP status</b>
ASELK030	Land to west of Calton Cottage	Selkirk	Central	Housing	100	6.1	Excluded

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b>	<b>SAC</b>	<b>SPA</b>	<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
1:200	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: Dependent on SEPA's building behind defences stance.

SEPA: Selkirk FPS recently completed. Standard of protection to Bannerfield and Philiphaugh area in 1:200 plus CC. Remeandering and upstream gravel extraction and bypass channel in operation on the Long Philip Burn offering protection to 1:100 plus CC. This may be uncertain due to the volume of debris that is mobilised during high flows. Site outwith area at risk from 1:200 year flood event regardless of the presence of defences on the Ettrick Water or Long Philip Burn. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b>	<b>Planning history references</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	There is no planning application history. The site was previously considered through the process of the Housing SG 2017 and was excluded.

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b>	<b>Access to employment</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b>	<b>Site aspect</b>
Good	Good	Good	Minor	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: No comments received.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	On/adjacent to site	On site

## Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: The proposed site is within the core of the Battlefield of Philiphaugh. Archaeological mitigation will be required. Development proposals will need to be sensitive to the setting of the Inventory Battlefield to be acceptable. Cumulative impacts must be considered as there is potential for overdevelopment of the battlefield core.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: No comments.

HES: Within BTL 14 - Battle of Philliphaugh and Setting of SM12981 - Philiphaugh, settlement and burial ground 150m S of Calton Cottage  
This site, which is proposed for dense housing, is near the centre of the Battle of Philliphaugh, in the area of the Royalist lines, where conflict started in September 1645. We consider that the impact on the battleground can be mitigated by application of policy. It also lies to the north of an early mediaeval, probably Anglian, high status settlement and burial ground, SM12981. We are satisfied that the impact of this proposal on the setting of the monument could be mitigated by appropriate application of planning policy. There may be, however, potential for significant impact on unscheduled archaeological remains in the area. For advice on this, you should consult your Council's archaeological adviser.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

On site

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: No comments received.

SNH: No comments.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: Divorced from rest of settlement.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Possible bus infrastructure required.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: Not in favour of this site being allocated for housing as it does not relate well to the settlement boundary. The site is out on a limb and difficult to integrate with other housing developments within Selkirk. Furthermore, it is unlikely that an acceptable access arrangement could be achieved and the existing road network does not have the required pedestrian facilities that a development of this size would require.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No comments.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Requires non-vehicular link to the existing path network.

EDUCATION: Extension or new school may need to be considered.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. Please note there is a 160mm water main within site. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Selkirk WwTW has sufficient capacity. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SEPA: Foul water must be taken to the SW foul network.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	100

### Conclusions

The site was considered as part of the Housing SG. An initial stage 1 RAG assessment was undertaken, however concluded that the site should not be taken forward as part of the Housing SG. The conclusion of the assessment is as follows and remains relevant to this proposal:

'This site is located outwith Selkirk, but partially borders the settlement boundary. Although partially adjacent to the settlement boundary, the site is notably detached from the built up parts of the town.

There are two existing housing allocations nearby, Philiphaugh North and Philiphaugh Steading. Another site has been proposed through the SG process at the Angle's Field. It would be preferable for some or all of these allocated sites to be developed before any land beyond the settlement boundary in this part of Selkirk was considered'.

Overall, the site's poor relationship with Selkirk prevents the site from being allocated within the Proposed LDP.

Furthermore, the site is unacceptable from a roads point of view given the detached location of the site. The site is out on a limb and difficult to integrate with other housing developments within Selkirk. Furthermore, it is unlikely that an acceptable access arrangement could be achieved and the existing road network does not have the required pedestrian facilities that a development of this size would require.

---

<b>Site reference</b> ASELK031	<b>Site name</b> Land north of Bannerfield	<b>Settlement</b> Selkirk	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 130	<b>Ha</b> 11.9	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: Dependent on SEPA's building behind defences stance.

SEPA: Site is adjacent to fluvial Flood Map however OS Map contours indicate a sufficient height difference between the site and the Ettrick and Linglie Burn. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map and steep topography indicates that there may be flooding issues at this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and the proposed development is not affected by surface runoff.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no relevant planning history on the site. The site was considered through the process of the Housing SG 2017 (ASELK031), the Local Plan Amendment (SSELK012) and the Local Plan (ESE16D).
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> South
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	-----------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: BIODIVERSITY: Minor risk - improved pasture with some mature tree and scrub cover and garden ground on boundary of site. No obvious connectivity to Ettrick water (River Tweed SAC/SSSI) (Protected species may include e.g. badger and breeding birds. Safeguard trees on boundary. No significant biodiversity issues. Whilst this area of Selkirk is some distance from the town, there is a nearby general store, a primary school and good public transport links available within the vicinity.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Not applicable	<b>Open space</b> Not applicable	<b>Listed buildings</b> Not applicable	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> On site	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> On site
--------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------

## Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: The proposed site is partly within the core of the Battlefield of Philiphaugh. The areas outside the battlefield are still of archaeological sensitivity as the exact extent of the battle is unknown. Archaeological mitigation will be required. Development proposals will also need to be sensitive to the setting of the Inventory Battlefield to be acceptable. Cumulative impacts must be considered as there is potential for overdevelopment of the battlefield core.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: No comments.

HES: No comments.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

On site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: No comments received.

SNH: This site lies outwith the current settlement boundary as shown in the LDP. It is within a Special Landscape Area.

The site is elevated relative to the A707 which runs along its southern boundary. Development in the eastern third of the site is likely to be visible from the A707 east of Linglie, bringing the perceived entry to Selkirk some 0.5km east of its current point.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Quite divorced from town centre. Likely to impact on position of 30 mph limit. Need to carefully consider new junction (s) with A707.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Contribution towards improved bus infrastructure on A707.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: Opposed to this site being allocated for development owing to it being on the opposite side of the A708 Principal Road from the rest of the town and the lack of opportunity for access to it. Due to the topography of the site and the elongated nature of the proposed site, there is no obvious means of access which would adequately serve the development. The site would offer little opportunity for integration with the existing street network.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No comments.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Should retain woodland strip for recreational purposes and create link to existing path network.

EDUCATION: Extension or new school may need to be considered.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. Please note there are Major water mains within site, site south of reservoir. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Selkirk WwTW has sufficient capacity. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SEPA: Foul water must be taken to the SW foul network. There appears to be a reservoir shown on the map just to the north of the site. It is not known what this is or if it is still active.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	130

### Conclusions

The site area and capacity was reduced for the purposes of the consultation process during the process of the Housing SG 2017 as it was considered that a reduced area/capacity was worth exploring.

There is a small area within the site that may be at risk of surface water flooding which would require investigation as well as surface water run off from the nearby hills. There are no significant biodiversity issues relating to the site. Whilst this area of Selkirk is some distance from the town, there are facilities within the vicinity, including Philiphaugh Primary School.

The site is located adjacent to the settlement boundary of Selkirk, to the north of Bannerfield. Part of the site has been considered previously in 2006, and was discounted for the reason that "the site is detached from the settlement by a steep, tree covered bank". However, the Scottish Borders Development and Landscape Capacity Study (February 2007) states that "there is potentially scope for several houses to be located to extend the existing pattern of individual house development north east of Levenlea, sited behind the belt of woodland which extends along the roadside. These proposals were not, however, interpreted as offering a serious expansion opportunity for Selkirk, as this area, while technically part of Selkirk, feels very detached from the main settlement". It is therefore considered that the principle of residential development at this location may be acceptable. However, the extent of the site from that submitted during the 'Call for Sites' was significantly reduced for the consultation process during the Housing SG 2017. Consideration would need to be given to the location of the site within a Special Landscape Area. Detached villa development would be most appropriate to the location.

However, it is not possible to achieve an appropriate access into the site due to topography and the elongated nature of the site. It is not therefore considered that this proposal can be supported from a roads point of view.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
<b>ASELK032</b>	Philiphaugh Nursery	Selkirk	Central	Housing	10	0.6	<b>Excluded</b>

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
1:200	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: Dependent on SEPA's building behind defences stance.

SEPA: Due to the site being in an undeveloped/sparsely developed area we do not consider that it meets with the requirements of Scottish Planning Policy and our position is unlikely to change. SEPA have a shared duty with Scottish Ministers and other responsible authorities under the Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009 to reduce overall flood risk and promote sustainable flood risk management. The cornerstone of sustainable flood risk management is the avoidance of flood risk in the first instance. Therefore, we require that this site is removed from the Local Development Plan.

SEPA have reviewed the information provided in this consultation and it is noted that the application site lies adjacent to the medium likelihood (0.5% annual probability or 1 in 200 year) flood extent of the SEPA Flood Map, and may therefore be at medium to high risk of flooding.

SEPA previously commented on the ASELK032 allocation during the Local Development Plan (LDP) consultation process in July 2016. Due to the extent of the flooding experienced in 2003 and the residual risk from the Long Philip Burn SEPA recommended this allocation was removed from the LDP. SEPA reiterate their previous response below for completeness, updated to take account of our latest guidance and the completion of the Flood Protection Scheme (FPS).

In May 2003, there was an intense thunderstorm event over the Broadmeadows, Yarrowford, and Selkirk area. In Selkirk, there was extensive flooding to the Bannerfield Estate as well as the allocation site, local infrastructure, and neighbouring sports pitches. Plates 1-3 demonstrate the volume of material that was scoured and deposited through the site during this flood event. The allocation is split into two distinct areas which are referred to in this report as the western or eastern part.

The 1977 Ettrick Water flood outline produced by Crouch and Hogg (1979) indicates that flood water extended along the boundary of the site. A detailed Flood Risk Assessment undertaken by Halcrow as part of the Selkirk Flood Protection Scheme indicates that the majority of the western site is within the 1:200 year flood extent of the Ettrick Water. This study also indicates that the entire western area is at risk of flooding from the Long Philip Burn during a 1:200 year flood event including a climate change allowance and bridge blockage scenario.

A Flood Protection Scheme has been completed for Selkirk providing a 1:200 year standard of protection including a sufficient allowance for climate change from the Ettrick Water to the area. In addition, the general area is afforded protection from the Long Philip Burn up to and including a 1:100 year event including an allowance for climate change. The risk from the Long Philip Burn has been mitigated as far as possible by the creation of upstream detention basins, which encourage the deposition of sediment and larger rocks/ boulders as well as re-meandering adjacent to the site and modifications made to the bridges. The motivation for these works was due to frequent flood events which resulted in rapid blockage of the channel from large volumes of coarse alluvial deposits. However, these works will only reduce the volume of mobile sediment, gravel, and rocks being conveyed downstream but not completely prevent material being conveyed beyond the detention basins. The catchment still has the potential to provide large volumes of loose material that can block bridges and direct flood water through the site hence the standard of protection is uncertain.

SEPA do not hold any records of the eastern part of the site flooding during the 2003 flood event. However, this area is immediately adjacent to the Long Philip Burn and as such may have also been flooded. We would recommend contacting the Flood Prevention Team within the council who may be able to provide additional details on the flooding to this site in 2003. The Selkirk Weekend Advertiser published a photo of flooding to the adjacent pitches in 2012 which required sandbags to protect the pitches from the Long Philip Burn.

The latest development planning/ management guidance published by SEPA (<https://www.sepa.org.uk/media/162837/lups-bp-gu2a-land-use-planning-background-paper-on-flood-risk.pdf>) on development behind defences clearly states that a precautionary approach should be taken to proposed allocations in areas protected by a flood protection scheme. Defences can be breached or overtopped leading to a scenario that can be significantly worse than if there are no defences present as flooding can be sudden, unexpected, and floodwater trapped behind defences can extend the period of inundation which can lead to greater damage. FPS have a finite design life, which may be less than that of the proposed and future development.

Scottish Planning Policy (paragraph 263) states that in medium to high risk areas (greater than 0.5% annual probability of coastal or watercourse flooding); “May be suitable for residential, institutional, commercial and industrial development within built-up areas provided flood protection measures to the appropriate standard already exist and are maintained, are under construction, or are a planned measure in a current flood risk management plan.” We consider this site to be within a sparsely developed area and based on the risk framework, these areas are generally not suitable for additional development unless a location is essential for operational reasons.

SEPA FRH acknowledges that the Selkirk Flood Prevention Scheme will reduce the risk of flooding to Selkirk, including to site ASELK032 Philiphaugh Nursery. However, the primary purpose of a flood protection scheme is to protect existing development from flooding rather than facilitate new development. Protection from flooding from the Long Philip Burn is formally only up to a 1:100 plus climate change standard which does not meet with the requirements of our current development planning guidance for new development.

In summary, as the housing allocation is located on undeveloped land, and the flood risk from the Long Philip Burn cannot be fully prevented, we require that this site is removed from the Local Development Plan. As demonstrated by Plate 1-3, development in this area would likely result in loss of floodplain conveyance and storage which could result in the increase risk of flooding elsewhere. Any land-raising, which should only be considered during exceptional circumstances would require compensatory storage which does not appear to be feasible at this location. In line with our SEPA position on development behind formal FPSs, development in this area would add to the overall area at risk and would therefore be contrary to the policy principles of Scottish Planning Policy and the aspirations of the Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	There is no history of planning applications on this site. The site was considered during the process of the Housing SG 2017 and was excluded (ASELK032).

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Good	Good	Good	Moderate	South

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site appears to be improved grassland with mature broad-leaved trees and plantation strip on boundary. Potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC/SSSI via run off (adjacent to Long Philip burn). Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including bats (EPS), badger and breeding birds.

## Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area	Open space	Listed buildings	Scheduled Monument	Ancient woodland inventory	Archaeology	Garden and designed landscape
Not applicable	On site	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	On/adjacent to site	Adjacent to site

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: The proposed site is within the core of the Battlefield of Philiphaugh. Archaeological mitigation will be required. Development proposals will need to be sensitive to the setting of the Inventory Battlefield to be acceptable. Cumulative impacts must be considered as there is potential for overdevelopment of the battlefield core.

DESIGN AND HERITAGE OFFICER: No comments.

HES: No comments.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Adjacent to site

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: 2/3no properties maximum. (semi-detached and small detached). Reinstate hedgerow along street frontage to link with neighbouring properties.

SNH: No comment due to size and location.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

Network Manager: New access required onto fast twisty section of an unrestricted section of the A708. Somewhat divorced from rest of main settlement.

Passenger Transport: No comments.

Roads Planning Service: Not in favour of the larger portion of this site being allocated for housing. It does not relate too well to the existing settlement and would be somewhat detached from it thus offering little in the way of scope for integration with the existing street network. Furthermore, access to it is problematic in terms of visibility due to the horizontal alignment of the A708 along this section. Not opposed to the smaller portion of the site being developed for a limited extent of housing served preferably by an upgrading of the existing access serving the property known as 'The Nursery'. The street lighting would have to be extended to the access serving the site and a marginal shifting of the 30 mph speed limit may also be required.

Strategic Transport: No comments received.

Transport Scotland: No comments.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

On site

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have been developed as a commercial horticultural nursey. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Non-vehicular access required to existing pavements and safe crossings to the existing path network.

EDUCATION: No objections.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. Please note there is a Water main within site boundary. Sufficient capacity in the network. Selkirk WwTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the network.

SEPA: Foul water must be taken to the SW foul network.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	10

### Conclusions

The site was considered as part of the Housing SG. An initial stage 1 RAG assessment was undertaken, however concluded that the site should not be taken forward as part of the Housing SG. The conclusion of the assessment is as follows, this remains relevant to this current assessment:

The site is safeguarded as a Key Greenspace within the Local Development Plan 2016 and is not therefore considered appropriate for a housing allocation. Issues relating to the registered battlefield (Philiphaugh) would require to be investigated further.

Furthermore, the proposal is not supported by the Roads Planning Team as the site does not relate particularly well to the existing settlement offering little in the way of scope for integration with the existing street network. Furthermore, access to it is problematic in terms of visibility due to the horizontal alignment of the A708 along this section.

Whilst the Roads Officer may be in a position to support a reduced size, this would not overcome the fact that the site is a Key Greenspace. It is therefore concluded that the site should be excluded from the Proposed LDP.

---

<b>Site reference</b> ASELK033	<b>Site name</b> Angles Field	<b>Settlement</b> Selkirk	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 30	<b>Ha</b> 2.0	<b>PP status</b> Retain LDP Site
-----------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------

## Initial assessment

**Floodrisk**      **SAC**      **SPA**      **SSSI**      **Ramsar**

### Initial assessment summary

The site is already allocated for the proposed use within the Adopted Supplementary Guidance on Housing (November 2017). It is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2.

Flood and Coastal Management Team: Dependent on SEPA's building behind defences stance.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency: As the housing allocation for 30 units is located on undeveloped land, and the flood risk from the Long Philip Burn cannot be fully prevented, SEPA require that this site is removed from the Local Development Plan. Development in this area would likely result in loss of floodplain conveyance and storage which could result in the increase risk of flooding elsewhere. Any land-raising, which should only be considered during exceptional circumstances would require compensatory storage which does not appear to be feasible at this location. In line with our SEPA position on development behind formal FPSs, development in this area would add to the overall area at risk and would therefore be contrary to the policy principles of Scottish Planning Policy and the aspirations of the Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act.

## Background information

**Minerals and coal**    **NNR**      **Prime Quality Agricultural Land**    **Current use/s**    **Planning history references**

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

**Access to public transport**      **Access to employment**      **Access to services**      **Wider biodiversity impacts**      **Site aspect**

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

## Local impact and integration assessment

**Conservation area**    **Open space**    **Listed buildings**    **Scheduled Monument**    **Ancient woodland inventory**    **Archaeology**    **Garden and designed landscape**

### Local impact and integration summary

## Landscape assessment

NSA

SLA

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

Wild Land

### Landscape summary

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

Right of way

TPOs

Contaminated land

Water supply

Sewerage

Gas Supply

Education provision

### Planning & infrastructure summary

---

## Overall assessment

PP status

Overall assessment

Site capacity

Retain LDP Site

30

### Conclusions

The site is already allocated for the proposed use within the Adopted Supplementary Guidance on Housing (November 2017). It is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2. However, the Scottish Environment Protection Agency has raised objections to the allocation of Angles Field (ASELK033) on the grounds that this is undeveloped land and that flood risk from the Long Philip Burn cannot be fully prevented. This matter has been discussed with the Council's Flood and Coastal Management Team and the Senior Project Manager of the Selkirk Flood Protection Scheme. As part of the Selkirk Flood Protection Scheme, a final 'as built' model run will be undertaken of the scheme to determine actual risk. This will confirm the actual standard of protection. It is expected that this will be undertaken by June 2020 and thereafter analysed. This information will then be conveyed to the Scottish Environment Protection Agency for their information and further comments. Angles Field remains an existing allocation within the Local Development Plan 2016 (as amended by the Housing Supplementary Guidance 2017) and it is noted that this allocation is subject to further scrutiny by SEPA and is therefore now subject to review.

---

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
<b>ASELK040</b>	Philiphaugh Mill	Selkirk	Central	Housing	19	1.7	<b>Included</b>

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
1:200	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

**FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM:** The site is protected from flood risk as a result of the Selkirk Flood Protection Scheme which was completed in February 2017. The scheme provides protection to a 1 in 200 year event plus climate change. The presence of the scheme and the level of protection it affords complies with SEPA Planning Information Note 4 and also SEPA Flood Risk and Land Use Vulnerability Guidance in relation to development behind flood defences in a built up area.  
Response to Pre-MIR: Dependent on SEPA's building behind defences stance.

SEPA: Due to the site being in a sparsely developed area and a proposed increase in sensitivity from commercial to residential we do not consider that it meets with the requirements of Scottish Planning Policy and our position is unlikely to change. We have a shared duty with Scottish Ministers and other responsible authorities under the Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009 to reduce overall flood risk and promote sustainable flood risk management. The cornerstone of sustainable flood risk management is the avoidance of flood risk in the first instance. Therefore, we require that this site is removed from the Local Development Plan.

SEPA previously required the removal of this site during the LDP consultation process in February 2014 and July 2016. Prior to the 2008 Local Plan, SEPA had indicated that the site was unsuitable for residential development. Therefore, SEPA has always had a consistent view regarding this site. SEPA attended a meeting with Scottish Borders Council representatives in November 2015 to discuss the Scottish Government Reporter findings. The Reporter had agreed with SEPA and recommended removal of this allocation. The 2013 Proposed Plan which was adopted in May 2016, included the Philiphaugh Mill redevelopment site, which was contrary to SEPA's and the Scottish Governments Reporter's recommendations. The previous Proposed Plan made no mention of flood risk within the Site Requirements. The Site Requirements did state that "The Redevelopment opportunity at Philiphaugh Mill is for housing use". As part of the November 2015 meeting, SBC pointed out that for the site at Philiphaugh Mill (then Zro200) SEPA could have objected to the housing part of the proposal rather than ask for the removal of the site. The allocation is consistently being promoted as housing and as such the council have not altered the land use.

Review of the SEPA Flood Map shows that the entire site boundary of ASELK040 lies entirely within the estimated 1 in 200 year functional floodplain of the Ettrick Water. In addition, there is a mill lade which flows through the site which poses an additional flood risk to the site.

The Ettrick Water has a well documented history of flooding. It is also well documented that the site flooded on the 31st of October 1977 in the book "Troubled Waters – Recalling the Floods of '77". "At the top of Ettrickhaugh Road, Kendal Fish Farm was flooded out and subsequently many thousands of rainbow trout were released into the river. The following day was a boom time for the local anglers". "Many houses in Ettrickhaugh Road, opposite Selkirk RFC, had to be abandoned and the only escape route for one unfortunate man trapped upstairs in the rugby club premises was via a rowing boat! A short distance away, the swollen waters meant the loss of 70,000 rainbow trout from Kendal Fish Farm, valued at £20,000." Philip Edgar, the former manager at Kendal Fish Farm is quoted as saying "A couple of thousand fish were lost from the farm. It was mainly the big fish that got washed away into people's gardens and the rugby pitch – they were everywhere". The site is also within the flood envelope of the 1977 flood as produced by Crouch & Hogg on behalf of Borders Regional Council.

SEPA acknowledge that the Selkirk Flood Prevention Scheme will reduce the risk of flooding to Selkirk, including to site ASELK040 Philiphaugh Mill. However, the primary purpose of a flood protection scheme is to protect existing development from flooding rather than facilitate new development.

The latest development planning/ management guidance published by SEPA (<https://www.sepa.org.uk/media/162837/lups-bp-gu2a-land-use-planning-background-paper-on-flood-risk.pdf>) on development behind defences clearly states that a precautionary approach should be taken to proposed allocations in areas protected by a flood protection scheme. Defences can be breached or overtopped leading to a scenario that can be significantly worse than if there are no defences present as flooding can be sudden, unexpected and floodwater trapped behind defences can extend the period of inundation which can lead to greater damage. FPS have a finite design life, which may be less than that of the proposed and future development.

Scottish Planning Policy (paragraph 263) states that in medium to high risk areas (greater than 0.5% annual probability of coastal or watercourse flooding); "May be suitable for residential, institutional, commercial and industrial development within built-up areas provided flood protection measures to the appropriate standard already exist and are maintained, are under construction, or are a planned measure in a current flood risk management plan." We consider this site to be within a sparsely developed area and based on the risk framework, these areas are generally not suitable for additional development unless a location is essential for operational reasons.

In summary, the housing allocation for 19 units is in a sparsely developed area and as the proposed development would be an increase in sensitivity from commercial to residential. In line with our SEPA position on development behind formal FPSs, development in this area would add to the overall area at risk and would therefore be contrary to the policy principles of Scottish Planning Policy and the aspirations of the Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act. However, SEPA would be supportive of redevelopment of the site for a similar commercial use.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Brownfield	There is no planning application history relating to the site. The site has previously been allocated within the Consolidated Local Plan 2011 as a redevelopment opportunity (zRO200).

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Good	Good	Good	Moderate	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGICAL OFFICER: Moderate risk - existing built structures (textile mill) have potential to support protected species such as bats (EPS) and breeding birds. Site contains trees and scrub and derelict buildings adjacent to mill lade, potential connectivity to Ettrick water (River Tweed SAC/SSSI) (protected species interest may include bats, badger and breeding birds). Mitigation required to ensure no significant adverse effects on integrity of River Tweed SAC.

## Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area	Open space	Listed buildings	Scheduled Monument	Ancient woodland inventory	Archaeology	Garden and designed landscape
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	On/adjacent to site	Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: The site is partly within the Inventory Battlefield of Philiphaugh. Mitigation will be required. Development must respect the setting of the battlefield.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: Although not listed, the remains of the former mill, including structures, former wheel pit and lade, are of historic significance, any development should take account of these features.

HES: No comments.

## Landscape assessment

**NSA**

Not applicable

**SLA**

Adjacent to site

**Over 200 metres?** **Over 12 degree slope** **Wild Land**

Not applicable

**Landscape summary**

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: Trees along mill lades, especially along north and east boundaries should be protected from development as they have a screening and amenity value. Building survey should be undertaken to assess cultural and historic value of remaining buildings. Need to explore potential to make direct pedestrian link onto footpath that runs along south and west boundary site. Perimeter trees and scrub have ecological value and should be retained and supplemented. Capacity is dependent on ability to convert some of the better quality mill buildings and infill development. A capacity of approximately 15-20 does not seem inappropriate for an ex-industrial site where density could be higher than surrounding area. The site has potential to be an interesting combination of building conversion, retaining the more attractive buildings, supplemented by infill development in keeping with the character of the site.

SNH: No comment, redevelopment of existing sites.

Scottish Natural Heritage: No comments.

**Planning and infrastructure assessment****Physical access/road capacity****Near a trunk road?** 

NETWORK MANAGER: No comments.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: No objections to the site being zoned for housing. Some minor widening of Ettrickhaugh Road will be required to mitigate the increase in traffic movements. Access to the site will require a new bridge over the Ettrickhaugh Burn. Given that the site only has one realistic point of access, any proposal will need to provide a well-connected layout internally with a potential link to the adjacent site to the north east if that site is also to be allocated for housing. Pedestrian/cycle links will also be required to take advantage of the new riverside path which has been constructed as part of the Selkirk Flood Prevention Scheme.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No comments.

**Right of way**

On/adjacent to site

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

On site

**Water supply**

Yes

**Sewerage**

Yes

**Gas Supply**

Yes

**Education provision**

Good

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have been developed as a woollen mill. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Non-vehicular access required to existing pavements and links to existing path network.

EDUCATION: No objections.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. A Flow and Pressure test is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Selkirk WwTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the network.

SEPA: Mill lade which went through old fish farm runs through the site. This would need to be protected to maintain flow and protect water quality. There should be no culverting for land gain. Foul water should be connected to the SW foul sewer network. SEPA is aware that there is made ground on the site (filling in of old fish tanks) which could contain unsuitable materials (ie be considered contaminated land).

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Included	Acceptable	19

### Conclusions

Proposed LDP assessment: SEPA consider the site to be in a 'sparsely developed area'. The Council can confirm that the site is located within the settlement boundary of Selkirk as defined by the Local Development Plan 2016. The site has been allocated in previous years for redevelopment given its former use as a fish farm and the Council's desire to see the site regenerated. The development of the site for residential development is regarded as acceptable in principle. The site is located immediately adjacent to existing residential properties and is accessed along Etrickhaugh Road which is residential in character. The Council refutes the view that the site is within a 'sparsely developed area'. The site is protected from flood risk as a result of the Selkirk Flood Protection Scheme which was completed in February 2017. The Scheme provides protection to a 1 in 200 year event plus climate change. The presence of the Scheme and the level of protection it affords complies with SEPA Planning Information Note 4 and also SEPA Flood Risk and Land Use Vulnerability Guidance in relation to development behind flood defences in a built up area. A final 'as built' model is yet to be undertaken. The Forward Planning team will be informed of the findings in due course and this will be copied to SEPA.

Pre-MIR assessment: SEPA object to the allocation of the site on flooding grounds on the grounds that the site is in a sparsely developed area and there would be an increase in sensitivity from commercial to residential. SEPA do not consider that the site meets the requirements of SPP and they advise that their position is unlikely to change. SEPA require that the site is removed from the LDP. These matters have been discussed with the Council's Flood and Coastal Management Team and the Senior Project Manager of the Selkirk Flood Protection Scheme. As part of the Selkirk Flood Protection Scheme, a final 'as built' model run will be undertaken of the scheme to determine actual risk. This will confirm the actual standard of protection. It is expected that this will be undertaken by the end of August 2018 and thereafter analysed. This information will then be conveyed to SEPA for their information and further comments. This site is therefore suggested as an 'alternative' site at this point in time, due to the outstanding objection raised by SEPA. This is, however, subject to ongoing discussion and will be reported further in the Proposed Plan. It should be noted that the Council considers that this site is part of the built up area which satisfies the terms of SEPA's 'Planning Information Note 4: SEPA Position on development protected by a Flood Protection Scheme' and does not consider that this is an argument SEPA should be contending.

Moderate risk to biodiversity. Mitigation required relating to River Tweed SAC. It is considered that the site relates well to the existing settlement at this location. Setting of historic battlefield to be considered. Accessibility to local services is acceptable. The site has the potential to be an interesting combination of building conversion with infill development in keeping with the character of the site. An acceptable access arrangement is achievable. Pedestrian/cycle links required. Potential contamination issues. WTW local network issues possible.

<b>Site reference</b> ASELK041	<b>Site name</b> Philiphaugh 2	<b>Settlement</b> Selkirk	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 15	<b>Ha</b> 0.6	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

SEPA: We have a shared duty with Scottish Ministers and other responsible authorities under the Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009 to reduce overall flood risk and promote sustainable flood risk management. The cornerstone of sustainable flood risk management is the avoidance of flood risk in the first instance. Therefore, we recommend that this site is removed from the Housing SG. We have reviewed the information provided in this consultation and it is noted that the entire application site lies within the medium likelihood (0.5% annual probability or 1 in 200 year) flood extent of the SEPA Flood Map, and may therefore be at medium to high risk of flooding. The Selkirk FPS is currently being constructed and will offer protection to existing development along Ettrickhaugh Road. With the scheme in place, Ettrickhaugh Road and adjacent properties will be protected to a 1:200 year event with an allowance for climate change incorporated into the scheme design.

As the housing allocation is located on Greenfield land, and has been flooded in the past, we strongly recommend that this site is removed from the Housing SG. In line with our SEPA position on development behind formal FPSs, development in this area would add to the overall area at risk and would therefore be contrary to the policy principles of Scottish Planning Policy and the aspirations of the Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act. As such we do not support housing in this area.

SBC FLOOD TEAM: Strongly refutes SEPA's position in relation to this site, and furthermore how sites that will now fall behind the protection provided by one of the most comprehensive flood protection schemes delivered to date in Scotland should be evaluated / assessed (from a planning perspective) further to the precedent set by SEPA in relation to this site. The Selkirk Flood Protection Scheme was not provided to allow development or to provide protection to undeveloped land, however the Scheme is now delivered and operational in this area and thus flooding from the 0.5% AEP Event will not occur.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> 04/02026/OUT - Erection of eight dwellinghouses (REFUSED) 19/01687/PPP - Residential development with associated works and access road (REFERRED TO SCOTTISH MINISTERS DUE TO SEPA OBJECTION RELATING TO FLOOD RISK)
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

BIODIVERSITY: Moderate risk - improved pasture with some mature tree and scrub cover and garden ground on boundary of site. Potential drainage connectivity to Ettrick water (River Tweed SAC/SSSI) via mill lade. (Protected species may include e.g. badger and breeding birds. Safeguard trees on boundary. Mitigation required to ensure no significant adverse effects on integrity of River Tweed SAC.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY: Area lies completely within Registered Battlefield (Philiphaugh) and to immediate northeast of previous area. Nothing recorded for area, but previously developed; Setting should also be accounted for.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No comments.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND (Further Comments): As part of the public consultation on the Draft Housing SG, SNH provided the following comments which referred to a number of sites within Selkirk: these sites are fully or partially within the Inventory Battlefield - Battle of Philiphaugh. However, the site requirements for these sites refer only to the need to consider the setting of the battlefield, rather than the necessity to ensure that development is sensitive and appropriate to their location within the battlefield. The site requirements should be amended to require that developments must not have a negative impact on key landscape characteristics and special qualities of the battlefield.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: Trees in association with the mill lade to SE boundary are a valuable bird and bat habitat and must be retained and an adequate buffer must be enforced to ensure their successful retention. Capacity of 8 units not inappropriate for the area and would reflect the density of existing residential units. Care will be required to retain the special qualities of the Ettrickhaugh Rd. Caution should be used in any development to maintain scale of surrounding houses i.e. Single or one and a half storey houses would be most appropriate.

SNH: Refer to HRA of zRO200 for measures to avoid likely significant effect on River Tweed SAC.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: No objections to the site being zoned for housing. Some minor widening to Ettrickhaugh Road will be required to mitigate the increase in traffic movements. A strong street frontage should be incorporated into the design to mirror the housing opposite.

NETWORK MANAGER: No comments.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: The erection of an unsuitable building, not in keeping with the stone mills, at this site will further detract from the aesthetics of the path network in this area. The site would also need to be linked to the existing path network.

STRATEGIC TRANSPORT: No comments.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped until aerial images identify a portion of the site as a storage facility/ yard (precise us unknown). The site is brownfield land and its use may present development constraints

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No comments.

EDUCATION: No issues.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: Developers need to be aware of the need to consult with Environmental Health, in respect of low carbon/carbon neutral technologies. This includes air source heat pumps, solid fuel use, biomass heating and district heating schemes. The design of dwellings may also need to take cognisance of nearby existing noise sources.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: Potential off-site contribution for play.

SCOTTISH WATER - WWTW: No issues. WTW: No significant issues identified. However there may be local network issues which would need to be addressed and funded by the developer to enable a connection.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Acceptable	15

## Conclusions

The site is a greenfield site, and has flooded in the past. SEPA object to the allocation of the site on flooding grounds on the basis that despite the recent Selkirk Flood Protection Scheme, the site is at risk of flooding. The Council's Flood Team, however, refute this view and consider that the site is now protected from the 0.5% AEP Event. The Council has recently agreed a planning permission in principle application (PPP) for a residential development on this site. This application has now been referred to Scottish Ministers due to an objection from SEPA.

There is moderate risk to biodiversity and River Tweed SAC mitigation would be required. Accessibility to local services is acceptable. Archaeological investigation and mitigation required. Setting of registered battlefield requires consideration. In principle it is considered that the site offers a suitable location for housing. Trees in association with the mill lade would require to be retained and an adequate buffer must be enforced to ensure their successful retention. Site acceptable from a physical access/road capacity point of view and should be linked to existing path network. Possible contamination would require to be investigated and mitigated.

Whilst the site is considered acceptable in principle for residential development, the flood risk objections raised by SEPA would require further discussion. It is considered that this site is of a scale which would not accommodate a significant number of properties. Whilst the indicative number proposed is 15, the planning application discussed above states an indicative number of 6. Given this and the fact the planning application has been referred to Scottish Ministers for this infill site, it is recommended that the site is not taken forward for inclusion within the Proposed Plan. It is acknowledged that the site could be considered again for inclusion in a future LDP.

<b>Site reference</b> ASELK042	<b>Site name</b> Philiphaugh Steading II	<b>Settlement</b> Selkirk	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 32	<b>Ha</b> 1.2	<b>PP status</b> Included
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Adjacent to site	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

Flood and Coastal Management Officer: Dependent on SEPA's building behind defences stance.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency: The information provided in the SBC FPS website shows the majority of site at risk during a 1:200 year including an allowance for climate change flood extent. This area experienced extensive flooding in 2003 from the Long Philip Burn. This area may also have been flooded in 1977. The information available on the Long Philip Burn scheme shows the Bannerfield area is protected to a 1:100 year RP including an allowance for climate change. There will be uncertainty associated with this scheme due to the volume of debris that can be mobilised during a flood. SEPA require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Long Philip Burn. SEPA are aware that significant earth works have been undertaken on this site which should be taken into account during any future assessment. Consideration will need to be given to bridges and culverts which are known to block in this area due to volume of debris that the burn can transport during high flows. Based on the information available as part of the Flood Scheme works, the site will likely be heavily constrained due to flood risk. The council may wish to consider removal or reduction in the number of housing or sensitivity of use. Due to steep topography above the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Brownfield	<b>Planning history references</b> 97/05755/FUL - Alterations, extensions and change of use to form 13 dwellinghouses (PERC) 05/00057/OUT - Demolition of dwellinghouse and steading buildings and erection of residential development (PERCI) 06/01304/OUT - Erection of ten dwellinghouses (PERCI)
				The site is part of a larger housing allocation in the LDP (ASELK006). It is understood that the reduction in the site size will take cognisance of the recent Selkirk Flood Prevention Scheme.

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> South
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	-----------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

Ecology Officer: No comments.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On site

### Garden and designed landscape

On site

### Local impact and integration summary

Archaeology Officer: The proposed site is within the core of the Battlefield of Philiphaugh. Archaeological mitigation will be required. Development proposals will need to be sensitive to the setting of the Inventory Battlefield to be acceptable. Cumulative impacts must be considered as there is potential for overdevelopment of the battlefield core.

Heritage and Design Officer: No comments.

Historic Environment Scotland: No comments.

General comments: Located within the Philiphaugh designed landscape.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Adjacent to site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

Landscape Architect: No response received.

Scottish Natural Heritage: No comments.

The Borders Development and Landscape Capacity Study (February 2007) identifies this area as being appropriate for infill development.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Network Manager: No comments.

Public Transport: Possible bus stop infrastructure on A707.

Roads Planning Service: This site has already been allocated as part of a larger site (ASELK006). The reduced site area takes into account the Selkirk Flood Prevention Scheme. No objections to this reduced site being allocated for housing. Good pedestrian/cycle linkage should be provided between this site and any adjoining development as well as with the existing road network. The former section of the A708 will have to be upgraded in terms of footway and street lighting. A Transport Statement is likely to be required depending on the scale of development.

Strategic Transport: AWAITING RESPONSE.

Transport Scotland: No comments.

### Near a trunk road?

**Right of way**

Adjacent to site

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

On site

**Water supply**

Yes

**Sewerage**

Yes

**Gas Supply**

Yes

**Education provision**

Good

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

Contaminated Land Officer: The site appears to have been developed as an agricultural steading. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

Countryside Access Team: Non-vehicular access required to existing pavements and safe crossings to the existing path network.

Education: No objections.

Scottish Water: Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. Please note there are Water mains within site. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Selkirk WwTW has sufficient capacity. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

**Overall assessment****PP status**

Included

**Overall assessment**

Acceptable

**Site capacity**

32

**Conclusions**

The principle of residential development at this location has long since been established given the site is already allocated within the LDP 2016 (ASELK006). The reduced size, which takes account of the recent Flood Protection Scheme, is regarded as acceptable. It is not considered that the indicative site capacity should be altered given the small area being reduced from the site allocation therefore the capacity will remain at 32 units.

However, SEPA object to the allocation of the site on flooding grounds on the grounds that the site is in a sparsely developed area and an increase in sensitivity from commercial to residential. SEPA do not consider that the site meets the requirements of SPP and they advise that their position is unlikely to change. SEPA require that the site is removed from the LDP. These matters have been discussed with the Council's Flood and Coastal Management Team and the Senior Project Manager of the Selkirk Flood Protection Scheme. As part of the Selkirk Flood Protection Scheme, a final 'as built' model run will be undertaken of the scheme to determine actual risk. This will confirm the actual standard of protection. It is expected that this will be undertaken by June 2020 and thereafter analysed. This information will then be conveyed to SEPA for their information and further comments. This site will replace the existing allocation (ASELK006) within the Proposed Plan.

<b>Site reference</b> ASELK043	<b>Site name</b> Land to North of Selkirk Golf Club	<b>Settlement</b> Selkirk	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 20	<b>Ha</b> 2.6	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

Flood Risk and Coastal Management: This site does not lie within the SEPA 1 in 200 year fluvial (river) or pluvial (surface water) flood extents. As such, the Officer would have no objections to this site on the grounds of flood risk. Due to the size of the development, surface water runoff and routing of overland flow should be considered.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency: Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes SEPA would recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at an increased risk of flooding.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> N/A
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Low impact. Site appears to be improved grassland with scrub and small number of trees and stone dyke on the boundary. Adjacent to Selkirk hills, areas of species rich grassland and heathland, northern brown argus butterfly. No obvious connectivity to River Tweed SAC. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats (lighting), badger and breeding birds.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Not applicable	<b>Open space</b> Not applicable	<b>Listed buildings</b> Not applicable	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> On/adjacent to site	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> Adjacent to site
--------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------

### Local impact and integration summary

Archaeology Officer: Archaeological potential within the site. Evaluation needed.

Heritage & Design Officer: The site lies outwith the current settlement boundary and lies in a prominent position on the approach to the town from both the south and east (Golf Course Road). The H&D Officer has concerns about the impact of development on this site in terms of visual separation from the existing settlement and does not support its inclusion.

Historic Environment Scotland: No comments.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

On/adjacent to site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

Landscape Architect: No comments received.

Scottish Natural Heritage: ASELK043 is a prominent site alongside A7 that is physically and perceptually detached from the existing settlement. In addition, SNH note that this site is adjacent to a safeguard for a bypass of Selkirk which raises queries around opportunities for creating a high quality place to live. SNH consider that a bypass would further detach housing here from the existing settlement. Sites within Special Landscape Area.

LANDSCAPE CAPACITY STUDY: Development within the 'Steep Slopes' is severely constrained by the physical separation of this area from the settlement, reinforced by the barrier created by the busy A7 and the A699. Some slopes are also very steep and would require considerable earthmoving to accommodate development.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Network Management: Difficult access arrangements (onto A7 or A699) outwith existing 30 mph limit.

Passenger Transport: Bus stop infrastructure required – Laybys and shelters in each direction south of Ladylands Toll.

Roads Planning: Not in favour of this site being zoned for housing. The site is bounded on the west by the A7 Trunk Road and the A699 on the north and is separated from Selkirk by these roads. It would therefore be very difficult to integrate this development with the rest of Selkirk, especially from a pedestrian movement point of view. I would also point out the protected route in the current LDP for Selkirk bypass impacts on the northern part of this site. If and when the bypass is constructed, this site will be even more detached from the rest of town. Although the indicative number of dwelling units is only 20, a Transport Assessment would be required in light of the extent of transport issues to be addressed i.e. the bypass and difficult crossroads junction. Transport Scotland will have an interest in this site, it being adjacent to the A7 Trunk Road and impacting on the A699/A7 junction and potential bypass.

Transport Scotland: No comments.

### Right of way

On/adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No comments received.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE RANGER: The access authority would request non-vehicular links to the existing path network and the town precincts (pavements).

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: The by-pass of Selkirk as protected under 'road safeguarding' in the Local Plan is a future economic aspiration and would reduce congestion within the town centre. Until this route is designed and the line fixed, it is premature to allocate the whole of this site. It also puts a development on the east side of this route which would be a natural edge to further town development.

EDUCATION: No objections.

HOUSING STRATEGY: No objections.

SCOTTISH ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AGENCY: This site is just outside of the current sewered catchment however will require to connect into the foul sewer network as there do not appear to be any other options for foul drainage, given the location of the site between the A7 and A699 roads.

SCOTTISH WATER: There is sufficient capacity at the waste water treatment works (Selkirk DOA). The site is not currently served by waste water network (Howden WOA). There is sufficient capacity at the water treatment works (Howden WOA). A WIA would probably be required. There are a number of Scottish Water assets located within this site. Exact location of these will have to be surveyed. There is a 3" and a 4" uPVC water main located well within the Western boundary of this site. There is a 450mm DI trunk main located within the SE boundary of the site. There is a 400mm HDPE trunk main within the Northern boundary of this site. All of these assets must either be diverted or significant protection measures must be in place to protect them including access rights and stand off distances. Early discussion with Scottish Water is highly advised before any further plans are made for this site.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	20

### Conclusions

The site is physically separated from the settlement of Selkirk by the A7 and A699 and is on a prominent approach into the town, being on higher ground. The A7 currently acts as a physical barrier. The proposal is not supported by the Roads Officer due to this separation as pedestrian integration would be problematic. This would be further exacerbated if/when the Selkirk By-pass is provided. It is not considered that this site should be taken forward into the Proposed LDP for the aforesaid reasons.

---

<b>Site reference</b> MSELK002	<b>Site name</b> Heather Mill	<b>Settlement</b> Selkirk	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Mixed Use	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 75	<b>Ha</b> 1.4	<b>PP status</b> Retain LDP Site
-----------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------

## Initial assessment

**Floodrisk**      **SAC**      **SPA**      **SSSI**      **Ramsar**

### Initial assessment summary

The site is already allocated for the proposed use within the Adopted Supplementary Guidance on Housing (November 2017). It is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2.

## Background information

**Minerals and coal**    **NNR**      **Prime Quality Agricultural Land**    **Current use/s**    **Planning history references**

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

**Access to public transport**      **Access to employment**      **Access to services**      **Wider biodiversity impacts**      **Site aspect**

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

## Local impact and integration assessment

**Conservation area**    **Open space**    **Listed buildings**    **Scheduled Monument**    **Ancient woodland inventory**    **Archaeology**    **Garden and designed landscape**

### Local impact and integration summary

## Landscape assessment

**NSA**      **SLA**      **Over 200 metres?**       **Over 12 degree slope**       **Wild Land**

### Landscape summary

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

Right of way

TPOs

Contaminated land

Water supply

Sewerage

Gas Supply

Education provision

Planning & infrastructure summary

---

## Overall assessment

PP status

Overall assessment

Site capacity

Retain LDP Site

75

### Conclusions

The site is already allocated for the proposed use within the Adopted Supplementary Guidance on Housing (November 2017). It is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2.

---

<b>Site reference</b> MSELK003	<b>Site name</b> Land west of Heather Mill	<b>Settlement</b> Selkirk	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Mixed Use	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 5	<b>Ha</b> 0.1	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Adjacent to site	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: Dependent on SEPA's building behind defences stance.

SEPA: Selkirk FPS is completed and offers protection to 1:200 year return period including an allowance for climate change. This proposed change to the land use is understood to be an increase in vulnerability and is reliant on the FPS to protect the site from the Ettrick Water. In line with our current guidance, the allocation is in a built-up area and protected to events greater than a 1:200 year including sufficient climate change allowance. There is a residual risk from surface water ponding behind defences. Council should be mindful that allocating land for housing will increase the number of persons reliant on a FPS to protect them from flooding. SEPA would stress that FPSs have a finite design life. SEPA would be more supportive of a land use type that is similar to the current land use.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Brownfield	<b>Planning history references</b> 97/00205/FUL - Demolitions, repairs to tannery building and formation of access road and car parking with landscaping.  The site is currently located within a larger site allocated for business and industrial safeguarding (BSELK003). The site was previously considered as part of the Housing SG 2017 (ASELK037).
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> South-west
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	----------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: No comments received.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Not applicable	<b>Open space</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Listed buildings</b> Not applicable	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> On site	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> Not applicable
--------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

## Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There is some potential for encountering industrial archaeological remains of the former Heather Mill. Some mitigation may be required.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: There is potential for redevelopment.

HES: No comments.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: No comments received.

SNH: No comment, redevelopment of existing site.

The Scottish Borders Development and Landscape Capacity Study (Febrary 2007) notes that this area of mixed use contains brownfield sites and disused buildings which could be redeveloped.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: No comments.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: Only able to support the inclusion of this site if it was to be classed for the same use as the adjoining land to the north east (currently part of BSELK003). There is no dedicated access to the site other than through the adjacent yard and the Roads Planning Service would not wish to encourage small scale housing that is accessed via industrial/business land.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No comments.

Near a trunk road?

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

On/adjacent to site

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have been developed as a yarn mill and dye works. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: No comments.

EDUCATION: No comments.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the network. Selkirk WwTW has sufficient capacity. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may

---

be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SEPA: Foul water should be connected to the SW foul sewer network.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	5

### Conclusions

The site was considered as part of the Housing SG. An initial stage 1 RAG assessment was undertaken, however concluded that the site should not be taken forward as part of the Housing SG. The conclusion of the assessment is as follows:

Although the site is currently allocated within the Local Development Plan 2016 as a business and industrial site, this is a local designation which gives a low level of protection for this particular use. It is accepted that this site may be acceptable for residential use in the future, there is currently however the potential for a conflict of uses due to the fact that the land to the immediate south can still be utilised for business/industrial purposes. This potential conflict has also been identified by the Roads Planning Team. SEPA has also raised concerns relating to residential development behind a flood scheme.

It is therefore concluded that the site should be excluded from the Proposed LDP.

---

<b>Site reference</b> MSELK004	<b>Site name</b> Land and buildings at Whinfield Mill	<b>Settlement</b> Selkirk	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Mixed Use	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 33	<b>Ha</b> 1.3	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Adjacent to site	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: Dependent on SEPA's building behind defences stance.

SEPA: Selkirk FPS is completed and offers protection to 1:200 year return period including an allowance for climate change. This proposed change to the land use is understood to be an increase in vulnerability and is reliant on the FPS to protect the site from the Ettrick Water. In line with our current guidance, the allocation is in a built-up area and protected to events greater than a 1:200 year including sufficient climate change allowance. There is a residual risk from surface water ponding behind defences. Council should be mindful that allocating land for housing will increase the number of persons reliant on a FPS to protect them from flooding. SEPA would stress that FPSs have a finite design life. SEPA would be more supportive of a land use type that is similar to the current land use.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Combination	<b>Planning history references</b> No planning history. The site has previously been considered through the Housing SG 2017 (ASELK039) and the Local Development Plan 2016 (RSELK006 & BSELK003).
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: No comments received.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Not applicable	<b>Open space</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Listed buildings</b> Not applicable	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> On/adjacent to site	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> Not applicable
--------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There is potential for encountering buried industrial archaeological remains related to Whinfield Mill. In particular there is the known site of dye pits within the site, which may also pose an environmental hazard. The upstanding remains are also of historical importance. Mitigation including below ground investigation and standing building recording will be required.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: Potential for redevelopment.

HES: No comments.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Adjacent to site

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: No comments received.

SNH: No comment, redevelopment of existing site.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: No comments.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: No objections to this site being zoned for mixed use development. There are multiple acceptable permutations in terms of accessing the site, however best use of the existing road infrastructure should be employed. An opportunity will exist for street connectivity between Rodgers Road and Riverside Road. A Transport Statement is likely to be required.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No comments.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

On site

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have been developed as a woollen mill and dyeworks. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: No comments.

EDUCATION: No objections.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the network. Selkirk WwTW has sufficient capacity. Please note there are sewers within the site. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SEPA: Foul water should be connected to the SW foul sewer network. Site near to metal recycling yard (exempt site). Unlikely to cause issues.

General Comments: The site is designated as a district business and industrial site within the Local Development Plan 2016. Due to the existing character and nature of uses within the immediate vicinity of

the site, it is not considered that a mixed use development would be acceptable at this location. The development of the site for mixed use purposes would lead to the loss of business/industrial land and raise a potential conflict in uses at this location.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	33

### Conclusions

The site is designated as a district business and industrial site within the Local Development Plan 2016. Due to the existing character and nature of uses within the immediate vicinity of the site, it is not considered that a mixed use development would be acceptable at this location. The development of the site for mixed use purposes would lead to the loss of business/industrial land and raise a potential conflict in uses at this location. SEPA has also raised concerns relating to residential development behind a flood scheme. It is therefore concluded that the site should be excluded from the Proposed LDP.

---

# Smailholm

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
ASMAI001	Land adjacent to Village Hall	Smailholm	Central	Housing	7	1.0	Excluded

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable				

### Initial assessment summary

There are no initial constraints on the site which would preclude it from being developed.

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. No objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

SEPA: No detailed flood risk comments.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	On site	Greenfield	06/01553/OUT - Erection of three dwellinghouses (Approved) 10/01188/PPP - Erection of three dwellinghouses (Withdrawn)

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Limited	Limited	Limited	Minor	South-west

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Low impact. Site appears to be rank improved pasture with areas of scrub in site and garden ground on the boundary. No obvious connectivity with River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Kelso and Melrose are both around 6 miles (10 mins drive) Galashiels is 11 miles (20 mins drive). Aside from a village hall and church, there are very few facilities in Smailholm and residents rely on nearby towns for all daily services. As an attractive conservation village, there has been demand for small scale growth in Smailholm. The village does fall within the Central Borders Rural Growth Area but would not represent a suitable location for development other than that which allows for a steady, organic, growth of the village. With this in mind, it might be appropriate to alter the settlement boundary in order to allow for this in future, in a way which does not compromise the setting and Conservation Area status of the village and at a scale that is appropriate for a small isolated village with few facilities. There are only minor ecological risks associated with a redrawing of the settlement boundary at the West Third of Smailholm.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

On/adjacent to site

### Open space

Adjacent to site

### Listed buildings

Adjacent to site

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On/adjacent to site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY: The medieval village of Smailholm was formerly much more more extensive. 18th century historic mapping shows it to have extended along the main road at least as far west as West Third. By the middle of the 19th century the village had shrunk to its current size. It is likely that archaeological deposits linked to medieval and post-medieval occupation of this site will exist. Mitigation will be necessary.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: The village hall, former village school is listed category C and lies in part within the designated conservation area. Any development should respect both the setting of the listed village hall and also the character of the conservation area.

HES: No comments.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Adjacent to site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No comments received.

SNH: No comment due to size and location.

The relevant Tweed Lowlands Local Landscape Area management recommendation is for 'careful management of development at settlement edges.' The East Third of Smailholm sits in a low lying flat arable farmland landscape. Existing houses are spread out along the narrow roads that converge at the settlement in an unplanned fashion. There is scope for self build plots of varying sizes, with appropriate boundary treatment, to respond to the existing settlement pattern and its place within the local landscape.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Access should be off the 'C' Road rather than the 'B' Road.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: While safe vehicular access is possible at the easterly corner of the frontage with the B6397, safe pedestrian access is not as there is no opportunity for suitable pedestrian connections with the rest of the village from here. As such there should be no access at all to the B6397 as vehicular access would double up as pedestrian access. Access is readily available from the C class road on the south east side of the site and I am able to support some residential development on the site, or at least on the south westerly portion of the site, on that basis. A strong street frontage would be required onto the public road and a footway would be required in the road verge on the road frontage.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Central HMA

Smailholm

ASMAI001

## Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Potential to improve local path network.

EDUCATION: No objections.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Waste: Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. Sufficient capacity in the network.  
Water: Robertson WTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the network.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. This will require extending the sewer network into the west of the village to incorporate this and the existing houses in the west end as there is no nearby watercourse to receive a sewage discharge. There are a number of existing private sewage discharges to soakaway and hence any proposed new discharges to soakaway may impact groundwater.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Acceptable	7

## Conclusions

Only development that allows for an organic growth of the village would be appropriate. There is a need to protect the conservation area status of the village. While there is a need for sensitivity and there is a greater degree of complexity in terms of identifying land for the future expansion of Smailholm, this does not rule out development. The land could be identified in the LDP for housing development, but it would have to be of a layout and design that is in keeping with the conservation area status of the village at this location. This means that a lower density of housing would only be appropriate on this site in order to follow the character of surrounding properties. It is difficult to envisage how this site could be sensitively developed with 5 or more properties. It is perhaps more likely that a lesser scaled development might be achievable at this location. In any event, the site is located within the settlement boundary of Smailholm and it is therefore considered that this proposal would be best considered through the planning application process. The site will therefore not be allocated within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b> ASMAI002	<b>Site name</b> Land at West Third	<b>Settlement</b> Smailholm	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 5	<b>Ha</b> 1.2	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	----------------------------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

There are no initial constraints on the site which would preclude it from being developed.

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is outwith both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. However, dependent on the amount of properties, we may want to see surface water runoff managed on site.

SEPA: Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues in this area. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> On site	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no relevant planning history on the site.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Limited	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Limited	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Low impact. Site appears to be rank improved pasture with areas of scrub in site and garden ground on the boundary. No obvious connectivity with River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Kelso and Melrose are both around 6 miles (10 mins drive) Galashield is 11 miles (20 mins drive). Aside from a village hall and church, there are very few facilities in Smailholm and residents rely on nearby towns for all daily services. As an attractive conservation village, there has been demand for small scale growth in Smailholm. The village does fall within the Central Borders Rural Growth Area but would not represent a suitable location for development other than that which allows for a steady, organic, growth of the village. With this in mind, it might be appropriate to alter the settlement boundary in order to allow for this in future, in a way which does not compromise the setting and Conservation Area status of the village and at a scale that is appropriate for a small isolated village with few facilities. There are only minor ecological risks associated with a redrawing of the settlement boundary at the West Third of Smailholm.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On/adjacent to site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY: The medieval village of Smailholm was formerly much more more extensive. 18th century historic mapping shows it to have extended along the main road at least as far west as West Third. By the middle of the 19th century the village had shrunk to its current size. It is likely that archaeological deposits linked to medieval and post-medieval occupation of this site will exist. Mitigation will be necessary.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Smailholm currently comprises two separate small settlements; the East Third with the church being larger and this is designated as a conservation area. The West Third is quite separate. I am not opposed to the potential expansion of West Third provided that there is no coalescence with East Third.

HES: No comments.

GENERAL COMMENTS: An allocation, via a redrawing of the development boundary at West Third, allowing for 5 units, could be accommodated in terms of impacting on the existing settlement. Smailholm East Third is a Conservation Area. There is a requirement to avoid the coalescence of the two separate parts of the village, and this proposal would not threaten that.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

On site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: There is adverse landscape or visual impact associated with amending the development boundary of the western part of Smailholm. The development of an informal footpath from the west part to the main Smailholm settlement should be considered as a measure to improve the amenities of the village.

SNH: No comment due to nature of the proposal. However, it should be noted that this consultation was based on an original proposal without an indicative site capacity and only to alter the settlement boundary.

The relevant Tweed Lowlands Local Landscape Area management recommendation is for 'careful management of development at settlement edges.' The West Third of Smailholm sits in low lying flat arable farmland landscape. Existing houses are spread out along the main road in an unplanned fashion. There is scope for self build plots of varying sizes, with appropriate boundary treatment, to respond to the existing settlement pattern and its place within the local landscape.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: The site may impact on the existing 30 mph limit position.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING MANAGER: I have no objections to this development boundary amendment. If this part of Smailholm is to eventually join up with the main part of Smailholm then consideration should be given to this being properly planned to allow proper infrastructure to be provided i.e. street lighting, footway provision and an extension of the 30 mph speed limit.

### Near a trunk road?

**Right of way**

Not applicable

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

Not applicable

**Water supply**

Yes

**Sewerage**

Limited

**Gas Supply**

No

**Education provision**

Average

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

**CONTAMINATED LAND:** The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

**COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM:** Opportunity to provide pedestrian path.

**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT:** Investigate waste water capacity. Boundary requirement? Need for pavements and public roads.

**EDUCATION:** No comments.

**NHS:** No comments.

**SCOTTISH WATER:** Waste: Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. Water: Robertson WTW has sufficient capacity. Please note there are Water mains within site. Depending on how many units this site includes will determine if further investigation required.

**SEPA:** Consideration should be given to extending the sewer network into this part of the village to incorporate this and the existing houses in the west end as there is no nearby watercourse to receive a sewage discharge. There are a number of existing private sewage discharges to soakaway and hence any proposed new discharges to soakaway may impact groundwater.

**GENERAL COMMENTS:** There are no constraints which should rule out development of five units on the West Third of Smailholm. There is a need to confirm waste water treatment capacity when the final number of units and program for delivery is confirmed. The allocation would be for a maximum of five units to be provided through self build plots and so it is expected that these will be built out privately, demand-led, rather than developer-delivered. Roads planning service have raised the potential need for linking the East and West Third in future. This would not be an objective at present because of the need to consider coalescence and viability of development for five units. However, the specific roads planning service requirement should be clarified before a decision is made.

**Overall assessment****PP status**

Excluded

**Overall assessment**

Acceptable

**Site capacity**

5

**Conclusions**

Smailholm is in the Central Borders Strategic Development Area. It is a settlement with none of the services that are required on a daily basis and so residents rely on neighbouring Kelso, Melrose, St Boswells. It is a distinctive settlement and this is reflected in its Conservation Area status. An allocation of five units may be appropriate in a settlement of this size and function.

The site, and settlement, could only accommodate 5 units. Given the size of Smailholm a 5 unit allocation would be appropriate. The proposal suggests that self-build plots would be likely, rather than developer-led build out. There is a question around marketability in this location, however, a small scale allocation such as this in terms of balancing plan deliverability and allowing for small scale rural settlement growth appeared appropriate to consider in the MIR.

There is a need for further investigation around WWTW. There is a need for archaeological investigation as records show that the village's West Third and East Third were once conjoined. In design terms, the existing settlement pattern and architectural heritage in the West Third of Smailholm is varied with individual non-uniform plots and buildings, but new development should recognise the pattern of stone dyke frontages and the traditional building styles that exist. Roads have called for consideration of proper infrastructure to be provided i.e. street lighting, footway provision and an extension of the 30 mph speed limit.

(The site was originally plotted and consulted on as (SBSMA001), a development boundary amendment. However, was changed to a housing allocation site code (ASMAI002) and included within the MIR).

Following the public consultation period on the Main Issues Report it is not considered there is an identified housing need for additional housing within Smailholm. The site was submitted with no active developer associated with the site and therefore it is difficult to justify the effectiveness of the site. It is acknowledged that development at this location would be appropriate in the future however it is not felt that there is a need for a housing allocation within the village at this point in time. It is considered there are more appropriate sites to be included within the LDP. Therefore site ASMAI002 will not be included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

---

# Sprouston

---

<b>Site reference</b>	<b>Site name</b>	<b>Settlement</b>	<b>SDA</b>	<b>Proposed Use</b>	<b>Indicative Capacity</b>	<b>Ha</b>	<b>PP status</b>
RSP2B	Church Field	Sprouston	Central	Housing	15	1.5	Retain LDP Site

---

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b>	<b>SAC</b>	<b>SPA</b>	<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
------------------	------------	------------	-------------	---------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site is already allocated for the proposed use within the current Local Development Plan and it is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2. It should be noted that the site capacity included within the LDP are only indicative, ultimately any proposal would be assessed throughout the development management process.

---

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b>	<b>Planning history references</b>
			Greenfield	04/02159/FUL - Erection of thirty nine dwellinghouses (Approved) 06/02183/FUL - Erection of thirty seven dwellinghouses (revised application) (Approved)
Note: Both applications cover RSP2B and adjacent housing allocation RSP3B (Teasel Bank).				

---

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b>	<b>Access to employment</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b>	<b>Site aspect</b>
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
--------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------------

### Local impact and integration summary

## Landscape assessment

NSA

SLA

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

Wild Land

Landscape summary

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

Right of way

TPOs

Contaminated land

Water supply

Sewerage

Gas Supply

Education provision

Planning & infrastructure summary

---

## Overall assessment

PP status

Overall assessment

Site capacity

Retain LDP Site

15

### Conclusions

The site is already allocated for the proposed use within the current Local Development Plan and it is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2. It should be noted that the site capacity included within the LDP are only indicative, ultimately any proposal would be assessed throughout the development management process.

---

# St Boswells

<b>Site reference</b>	<b>Site name</b>	<b>Settlement</b>	<b>SDA</b>	<b>Proposed Use</b>	<b>Indicative Capacity</b>	<b>Ha</b>	<b>PP status</b>
MSTBO001	Land north west of Garage	St Boswells	Central	Mixed Use	N/A	2.9	Excluded

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b>	<b>SAC</b>	<b>SPA</b>	<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. I would, however, ask that due to the size of the development that surface water flooding is considered and it is ensured that any water would be routed around the housing.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the West Burn which flows adjacent to site. Consideration will need to be given to any culverts/ bridges which may exacerbate flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b>	<b>Planning history references</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	11/00667/FUL - Change of use of agricultural land to incorporate car park, extension to workshop and car wash bays (Approved) 17/00902/PAN - Erection of car showroom, including workshop, offices, petrol filling station, shop, cafe, parking, access, pedestrian crossing and associated infrastructure works (Pending Decision) 17/01078/SCR -Erection of car showroom, including workshop, offices, petrol filling station, shop, café, parking, access, pedestrian crossing and associated infrastructure works (Pending Decision)

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b>	<b>Access to employment</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b>	<b>Site aspect</b>
Good	Good	Good	Moderate	South-west

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site appears to be arable field with hedgerow and lowland mixed deciduous woodland on the boundary. Potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC/SSSI via run off (adjacent to West burn). Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including bats (EPS), badger and breeding birds.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY: There is a known prehistoric enclosure and probable settlement within this proposed LDP area. It has recently been evaluated and is of regional significance. Any development would need to satisfy the requirements of Policy EP8 and those of local or regional benefit may be contrary to policy. Consider not taking this site forward. However, if it is mitigation in the form of large scale excavation and post-excavation analysis/dissemination may be required.

HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER: I am aware that there are archaeological implications in the redevelopment of this site as some initial evaluation has been carried out. The site occupies a prominent position on the approach to St Boswells and is not currently screened by any existing landscape features. A specific case would need to be accepted as to why this site should be developed.

HES: No comments.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

On/adjacent to site

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: In landscape and visual terms it would be unfortunate to further breach the north western edge of the woodland that helps to contain/enclose the village. Development in this location could create ribbon development which could only be mitigated by substantial structure planting along NW edge (Minimum width of 25m).

SNH: Seek reasonable alternative. The site is likely to present significant and/or adverse impacts on the natural heritage. We advise that an alternative site may present less significant impacts and therefore should be considered in advance of this allocating this site. The site is on the boundary of the Eildon & Leaderfoot Hills NSA. The site's visual prominence and elevated topography as outlined below, suggests there is likelihood of impact to the local landscape character and potentially to the special qualities of the NSA. The current settlement at St Boswells is located to the south of the West Burn. We consider that allocating this site would alter the entry to St Boswells from the north on the A68, establishing a new gateway and reducing the separation of Newtown St Boswells and St Boswells. The site is also separated from the existing settlement and is unlikely to meet Scottish Planning Policy paragraph 287: "Planning permission should not be granted for significant travel-generating uses at locations which would increase reliance on the car and where... access to local facilities via public transport networks would involve walking more than 400m..." The site is around 600m from the nearest local facilities and it appears unlikely that a more direct, pleasant route for walking and cycling could be achieved. The site rises from the A68 to a high point of 107m. Development here would be very prominent in both long and close views. The character of existing settlements along the A68 here is that they are generally low-lying and well-screened. From our visit to this site, we consider it unlikely that this could be achieved here, representing a change to the established character of this area.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: Existing issues with garage junction onto busy A68 Trunk Road.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Possible bus infrastructure and bus bay on A68.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: I have no objections in principle to the inclusion of this site for mixed use development. For junction rationalisation, junction visibility standards etc. it is likely the existing Border Toyota site and this site will rely on each other so that the area will need to be developed as a whole. As the adjacent A68 is a trunk road, the comments of Transport Scotland will be critical in the determination of any application for this site in respect of junction location(s), junction standards and junction visibility. Pedestrian connectivity between the site and the rest of the village, including pedestrian

crossing arrangements in the A68, will be a further key consideration for Transport Scotland. The internal access arrangements for the site will have to be such that traffic movements are straightforward with no resultant undue impact on road safety on the A68 caused by convoluted manoeuvres, lack of clarity of traffic flow or arrangements which are likely to result in stacking traffic impacting on the A68.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Previous discussions have taken place with Transport Scotland in relation to this site recommending that the existing trunk road access would require to be closed with a new access created to access the existing development and any further development.

<b>Right of way</b>	<b>TPOs</b>	<b>Contaminated land</b>	<b>Water supply</b>	<b>Sewerage</b>	<b>Gas Supply</b>	<b>Education provision</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Yes	Yes	No	Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Opportunity to provide path link to village for pedestrians.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Inappropriate addition to the development boundary due to its location and scale; Conflicts with policy EP6 as it would extend St Boswells closer to Newtown St Boswells; Access onto the trunk road may be an issue with Transport Scotland; Archaeological implications.

EDUCATION: No issues.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Waste: Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. Depending on how many units this site includes will determine if further investigation required. Water: Robertson WTW has sufficient capacity. Depending on how many units this site includes will determine if further investigation required.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing sewer network. This will require extending the sewer network to incorporate this development.

---

## Overall assessment

<b>PP status</b>	<b>Overall assessment</b>	<b>Site capacity</b>
Excluded	Doubtful	N/A

### Conclusions

There are landscape issues in relation to the NSA and the potential issues of coalescence to consider. Aside from this there have been no issues that pose a threat to potential development. Having said that, this site is the subject of a planning application process, and is related to the existing garage site.

It would be premature to allocate this in the LDP2. Instead this should be treated as a DM issue and the subsequent LDP updated to reflect this.

<b>Site reference</b> RSTBO001	<b>Site name</b> Garage Site	<b>Settlement</b> St Boswells	<b>SDA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Redevelopment	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 40	<b>Ha</b> 0.5	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

There are no initial constraints on the site which would preclude it from being developed.

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. No objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. I would, however, ask that due to the size of the development that surface water flooding is considered.

SEPA: Require an FRA which assesses the risk from the West Burn which flows adjacent to site. Consideration will need to be given to any culverts/ bridges which may exacerbate flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Combination	<b>Planning history references</b> 90/01628/ADV - Erection of signs (Approved) 90/01637/FUL - Change of use from field margin to extension of circulation area and screening of buildings with trees (Approved) 95/01605/FUL - Erection of satellite dish (Approved) 14/00688/FUL - Extension to form workshop/canteen/toilets/car wash (Approved) 15/00412/FUL - Re-cladding of existing workshop, showroom and shop (Approved)
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site is garage (forecourt and show room) with associated car park with garden ground and lowland mixed deciduous woodland on the boundary. Potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC/SSSI via run off (adjacent to West burn). Built structures have potential to support bats (EPS) and breeding birds. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including bats (EPS), badger and breeding birds.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

On/adjacent to site

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: The existing building is of some historical interest. Some form of mitigation may be required depending on proposals.

HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER: In the event of the garage being relocated, there is scope for this site to be redeveloped for housing. It lies in a sensitive position at the edge of the village green which effectively defines the conservation area. Great care will be needed in the design of new housing (a development brief should be produced) and in particular the treatment of the east boundary facing the green will need to be very carefully considered.

HES: No comments.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Adjacent to site

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: Circa 20 units (40 units would be contrary to the style, scale and pattern of development within the village to date).

SNH: Although this is re-use of brownfield land we would advise that allocation of this site within the NSA should be supported by a site brief which identifies the key natural heritage assets of the site, including views and the key opportunities for the integration of green infrastructure within future development. Our advice is that this site represents a more appropriate potential extension to St Boswells than site MSTBO001. Development at this location could fit the current character of the settlement, south of the West Burn and well contained on approach from the north on the A68. This site is also near the boundary of the Eildon & Leaderfoot Hills NSA but, in contrast to MSTBO001, is unlikely to impact on the special qualities of the NSA due to its lower-lying position and screening provided by the woodland corridor of the West Burn. Nonetheless we advise that issues of key views, massing and other aspects of site design, will be important to consider through a site design brief.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Possible Bus infrastructure and bus bay on A68.

### Near a trunk road?



NETWORK MANAGER: Existing issues with garage junction onto busy A68 Trunk Road, but within 30 mph and less of an issue than MSTBO001.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: I would have no objections to the inclusion of this site for mixed use development. The adjacent A68 is a trunk road and the comments of Transport Scotland will be critical in the determination of any application for this site. The existing pedestrian links with the village would need to be improved, including pedestrian crossing provision in the A68 and connectivity with the hotel and ideally with Buccleuch Chase. A strong frontage along the A68 should be encouraged in this prominent location, including footway provision, and this will help reinforce the 30 mph speed limit. Depending on the use proposed, a Transport Assessment would be required which would consider all aspects of sustainable travel and confirm what form of junction(s) would be required onto the A68. At present there is a real conflict of manoeuvres between the hotel car park, the garage access and the one-way filling station arrangement. There would be an opportunity to rationalise this in the best interests of road safety.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Early discussion with Transport Scotland is advised on the redevelopment of this site for housing and the rationalisation of the existing accesses.

**Right of way**

Not applicable

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

On site

**Water supply**

Yes

**Sewerage**

Yes

**Gas Supply**

Yes

**Education provision**

Good

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have been developed as an vehicle repair and filling. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Path link to path to West of site is along North edge of site. Footway to be included within development from existing roadside footway.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Infill potential within the development boundary, though it would result in the loss of the petrol filling station (potential conflict with policy IS1); Contamination would need investigation/mitigation. Access onto the trunk road may be an issue with Transport Scotland; A mixed use development would be appropriate.

EDUCATION: No issues.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Waste: Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Water: Robertson WTW has sufficient capacity. A Flow and Pressure test is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. Site is currently a garage and petrol station regulated under PPC Part B (PVR).

**Overall assessment****PP status**

Excluded

**Overall assessment**

Acceptable

**Site capacity**

40

**Conclusions**

This site would be suitable as a brownfield development opportunity. This would not strictly have to be allocated in the development plan as it already lies within the development boundary. An allocation here needs to be considered as interrelated with the landowner's plans to expand their operations on the west of St Boswells (MTSBO001). This site (RTSB001) is, according to the landowner, no longer fit for purpose. As such this creates a brownfield development opportunity. So, allocating this site for housing effectively adds weight to the need for an employment and industrial use expansion at MTSB001. There are (resolvable) contamination issues and trunk road access issues to consider. In the circumstances this site will not be included within the LDP for redevelopment purposes. This site should not be included in the Proposed LDP but would be supported as redevelopment in future if it was to become redundant through the planning application process.

# Stichill

<b>Site reference</b>	<b>Site name</b>	<b>Settlement</b>	<b>SDA</b>	<b>Proposed Use</b>	<b>Indicative Capacity</b>	<b>Ha</b>	<b>PP status</b>
ASTIC003	Land north west of Eildon View	Stichill	Central	Housing	16	1.0	Excluded

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b>	<b>SAC</b>	<b>SPA</b>	<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

There are no initial constraints on the site which would preclude it from being developed.

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. I would, however, ask that due to the size of the development that surface water flooding is considered.

SEPA: No detailed flood risk comments.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b>	<b>Planning history references</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	There is no relevant planning application history on the site. Site has been submitted, considered, and rejected in previous LDP and SG processes.

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b>	<b>Access to employment</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b>	<b>Site aspect</b>
Limited	Limited	Limited	Minor	South-west

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGICAL OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Low impact. Site appears to be improved grassland with lowland mixed deciduous woodland, field margin and garden ground on the boundary. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including potentially bats, badger breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: There are no key services in Stichill. There is one bus service, the 66 Earlston-Kelso Circular. Stichill is in the Central Borders Rural Growth Area, but access to key services and employment is still limited. Kelso is around 3 miles away and is less than a 5-10 mins drive. Tweedbank and Galashiels are 16/18 miles away, 25-30mins drive. Stichill compares well to other rural settlements in terms of its relatively close access to Kelso, but poorly in terms of the key services available within the village itself. There is a low ecological risk associated with the site.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

On site

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On/adjacent to site

### Garden and designed landscape

On/adjacent to site

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There are no known archaeological issues.

HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER: The gatepiers and former gate lodge (Eildon View) are listed category C. Any development should respect the setting of these structures.

HES: No comments.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Development of 16 units could be fairly easily integrated into the settlement. The site itself is well sheltered and would have a low visual impact. There is an issue with access though. First assurance that the C listed gateway and gatehouse are not damaged and their setting respected is required. If either alternative accesses have to be used, then these alternatives could create issues around road safety, integration and impact on the settlement.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: This creates a difficulty because the access road would need to come through the existing decorative stone gate which is part of the Designed Landscape and single track only. You may wish to check with roads planning what they might be prepared to accept but removing the gates and opening up a 2 lane road is objectionable from a landscape and cultural perspective especially since this is a major focal point in the village. A development of 16 units could be achieved on the site if access to the site through the gateway could be resolved. Structure planting required to achieve a landscape fit.

SNH: Advise that a site brief is produced to identify the key natural heritage assets of the site to be protected and the key opportunities for the integration of green infrastructure within future development. SNH's advice on this site is based on prior knowledge and desktop assessment using GIS and streetview. We may provide further advice based on a site visit if the potential allocation is carried forward. Due to the change to the established settlement pattern and the elevated position of this site, SNH recommend that a site brief should be prepared if the site is allocated.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: No comments.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: In order to support development on this site I shall require the length of private road leading to the site to be upgraded to a fully adoptable standard. This may affect third party land. The upgrading works are also likely to have an impact on the entrance pillars and gates, or at least the arch feature between them.

### Near a trunk road?

### Right of way

On site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Average

## Planning & infrastructure summary

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: No comment.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

EDUCATION: No issues.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Waste: Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. Water: RobertonWwTW has sufficient capacity. Please note there is an abandoned water main within site. A Flow and Pressure test is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to existing SW foul network. SW should confirm capacity.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Doubtful	16

### Conclusions

The site was considered as part of the Housing SG. An initial stage 1 RAG assessment was undertaken, however concluded that the site should not be taken forward as part of the Housing SG. The conclusion of the assessment is as follows:

"The site was previously considered in the preparation of the Local Plan. The site was rejected on roads access grounds.

The site sits within Central HMA but is outwith the SDAs. There are no current allocations within the settlement, but there has been recent development within Stichill following the erection of 8 dwelling houses at land south of the B6364. The proposed 16 units at this site would represent further relatively large scale development for a small settlement such as Stichill.

The site is situated within the SBC designated Stichill Designed Landscape, which relates to the now-demolished Stichill House. The site is located within close proximity to two C Listed Buildings, including the gates to Stichill House.

There are no known key services provided in Stichill. The nearest primary school is located in nearby Ednam. Stichill is considered to have poor local service accessibility.

The site submission does not confirm ownership of the road and consequently the Council is not able to confirm that the access road can be formed to the required adoptable standard. Consequently it is considered at this point in time that the proposal is premature and cannot be confirmed as being effective within this SG process. If the access issue can be addressed and resolved at a later point in time it consequently may be considered for allocation within a future LDP taking cognisance of any other relevant matters.

Overall, it is considered that there are better sites available in the Central Housing Market Area and the site should not be considered further."

Following a detailed site assessment, it is considered that the sustainability of a 16 unit allocation in a village with no daily services is very questionable. In terms of the details, the issue of using the shared access has still not been resolved. It is not in the landowners ownership and so the viability of the site's development is undermined. Related to this, that access point would likely require a major impact on or the demolition of the C listed gated entrance to the former Stichill House estate. Comment from HES is required in this regard but it is highly unlikely that this would be supported. The alternative routes suggested do get around this problem technically, but lead to other issues in terms of feasibility and impact on the surrounding area. These alternative accesses need to be assessed further. For the aforesaid reasons, it is not considered that this site can be brought forward for housing within the Proposed LDP.

# Tweedbank

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
MTWEE003	Lowood II	Tweedbank	Central	Mixed Use	300	37.6	Excluded

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
1:200	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The site is shown to be within SEPA's 1:200 year fluvial and surface water flood map. The team would require that a Flood Risk Assessment is undertaken to assess the flood risk from the River Tweed and demonstrate how surface water flooding would be mitigated. A drainage assessment and SUDS will also be required.

SEPA: Require an FRA which assesses the risk from the River Tweed, Allan Water and small watercourse which flows along the boundary of the northern allocation. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site which may exacerbate flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Site will likely be constrained due to flood risk.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	03/01027/FUL - Alterations to flats (Approved)  The site was included within the Housing SG 2017 for mixed use (MTWEE002) with an indicative capacity of 300 units. The site being assessed under MTWEE003 reflects the boundaries of MTWEE002 but includes an area of riverbank north of the Tweed as well as a small area at the access from the east of the site.

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Good	Good	Good	Moderate	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: BIODIVERSITY: Moderate risk - mature broad-leaved woodland and parkland, improved pasture and pond. Potential drainage connectivity River Tweed SAC/SSSI), N boundary and NW part of site in SEPA 1 in 200 year fluvial flood risk area. Noctule bat recorded at this site (pers.comm). Existing built structures and woodlands of high suitability for bats (EPS). Potential to support otter (other Protected species may include e.g. bats badger and breeding birds). Pond was assessed for GCN in previous national survey- unsuitable, check survey results. Safeguard trees on boundary. Mitigation required to ensure no significant adverse effects on integrity of River Tweed SAC. Safeguard mature woodland and parkland trees and maintain buffer area to River Tweed SAC/SSSI. This would constrain the number of potential units.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	On site	Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There is moderate to high archaeological potential within the site. This relates to the former medieval toll bridge that linked Easter Langlee with Lowood (Bridgend) and a probable medieval settlement at Lowood. The entire area has potential for unknown archaeological deposits and sites. Evaluation will be required followed by any mitigation measures as deemed necessary.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: This is a very significant site in terms of scale. Not supportive of the proposal to include a section of the riverbank north of the Tweed as part of this site. The Tweed riverbank is an important green corridor both visually and environmentally. Development on the site north of the Tweed will effectively lead to coalescence of Galashiels and Tweedbank on the north bank which is undesirable. It is also stressed that whilst the riverbank south of the Tweed is shown within the allocated area, this does NOT mean that this is suitable for building development. Although Lowood House is not included on the statutory list, it is never the less an historic building with its own setting and planned landscape. Any development should respect the setting of the house. The development of a masterplan / design guidance is essential in framing a development strategy for this site.

HSE: No comments.

---

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable			Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: Area of land within large meander of the River Tweed, gently to moderately sloping with steep slopes in places with various slope orientations, between river level around 85m AOD at Backbrae Pool up to 105m AOD at Well Park (N of the station). The ground forms a rural estate with a mansion house, driveway with entrance gatehouse, parkland, fields, gardens, steading and various cottages. W, N and E boundaries formed by River Tweed a designated SSSI and SAC. Long southern boundary largely formed by Borders rail line, Tweedbank Station and Lowood access road. Although remarkably lacking in designations, the estate shows clear indications of being a 'designed landscape' with an attractive meandering driveway leading from the gatehouse through parkland to the main house and associated buildings. There is a significant tree and woodland structure on the estate much of it of potential TPO quality. The river and riparian strip and pond are also notable features as is the stone boundary wall that defines much of the southern boundary.

The main constraint is access with the river and railway line forming a significant barrier around most of the perimeter and leaving only the section of ground between Tweedbank Station and Lowood Bridge as potential access points (unless substantial and potentially intrusive engineering is to be undertaken.) Future extension of the railway is also a consideration. A further constraint is provided by mature existing woodland which would probably need to be breached to some degree. The river flood zone limits development around the N perimeter. An OH power line crosses the W section of the site.

Despite its central location in central borders, this area is quite isolated and presently undeveloped. There is some scope for development particularly towards the western section but access is problematic. Great care would be required to form any development in the easier to reach eastern (parkland) parts of the site where the amenity values and potential for disruption are greatest. Given the exceptional quality of the parkland area, it is recommended that development be restricted to 'prestige' forms that benefit from such a setting e.g. corporate headquarters or luxury hotel. More mundane development would constitute a wasted opportunity and would likely cause environmental degradation. The site merits a detailed feasibility study including tree survey to BS5837 prior to any revision of status.

SNH: From our previous response of 03 August 2016 for allocation reference MTWEE002: This site lies outwith the settlement boundary. Its northern boundary abuts the River Tweed SAC. At present the site is characterised by areas of woodland, specimen trees and boundary walls enclosing Lowood. It is a relatively well contained site that would nevertheless benefit from its proximity to Tweedbank Station. If allocated, we recommend that development is designed around these existing features, making use of them to create a high-quality, sustainable development. The quality of the existing site and the proposed extent of development suggest that a site development brief will be required. The proximity to the River Tweed SAC and the need for assessment and mitigation of potential impacts should be clearly highlighted in the planning brief.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Potentially significant impact on local road network.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Possible bus infrastructure required.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: Would not support the inclusion of the land to the north of the river as it is detached from other development and there would be no real opportunity for integration with any existing or prospective street infrastructure. Flooding potential would also be an issue. There is a Housing SG which for all intents and purposes covers the main body of this site on the south side of the river and the Roads Planning Service has no objections to the land in question here being allocated for mixed use development. This site has the potential to be a key development site given its location between the expanding east side of Galashiels and Tweedbank, including Tweedbank Railway Station and the proposed Central Borders Business Park. It offers ample opportunity for good accessibility and for supporting sustainable transport initiatives. The site is well positioned to take advantage of the comprehensive range of services and transport infrastructure in the vicinity. If this land is to be zoned for development then in light of its strategic significance it will have to be carefully master planned, including the undertaking of comprehensive transport appraisal work. Tweedbank Drive is a distributor road and straightforward vehicular access is required from this road into the main body of the development. There will have to be at least two key vehicular access points into the site and good internal street connectivity will be expected as well as good external connectivity. As well as the opportunity for a vehicular access route, or access routes, from the east, the main options for vehicular access appear to be via the existing railway station road, which will be rerouted if the railway is extended, and via an access off Tweedbank Drive near Essenside Drive. Creation of effective pedestrian/cycle connectivity with both Galashiels and Tweedbank is a prerequisite for the development of the site. Any development at Lowood will need to provide the infrastructure that enables good public transport access and connectivity. Site access must take cognisance of the possible extension of the Borders Railway and of the potential for a replacement for Lowood Bridge as identified in the 'Local Access and Transport Strategy'. While the development of Lowood is not necessarily reliant on a replacement/supplementary bridge for Lowood Bridge, we need to know where any such new bridge is likely to be located and how the road infrastructure will be adjusted to accommodate it so that the access infrastructure for the Lowood development can take cognisance of it as appropriate.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: As per Transport Scotland's previous comments on this site, TS would welcome involvement in the appraisal of this site and the identification of potential impact and any appropriate and deliverable mitigation measures.

### Right of way

On site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Limited

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped with the exception of apparent residential dwellings to the south of the subject site. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Links to the existing path network, non-vehicular links to existing pavements and the railway station required and consideration to the capacity of the railway car park all required for integrated green transport.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: The additional northern section on the opposite side of the river would be a detached pocket, divorced from Gala and clearly not part of Tweedbank. Aside from obvious issues regarding tree impacts, how it would relate to topography, and potential flooding and impacts on the SAC/SSSI, it is suggested development of this site would have a poor relationship to the settlement, and extend urban development in a highly undesirable manner towards Gattonside. The south-eastern portion appears to include woodland and its inclusion in the allocation would ostensibly seem to achieve little, if the landscape framework and character of the site here is to be maintained.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Comments already made by the Economic Development service on this allocation, in terms of response to consultation from master plan consultants.

EDUCATION: Extension or new school may need to be considered.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Galashiels WwTW has sufficient capacity. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SEPA: The sites border the R Tweed along a large part of its length and also the Allan water so care must be taken to protect these sensitive water environments. There also appears to be a pond within the estate which should be protected. Foul water must be connected to the SW foul network, however this site is not currently within the sewered catchment. Potential odour issues from E Langlee landfill site (PPC) and Pavillion exempt composting site (WML exemption).

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	300

### Conclusions

This submission proposes an area of land to the north of the River Tweed and a small area of land at the eastern access of the site in addition to the area of land (MTWEE003) which was allocated for mixed use development through the process of the Housing SG 2017. The additional land proposed, in particular the land to the north of the River Tweed, is inappropriate for a mixed use allocation. This area of land is both detached from the site at Lowood and is an important green corridor both visually and environmentally. It is not considered that the additional land supported can be included. MTWEE002 will, however, remain an allocation within the LDP2.

The following is the summary of MTWEE002 as contained within the assessment for the Housing SG 2017, which otherwise remains relevant:

The submission of a Flood Risk Assessment would be required to assess risk from the River Tweed as well as surface water flooding issues. Co-location issues include potential for odour from E Langlee landfill (PPC) and WML exempt composting site at Pavillion Farm. There is moderate risk to biodiversity and mitigation would be required to ensure no significant adverse effects on the integrity of the River Tweed SAC. Archaeological investigation would be required. This site is outwith the Tweedbank settlement boundary however it benefits from its close proximity to the station at Tweedbank and business and industrial sites as well as a range of services in Galashiels. The site is entirely enclosed by the River Tweed to the north and by the existing settlement of Tweedbank to the south. The development of the site would not result in settlement coalescence. It is considered that the site offers a strategic opportunity due to its immediate proximity to the railway terminus and its location within the Central Borders. Internally there are a number of constraints which would require to be sensitively addressed. Although lacking in designations, the estate shows clear indications of being a 'designed landscape' with an attractive meandering driveway leading from the gatehouse through parkland to the main house and associated buildings. There is also a significant tree and woodland structure on the estate as well as a pond which is a notable feature. These issues will require careful consideration through the process of the aforesaid masterplan and a tree survey. A Transport Appraisal will be required, with the need for at least two key vehicular access points into the site and effective pedestrian/cycle connectivity. Site access must take cognisance of the possible extension of the Borders Railway and of the potential for a replacement for Lowood Bridge as identified in the Local Access and Transport Strategy. Potential contamination would require investigation/mitigation. A full Drainage Impact Assessment would be required. There is currently no capacity at the Waste Water Treatment Works to accommodate development. The site, with its close proximity to the existing business and industrial uses at Tweedbank offers the opportunity for the extension of the Central Borders Business Park. A masterplan for the site is currently being prepared which will address relevant matters in more detail, including taking account of the existing planned landscape and the consideration of appropriate zoning and phasing.

# Yetholm

<b>Site reference</b> BYETH001	<b>Site name</b> Land North West of Deanfield Place	<b>Settlement</b> Yetholm	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Business and Industrial	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> N/A	<b>Ha</b> 1.0	<b>PP status</b> Included
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

There are no initial constraints on the site which would preclude it from being developed.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

SEPA: The OS Map indicates a sufficient height difference between the site and The Stank Burn.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no relevant planning history on the site.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Poor	<b>Access to employment</b> Poor	<b>Access to services</b> Limited	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Low impact. Site appears to be an arable field with broad-leaved trees, hedgerow and young plantation on the boundary. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats (EPS), badger breeding birds

GENERAL COMMENTS: Not a very accessible location but the purpose of the proposal is to provide a local employment opportunity suitable to this location.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Not applicable	<b>Open space</b> Not applicable	<b>Listed buildings</b> Not applicable	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> Not applicable	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> Not applicable
--------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

## Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY: While there are no known archaeological sites within the proposed LDP area, there are records for prehistoric discoveries in the surrounding area. The site is on the edge of drained loch or bog where settlement and other activities may have taken place in prehistory. It is also near the medieval settlement of Yetholm and evidence of contemporary activity may exist. While this potential is low, a requirement for evaluation is likely.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Outwith the settlement boundary and conservation area in a highly visible location on the approach to Yetholm from Kelso without much existing screening.

HES: No comments.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is prominent, particularly for an employment allocation.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No comments.

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comments due to size and location.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: Following the previous comments made by the Roads Planning Team during the pre-Main Issues Report period, the Lead Roads Planning Officer has visited the site with the local Councillor to discuss the road safety concerns associated with the site and to see if there was a possible solution.

On the site visit a safe means of access to the site seemed possible approximately at the midpoint of the frontage with the B6352. Due to the difference in level between the site and the public road a fair extent of engineering work would be required to form the access and to provide junction sight-lines in both directions along the B6352. A footway would be required from the new junction along the B6352 to connect with the main street through the village. This is not possible on the south side of the road due to restrictions at the tight bend at Yetholm Hall and so the footway would have to be in road verge on the north side. This would be challenging in terms of verge width, hedging, and level differences between the verge and the public road. Furthermore, the extent of road verge is not clear and is open to interpretation. That said, with a fair extent of engineering work, it would appear possible to fit in a narrow footway in the verge. The footway and associated kerbing would require to take into account road surface water drainage and the footway would likely need to be retained in part and roadside fencing would be required where the adjacent land sits below the road level.

In summary, although the provision of a junction from the B6352 to serve this site and a footway along the B6352 to connect with the village would be challenging to achieve it does seem possible and if there is strong justification for the site being developed then the Roads Planning Team on balance are able to offer support. The main pedestrian/cycle link with the village would be via housing site RY1B.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

## Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NETWORK MANAGER: Concern for new access onto B6352 on a twisty section of route. Visibility likely to be an issue.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: No comment.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

EDUCATION: No comments.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER (WASTEWATER): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. Please note there are Foul and surface sewers within site. Depending on how many units will determine if further investigation is required.

SCOTTISH WATER (WATER): Robertson WTW has sufficient capacity. Depending on how many units will determine if further investigation is required.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Included	Acceptable	N/A

### Conclusions

Question 4 of the Main Issues Report asked for suggested sites for business and industrial uses within Yetholm. Following discussions with the local Councillor, Roads Planning Team and the Economic Development Team, this site was identified for further consideration.

The Roads Planning Team state, in summary, although the provision of a junction from the B6352 to serve this site and a footway along the B6352 to connect with the village would be challenging to achieve it does seem possible and if there is strong justification for the site being developed then the Roads Planning Team on balance are able to offer support. The main pedestrian/cycle link with the village would be via housing site RY1B.

In relation to landscaping within the site, although the site is visible it is felt that this could be addressed through appropriate landscaping and structure planting. Screening will be required along the eastern site boundary to protect the amenity of adjacent residential properties. Structure planting would also be required to the southern and western boundaries to reinforce the settlement edge.

It should be noted that the local Councillor confirmed there is demand for small and medium business/industrial units within the area for local tradesmen and businesses.

Following further consultation and taking the above points into account it is considered that this is an appropriate site for business and industrial use and therefore the site will be included within the Proposed Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b> RY1B	<b>Site name</b> Deanfield Court	<b>Settlement</b> Yetholm	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 7	<b>Ha</b> 0.6	<b>PP status</b> Retain LDP Site
-------------------------------	-------------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------

---

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b>	<b>SAC</b>	<b>SPA</b>	<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
------------------	------------	------------	-------------	---------------

[Initial assessment summary](#)

---

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b>	<b>Planning history references</b>
--------------------------	------------	----------------------------------------	----------------------	------------------------------------

---

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b>	<b>Access to employment</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b>	<b>Site aspect</b>
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------

[Accessibility and sustainability summary](#)

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
--------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------------

[Local impact and integration summary](#)

---

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
------------	------------	--------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	------------------

[Landscape summary](#)

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

Right of way

TPOs

Contaminated land

Water supply

Sewerage

Gas Supply

Education provision

Planning & infrastructure summary

---

## Overall assessment

**PP status**

**Overall assessment**

**Site capacity**

Retain LDP Site

7

### Conclusions

This site is owned by Scottish Borders Council. Forward Planning spoke to Neil Hastie directly, who advised that they are doing works to the walls along this road at the moment and in discussions with developers, therefore likely prospect that this site will be developed. It is therefore considered that the site should remain an allocation within the LDP.

---

# Northern HMA

## Blyth Bridge

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
<b>SBBLY002</b>	Blyth Bridge Development Boundary Amendment	Blyth Bridge	Rest of Borders	Development Boundary	N/A	1.0	<b>Excluded</b>

### Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
1:200	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

#### Initial assessment summary

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The South West side of the site (next to the Tennis Courts) lies within the SEPA 1 in 200 year fluvial and pluvial flood extent. Dependent on the development and the location of the housing, this may require a Flood Risk Assessment. If there are no properties to be located in the "add-on" area, I would have no objections, as in the response to "ABLYT004".

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourse and the Tath Water. Consideration should be given to any culverts/bridges might may exacerbate flood risk. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at an increased risk of flooding. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.

We note that there is a watercourse immediately adjacent to this site. We therefore recommend that a development requirement is attached to these sites to ensure that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6m wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

A culverted watercourse may run through this site. There may be opportunities to restore the water environment to its natural state by removing the culvert. We therefore recommend that a development requirement is attached to this site requiring a feasibility study including a flood risk assessment to be undertaken prior to development to assess the potential for channel restoration.

### Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	05/00563/OUT - Erection of two dwelling houses - refused on appeal. Site previously submitted for consideration in the 2008 Local Plan - TBL1.

### Accessibility and sustainability assessment

**Access to public transport**

Limited

**Access to employment**

Limited

**Access to services**

Limited

**Wider biodiversity impacts**

Minor

**Site aspect**

South-west

**Accessibility and sustainability summary**

GENERAL COMMENTS: Blyth Bridge is located 11 mins drive time to West Linton, 15 mins drive time to Biggar and approximately 20 mins drive time to Peebles. Travel is required to access many services. The south-easterly part of the site is south-westerly facing.

**Local impact and integration assessment****Conservation area**

Not applicable

**Open space**

Adjacent to site

**Listed buildings**

Not applicable

**Scheduled Monument**

Not applicable

**Ancient woodland inventory**

Not applicable

**Archaeology**

Adjacent to site

**Garden and designed landscape**

On/adjacent to site

**Local impact and integration summary**

The site is located within the SBC Scotstoun Designed Landscape.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Sits adjacent to medieval and post-medieval village core. Archaeology mitigation may be required.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific H&D issues.

**Landscape assessment****NSA**

Not applicable

**SLA**

Not applicable

**Over 200 metres?** **Over 12 degree slope** **Wild Land**

Not applicable

**Landscape summary**

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment.

**Planning and infrastructure assessment****Physical access/road capacity****Near a trunk road?** 

NETWORK MANAGER: More contiguous with existing houses in village (than ABLYT004).

ROADS PLANNING: I am not in favour of the settlement boundary being altered as per the plan. Expanding the settlement in this way does not allow proper integration with the remainder of the settlement, due to the presence of the A701, should the land be considered for housing in the future. PG/DJI

**Right of way**

Not applicable

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

Not applicable

**Water supply**

Yes

**Sewerage**

Limited

**Gas Supply**

No

**Education provision**

Average

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed.

There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Appears disconnected from the rest of the settlement. A very short frontage onto the main road. Perhaps it would be better in townscape terms to have a longer frontage onto the road.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: EN = Future development must include non-vehicular links to the path network and bus stops etc.  
SCOTTISH WATER - WASTE: No current WW network, 2 WWTW but not in this area.  
SCOTTISH WATER - WATER: No real concerns however it would depend on anticipated water consumption.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	N/A

### Conclusions

The site was submitted in response to the MIR public consultation.

If developed it is considered that the site would not integrate well into the settlement. The settlement has limited access to services and facilities. The site is located within the SBC Scotstoun Designed Landscape.

Roads Planning state that they are not in favour of the proposed amendment to the Development Boundary as expanding the settlement in this way does not allow proper integration with the remainder of the settlement, due to the presence of the A701, should the land be considered for housing in the future.

In conclusion, the site will not be taken forward for inclusion within the Proposed Local Development Plan as a Development Boundary extension.

---

<b>Site reference</b> ABLYT004	<b>Site name</b> Blyth Bridge South	<b>Settlement</b> Blyth Bridge	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 3	<b>Ha</b> 0.7	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	----------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Adjacent to site	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site does not lie within the SEPA 1 in 200 year fluvial (river) flood extent. I would have no objections on the grounds of flood risk.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourse. Consideration should be given to any culverts/bridges might may exacerbate flood risk. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at an increased risk of flooding.

Flooding from a major water main serving Edinburgh burst and flooded parts of Blyth Bridge in 2007. Cannot attach a probability to this type of flooding.

We note that there is a watercourse immediately adjacent to this site. We therefore recommend that a development requirement is attached to these sites to ensure that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6m wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

A culverted watercourse may run through this site. There may be opportunities to restore the water environment to its natural state by removing the culvert. We therefore recommend that a development requirement is attached to this site requiring a feasibility study including a flood risk assessment to be undertaken prior to development to assess the potential for channel restoration.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> 05/00563/OUT - Erection of two dwelling houses - refused on appeal. Site previously submitted for consideration in the 2008 Local Plan - TBL1.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Limited	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Limited	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> South-west
----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	----------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

GENERAL COMMENTS: Blyth Bridge is located 11 mins drive time to West Linton, 15 mins drive time to Biggar and approximately 20 mins drive time to Peebles. Travel is required to access many services. The site is located adjacent to a SAC. Southern part of site has a south-westerly aspect. The site is located on the eastern side of the A701, the majority of the settlement including its greenspace is located on the adjacent side.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Adjacent to site

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Adjacent to site

### Garden and designed landscape

On/adjacent to site

### Local impact and integration summary

The site is located within the SBC Scotstoun Designed Landscape.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Sits adjacent to medieval and post-medieval village core. Archaeology mitigation may be required.  
HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific H&D issues.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

Development at this location would appear over dominant in the landscape when approaching the settlement from the north on the A701.

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to size / location.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: New access onto unrestricted A Class road may present road safety implications and lead to increased calls for a speed restriction on the A701. Also increased crossing desire as majority of community and play park etc is on opposite side of A701.

ROADS PLANNING: I am not in favour of this site being zoned for housing. The site lies on the opposite side of the derestricted A701 from the bulk of the settlement. This would make it difficult to integrate the development with the existing residential properties, particularly when considering pedestrian movements. PG/DJI

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed.

There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Appears disconnected from the rest of the settlement. A very short frontage onto the main road. Perhaps it would be better in townscape terms to have a longer frontage onto the road.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: EN = there is a track along the west side of the site that people may use for recreational access. The access authority would seek non-vehicular connectivity to the path network and the main road.

SCOTTISH WATER - WASTE: No current WW network, 2 WWTW but not in this area.

SCOTTISH WATER - WATER: No concerns for 3 units.

SEPA: Water Enviro: This site is immediately adjacent to the Scottish Water foul sewer network and as such foul drainage must connect to the foul sewer. There is an unnamed trib just to the west of the site which must be protected as part of any development.

---

## Overall assessment

### PP status

Excluded

### Overall assessment

Unacceptable

### Site capacity

3

### Conclusions

The site was submitted in response to the MIR public consultation.

If developed it is considered that the site would not integrate well into the settlement. The site appears separate from the rest of the settlement. The settlement has limited access to services and facilities.

The site is located within the SBC Scotstoun Designed Landscape. Development at this location would appear overdominant in the landscape.

Roads Planning have stated that they are not in favour of an allocation at this location as the site lies on the opposite side of the derestricted A701 from the bulk of the settlement. This would make it difficult to integrate the development with the existing residential properties, particularly when considering pedestrian movements.

In conclusion, the site will not be taken forward for inclusion within the Proposed Local Development Plan for housing.

---

<b>Site reference</b> ABLYT005	<b>Site name</b> East of Blyth Farm	<b>Settlement</b> Blyth Bridge	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 6	<b>Ha</b> 1.1	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	----------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site does not lie within the SEPA 1 in 200 year fluvial (river) flood extent. I would have no objections on the grounds of flood risk.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourses. Consideration should be given to any culverts/bridges might may exacerbate flood risk. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at an increased risk of flooding.

Flooding from a major water main serving Edinburgh burst and flooded parts of Blyth Bridge in 2007. Cannot attach a probability to this type of flooding.

We note that there is a watercourse immediately adjacent to this site. We therefore recommend that a development requirement is attached to these sites to ensure that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6m wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

A culverted watercourse may run through this site. There may be opportunities to restore the water environment to its natural state by removing the culvert. We therefore recommend that a development requirement is attached to this site requiring a feasibility study including a flood risk assessment to be undertaken prior to development to assess the potential for channel restoration.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> Site previously submitted alongside the adjacent farm for inclusion in the Development Boundary as part of the Local Plan Amendment process.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Limited	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Limited	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> South
----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	-----------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

GENERAL COMMENTS: Blyth Bridge is located 11 mins drive time to West Linton, 15 mins drive time to Biggar and approximately 20 mins drive time to Peebles. Travel is required to access many services. The site is mainly southerly facing.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Adjacent to site

### Archaeology

Adjacent to site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY: Sits adjacent to medieval and post-medieval farmstead. Archaeology mitigation may be required.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific H&D issues.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

Potential to strengthen boundary features.

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to size / location.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: More contiguous with existing houses in village (than ABLYT004).

ROADS PLANNING: The minor public road leading to the site consists of a shared road surface (no footways). While this is generally acceptable for residential traffic, it has its limitations here in that as well as serving the houses fronting onto the road, the road also serves a separate residential cul-de-sac and Blyth Farm. Furthermore, the junction onto the A701 suffers from sub-standard driver visibility caused by the proximity of the mature roadside beech hedge to the road.

In principle I am not opposed to a limited amount of development so long as junction visibility at the A701 is improved and the existing road infrastructure is extended into the site.  
PG/DJI

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed.

There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: A logical expansion. Immediately adjacent to a working dairy farm which has expanded its building stock recently.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: EN = the road link to core path167 and rights of way BT33/34 is adjacent to this site. The access authority would seek non-vehicular connectivity to the path network and the main road.

SCOTTISH WATER - WASTE: WWTW serving Smiddyfield has no capacity – would need growth.

SCOTTISH WATER - WATER: No concerns.

There are 2 x 33" Cast Iron strategic raw water mains running directly through this site. The mains are not operational and have been retained for potential future strategic options. This asset will require substantial access distances of a minimum of 10 metres either side of this main. This access distance of 20 metres total sanitised strip must remain clear of structures, property, gardens, roads etc. The stand-off distance, required for health and safety in event of failure of the main, may exceed this distance. Any construction work within this Access Distance zone must comply with Scottish Water's Distribution

Operational Maintenance Strategy (DOMS) procedures with design, Risk Assessment Method Statement (RAMS) and contingency measures submitted alongside DOMS application at least two weeks prior to activity commencing on site. Early discussion with Scottish Water is HIGHLY advised before any land transactions take place due to the location of these assets, which may make any development financially unviable. We would recommend that this site not be developed. This is not an objection, but an assessment.

SEPA: Co-Location Issue: The site is right next door to a large (and expanding dairy) farm which may give rise to issues in relation to odour/nuisance which would be dealt with by Environmental Health. The 2 land uses may therefore be incompatible given the close proximity.

Water Environ: This site is immediately adjacent to the Scottish Water foul sewer network and as such foul drainage must connect to the foul sewer. There is an unnamed trib just to the south of the site which must be protected as part of any development.

---

## Overall assessment

### PP status

Excluded

### Overall assessment

Doubtful

### Site capacity

6

### Conclusions

The site was submitted in response to the MIR public consultation.

The settlement has limited access to services and facilities. The site fits well within the settlement. Potential co-location issue - the site is adjacent to a large (and expanding dairy) farm.

Little in the way of natural boundary features, dry stone boundary wall along north east. Potential to strengthen boundary features.

Roads Planning state that they are not opposed to a limited amount of development so long as junction visibility at the A701 is improved and the existing road infrastructure is extended into the site.

In conclusion, the site will not be taken forward for inclusion within the Proposed Local Development Plan for housing. However, development of the site could be tested under the Council's Housing in the Countryside Policy.

---

# Broughton

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
ABROU002	South west of Dreva Road	Broughton	Rest of Borders	Housing	25	3.2	Excluded

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
1:200	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

An area of flood risk (1:200) is shown along the western boundary of the site.

SEPA: Should the agreed layout or development type differ from what was previously agreed we would require an updated FRA which considers our previous responses. The FRA should assess the risk from the small watercourses and Broughton Burn which flow through and adjacent to the site. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site which may exacerbate flood risk. Due to steep topography adjacent/ through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and the proposed development is not affected by surface runoff. SEPA require a flood risk assessment (FRA) to be included as a site specific developer requirement prior to any development occurring on the site, and that the findings are used to inform the scale, layout and form of development. Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. The site appears to run alongside the Broughton burn and also another burn is shown to run through the site. These should be protected and enhanced as part of any development. No watercourses should be culverted for land gain as part of this development. SEPA request a developer requirement attached to the site to ensure that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is within the fluvial 1 in 200 year flood extents on the south western boundary. The Broughton Burn runs adjacent to this site and there are shown to be drains/ditches running through the site. Therefore, I would require a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) be undertaken for this site.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	The site benefits from an extant planning consent on site from 1970's. Application 17/00555/FUL in system for renewal of previous consent. Earlier consent now lapsed. 12/01068/PPP - Residential development including affordable housing and associated infrastructure - Application Refused, but then approved at appeal. A site at this location was included in the Finalised Local Plan 2005 and was recommended for removal by Inquiry Reporter. The Reporter who considered objections into the Proposed LDP1, recommended inclusion of the site within the Development Boundary without an allocation.

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

**Access to public transport**

Limited

**Access to employment**

Limited

**Access to services**

Limited

**Wider biodiversity impacts**

Major

**Site aspect**

South-west

**Accessibility and sustainability summary**

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response to date. However, the Ecology Officer responded when the site was submitted as part of the LDP and offered the following comments, outlined below. Biodiversity risk is major. (SAC impacts - but note mitigation likely see 12/01068/PPP). Adjacent to Broughton burn (River Tweed SAC). Identified in biological records as Flood Plain fen (Borders wetland inventory) Emma Lamb's meadow NT113363. Phase 1 habitat (aerial interpretation) semi-improved acid grassland (B1.1). Field boundaries: Mature trees, garden ground, scrub, burn. Mitigation: Ensure no significant adverse effects on Broughton burn (River Tweed SAC), avoid hydrological floodplain. Compensate for loss of wetland habitat and provide habitat buffer to existing sites. Site clearance outside breeding bird season.

Flood Risk (Fluvial 1 in 200): Yes (part)

GENERAL COMMENTS: Broughton is located 30 mins drive time to Peebles and approximately 15 mins drive time to Biggar. The site is located adjacent to a SAC and is partially within an area of floodrisk. Employment land safeguarded in settlement, however there are limited services now available in Broughton.

**Local impact and integration assessment****Conservation area**

Not applicable

**Open space**

Adjacent to site

**Listed buildings**

Not applicable

**Scheduled Monument**

Not applicable

**Ancient woodland inventory**

Not applicable

**Archaeology**

Adjacent to site

**Garden and designed landscape**

Not applicable

**Local impact and integration summary**

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: No known issues.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific comment.

**Landscape assessment****NSA**

On/adjacent to site

**SLA**

Not applicable

**Over 200 metres?** **Over 12 degree slope** **Wild Land**

Not applicable

**Landscape summary**

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: SNH provided the following response; 'From our response of 3rd August 2016, we note that the Reporter recommended a change to the settlement boundary to take account of an approved proposal. On that basis, we have no comment to make'. This previous comment was made in relation to the Housing SG.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No response received.

To the north east of the site is allocated housing site TB200 which once developed along side this site ABROU002 will result in a more cohesive settlement.

**Planning and infrastructure assessment****Physical access/road capacity**

NETWORK MANAGER: Initial access off A701 is known to cause difficulties with HGVs. Would need to extend 30 mph limit.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No issues raised.

**Near a trunk road?**

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No issues raised.

ROADS PLANNING: I am not opposed to this site being developed. Vehicular access to this site is physically possible from Hawdene, Smithy Croft and Dreva Road and should ideally be taken from at least two of these points, one of them being from Dreva Road. Upgrades to Dreva Road and improvements to the junction of Dreva Road and the A701 will be required. Pedestrian/cycle linkage to Smithy Croft and the playing fields/school will be required. The design of any street connectivity through the site between Dreva Road and the A701 will have to be such that a 'rat run' is not created and the development of the site needs to incorporate a street frontage on Dreva Road. A Transport Statement will be required for this site.

#### Right of way

Not applicable

#### TPOs

Not applicable

#### Contaminated land

Not applicable

#### Water supply

Yes

#### Sewerage

Yes

#### Gas Supply

No

#### Education provision

Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

Despite an extant planning approval dating back from the 1970's, and a more recent approval from April 2014 granted on appeal and which is now lapsed, the site has continually failed to come forward for development. It is noted that a new application has been submitted to extend the consent - 17/00555/FUL, that application has been approved and that consent will not lapse on 01 Jun 2021 if not commenced. It should also be noted that the site is currently included within the Housing Land Audit (due to the extant consent from the 1970's), and therefore allocation of the site will not assist in meeting the SESplan housing requirement. In addition, the settlement already has two allocated Housing sites.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: App 17/00555/FUL at section 75 stage. That was a section 42 application relating to a time condition imposed by a Reporter.

HOUSING STRATEGY: No issues raised.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. Please note there is a Rising sewer main within site, sewers within North of the site also. Sufficient capacity in the network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): RoseberryWTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: No issues raised.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No Issues.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

#### PP status

Excluded

#### Overall assessment

Doubtful

#### Site capacity

25

### Conclusions

The site was submitted for consideration as a 'Call for Site'. The same site was recently considered as part of the Housing SG and was not taken forward. If developed, the site would integrate well into the settlement. It is noted that the site is already included within the Housing Land Audit (HLA) and had a recent consent for 25 units (now lapsed). Nevertheless, there is an extant planning consent from the 1970's. It should also be noted that this site remains within the Broughton Development Boundary. The most recent 2019 Housing Land Audit shows that there are 48 units within the established housing land supply, over 4 large sites within Broughton. It is considered that the current allocations and extant planning consent are sufficient for the LDP2 plan period. In conclusion, the site will not be taken forward for inclusion within the Proposed Local Development Plan for housing.

---

<b>Site reference</b> ABROU003	<b>Site name</b> Old Kirkyard Field	<b>Settlement</b> Broughton	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 10	<b>Ha</b> 2.3	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	----------------------------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

SEPA: Due to steep topography adjacent/ through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and the proposed development is not affected by surface runoff. Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> N/A
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Limited	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Limited	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: There is a low biodiversity risk. The site contains improved pasture with trees and hedgerow and garden ground on the boundary. Protect trees and boundary features and mitigation for protected species, including breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Broughton is located 30 mins drive time to Peebles and approximately 15 mins drive time to Biggar. Employment land safeguarded in settlement, however there are limited services now available in Broughton.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Not applicable	<b>Open space</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Listed buildings</b> Not applicable	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> On/adjacent to site	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> Not applicable
--------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

## Local impact and integration summary

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Setting of SM2779 Broughton Church. The proposed development site does not raise issues of national significance. This site is sufficiently separated from the monument that the development is not likely to impact on its setting and sense of place.

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: Low archaeological potential, but slightly greater nearer the Kirk where older churchyard may exist. Some mitigation may be needed. The setting of the Scheduled Kirk and churchyard must be taken into account in a development design per SPP and the Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting guidance.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific comment.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

On/adjacent to site

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: Seek reasonable alternative. The site is likely to present significant and/ or adverse impacts on the natural heritage. We advise that reasonable alternatives may present less significant impacts and therefore they should be considered in advance of this site. Our advice on this site is based on prior knowledge and desktop assessment using GIS and streetview. We may provide further advice based on a site visit if the potential allocation is carried forward. This site is within the Upper Tweeddale NSA. We have not yet analysed this site in the field but note that it is on fairly open and elevated ground. We have concerns that development could impact on the special qualities of the NSA and also erode the well-defined setting and landscape character of the village and its environs. We therefore withhold our position on this site. If it was to be taken forward as an allocation a site brief should be prepared in advance to illustrate how the site could mitigate adverse impacts on landscape and deliver the highest standards of siting and design, which we consider is necessary for development within the NSA.

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: Site partially contained by hedgerow and mature trees along B7016 which should be retained and enhanced with additional tree planting along hedgerow. This in addition to broad woodland belt to S W corner and along western boundary would help to contain development in the views. Alterations to road geometry of B7016 which would create unacceptable changes to the character of the lane, and should be afforded protection in this sensitive landscape of the NSA.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: May impact on location of 30 mph limit. Increased traffic volume on sub-standard junction (visibility necessitates STOP rather than Give way) with A701.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comment.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No issues raised.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I have no objections in principle to this site being allocated for housing. The existing infrastructure will have to be extended to encompass the site, such as footway, lighting, speed limit etc. A strong street frontage along the B7016 should be encouraged. A minimum of two access points should be taken from the B7016 with internal connectivity at the forefront of the design approach. A pedestrian/cycle link should be provided to the road serving the church. It should be noted that the requirement to extend the footway may impact on a couple of mature trees along the boundary of the site. Another constraint is the width of the verge, in particular the section along the length of the paddock behind "The Towers".

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Average

## Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Appears a significant expansion which doesn't look like it relates well to the existing pattern of development. Not related to a defensible boundary. Would be highly visible approaching from the west. NSA.

HOUSING STRATEGY: No issues raised.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. Please note there are Sewers slightly within site at south east corner. Sufficient capacity in the network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Roseberry WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Pedestrian access on to RoW BT57 (CP176) from the site and possible contributions to upgrading BT57/CP176.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raised any issues.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No Issues.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Doubtful	10

### Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the 'Call for Sites' process for consideration, for housing. The site has limited access to public transport, services and employment.

SNH raised issues regarding the location of the site within the National Scenic Area, but did not make a formal objection. The Landscape Officer did not make any formal objection to the proposal and advised that the site is partially contained by hedgerow and mature trees along the B7016, which should be retained and enhanced with additional tree planting along the hedgerow. This in addition to broad woodland belt to the south west corner and along the western boundary would help to contain development in the views.

It should be noted that there are already 2 allocated housing sites within Broughton and an extant planning consent from the 1970's. The most recent 2019 Housing Land Audit shows that there are 48 units within the established housing land supply, over 4 large sites within Broughton. It is considered that the current allocations and extant planning consent are sufficient for the LDP2 plan period. In conclusion, the site will not be taken forward for inclusion within the Proposed Local Development Plan for housing.

<b>Site reference</b> ABROU004	<b>Site name</b> Village Park Site	<b>Settlement</b> Broughton	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 10	<b>Ha</b> 2.4	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Adjacent to site	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from Broughton Burn/ Biggar Burn. Consideration will need to be given to any culverts/ bridges which may exacerbate flood risk. Due to steep topography adjacent/ through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and the proposed development is not affected by surface runoff.

SEPA require a flood risk assessment (FRA) to be included as a site specific developer requirement prior to any development occurring on the site, and that the findings are used to inform the scale, layout and form of development.

Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> It should be noted that currently the Local Development Plan identifies this area as the preferred area for future expansion within the settlement profile text.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Limited	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Limited	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Low. Site contains improved pastures with trees and hedgerow and garden ground on boundary. Protect trees and boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Broughton is located 30 mins drive time to Peebles and approximately 15 mins drive time to Biggar. Employment land safeguarded in settlement, however there are limited services now available in Broughton.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Adjacent to site

### Scheduled Monument

Adjacent to site

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Adjacent to site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There are no known archaeological implications.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific comment.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any objections.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

On/adjacent to site

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: Seek reasonable alternative. The site is likely to present significant and/or adverse impacts on the natural heritage. We advise that reasonable alternatives may present less significant impacts and therefore they should be considered in advance of this site. Our advice on this site is based on prior knowledge and desktop assessment using GIS and streetview. We may provide further advice based on a site visit if the potential allocation is carried forward. This site is within the Upper Tweeddale NSA. We have not yet analysed this site in the field but note that it is on fairly open and elevated ground. We have concerns that development could impact on the special qualities of the NSA and also erode the well-defined setting and landscape character of the village and its environs. SNH therefore withholds our position on this site. If it was to be taken forward as an allocation we would advise that a site brief should be prepared in advance to illustrate how the site could mitigate adverse impacts on landscape and deliver the highest standards of siting and design, which we consider is necessary for development within the NSA.

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: Scales of these sites ABROU004/3 appear disproportionate with scale of village development to date. If adopted I suggest that the sites should be developed in smaller pockets/phases rather than as a large single block. Village development currently characterised by narrow strip and smaller 'pockets' of housing following the roads and watercourses nestling in the valley amongst mature trees.

Hedgerow along B7016 and mature trees on N boundary should be retained and enhanced and a broad woodland belt to S and W of site in addition to tree and hedge planting within the site would be essential to help contain this development.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: May impact on location of 30 mph limit. Increased traffic volume on sub-standard junction (visibility necessitates STOP rather than Give way) with A701.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No issues raised.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No issues raised.

ROADS PLANNING: I have no objections in principle to this site being allocated for housing. The existing infrastructure will have to be extended to encompass the site, such as footway, lighting, speed limit etc. It should be noted that the requirement to extend the footway, may impact on a couple of mature trees along the boundary of the site. A strong street frontage along the B7016 should be encouraged. A minimum of two access points should be taken from the B7016 with internal connectivity at the forefront of the design approach. Any site layout must allow for future external connectivity. The possibility for a pedestrian/cycle link onto the A701 adjacent to the property known as "Lendal" should be investigated, but it is noted the land involved lies outwith the site boundary.

**Right of way**

Not applicable

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

Not applicable

**Water supply**

Yes

**Sewerage**

Yes

**Gas Supply**

No

**Education provision**

Average

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Appears a significant expansion which doesn't look like it relates well to the existing pattern of development. Not related to a defensible boundary. Would be highly visible approaching from the west. NSA.

HOUSING STRATEGY: No concerns raised.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. Sufficient capacity in the network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): RoseberryWTW has sufficient capacity. Please note there is a Raw water main running through the site. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: An area of the site appears to have been developed with a large greenhouse which may have been in commercial use. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Safe route for non-vehicular access would be strongly advised from this site to connect to existing pavements/footpaths.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No Issues.

NHS: No response received.

**Overall assessment****PP status**

Excluded

**Overall assessment**

Doubtful

**Site capacity**

10

**Conclusions**

The site was submitted as part of the 'Call for Sites' process for consideration, for housing. The site has limited access to public transport, services and employment.

SNH raised issues regarding the location of the site within the National Scenic Area, but did not make a formal objection. However the Landscape Officer advised that if the site is allocated, sites should be developed in smaller pockets/phases rather than as a large single block. Furthermore, the existing hedgerow and mature trees should be retained and enhanced and additional tree/hedge planting would be essential to help contain this development.

It should be noted that there are already 2 allocated housing sites within Broughton and an extant planning consent from the 1970's. The most recent 2019 Housing Land Audit shows that there are 48 units within the established housing land supply, over 4 large sites within Broughton. It is considered that the current allocations and extant planning consent are sufficient for the LDP2 plan period. In conclusion, the site will not be taken forward for inclusion within the Proposed Local Development Plan for housing.

<b>Site reference</b> ABROU005	<b>Site name</b> Land adjacent to Broughton Cemetery	<b>Settlement</b> Broughton	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 12	<b>Ha</b> 0.9	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Adjacent to site	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Broughton Burn. Consideration will need to be given to any culverts/ bridges which may exacerbate flood risk. Site may be constrained due to flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within/ adjacent to site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Also, due to steep topography adjacent/ through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and the proposed development is not affected by surface runoff.

SEPA require a flood risk assessment (FRA) to be included as a site specific developer requirement prior to any development occurring on the site, and that the findings are used to inform the scale, layout and form of development.

Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: A small portion on the north-east side lies within the fluvial 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk but would encourage the housing to be built away from the North East side of the site.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> N/A
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Limited	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Limited	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Moderate biodiversity impact. Site contains improved pasture with trees & hedgerow and garden ground on boundary. Potential connectivity with River Tweed SAC- 10m to east across road. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC (Broughton water). Protect trees and boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Broughton is located 30 mins drive time to Peebles and approximately 15 mins drive time to Biggar. Employment land safeguarded in settlement, however there are limited services now available in Broughton.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Adjacent to site

### Listed buildings

Adjacent to site

### Scheduled Monument

Adjacent to site

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On/adjacent to site

### Garden and designed landscape

Adjacent to site

### Local impact and integration summary

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Setting of SM2779 Broughton Church: Development immediately adjacent to the east wall of the churchyard may raise issues of national significance in relation to the setting of the monument. Consideration should be given to design, massing and density to retain the sense of place.

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: This is likely the site of the medieval village. There is a moderate to high archaeological potential. If significant archaeology exists it could prevent development. Mitigation is likely.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: The site lies adjacent to the category B listed Old Broughton Parish Church. Care needed in any development to respect the scale and setting of the remains of the church.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

On/adjacent to site

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: Seek reasonable alternative. The site could present significant and/or adverse impacts on the natural heritage. We advise that reasonable alternatives may present less significant impacts and therefore they should be considered in advance of this site. Our advice on this site is based on prior knowledge and desktop assessment using GIS and streetview. We may provide further advice based on a site visit if the potential allocation is carried forward. This site is within the Upper Tweeddale NSA. We have not yet analysed this site in the field but note its location open location on rolling ground north of the existing settlement. We would have concerns that development could impact on the special qualities of the NSA and also erode the well-defined setting and landscape character of the village and its environs.

SNH therefore withholds our position on this site. If it was to be taken forward as an allocation we would advise that a site brief should be prepared in advance to illustrate how the site could mitigate adverse impacts on landscape and deliver the highest standards of siting and design, which we consider is necessary for development within the NSA.

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: Site fairly well contained with mitigating features. Visual receptors limited. Low impact on NSA. Links well with existing pattern of development along the lower valley sides. Smaller properties within the site positioned at a distance from the Old parish Church. Woodland block to contain site from south and connect to rural landscape.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: May impact on location of 30 mph limit. Increased traffic volume on sub-standard junction (visibility necessitates STOP rather than Give way) with A701. Or additional junction onto A701.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Possible Bus stop infrastructure required.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns.

ROADS PLANNING: I am not in favour of this site being allocated for housing as I do not feel it is a logical expansion to the settlement. The allocation of this site would expand the settlement boundary in linear nature along the A701, stretching it beyond the existing 30mph boundary. An objective of any principal road is to effectively contain the speed restrictions for settlements and allow the safe and expeditious movement of longer distance traffic.

**Right of way**

Adjacent to site

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

Not applicable

**Water supply**

Yes

**Sewerage**

Yes

**Gas Supply**

No

**Education provision**

Average

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Development pattern would be different from that immediately to the south. That would give it a feeling of isolation from the rest of the settlement. Extremely visible location approaching from the north. No defensible boundary to the north west. Access would likely be from the A701. Impact on the setting of the scheduled monument. NSA.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. Sufficient capacity in the network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): RoseberryWTW has sufficient capacity. Please note there is a Raw water main running through the site. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Safe route for non-vehicular access would be strongly advised from this site to connect to existing pavements/footpaths.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

**Overall assessment****PP status**

Excluded

**Overall assessment**

Unacceptable

**Site capacity**

12

**Conclusions**

The site was submitted as part of the 'Call for Sites' process for consideration, for housing. It should be noted that there are already 2 allocated housing sites within Broughton and an extant planning consent from the 1970's. The site has limited access to public transport, services and employment.

Further to a site assessment, the Roads Planning Officer has advised that they cannot support the proposal, for the following reasons, 'The allocation of this site would expand the settlement boundary in linear nature along the A701, stretching it beyond the existing 30mph. An objective of any principal road is to effectively contain the speed restrictions for settlements and allow the safe and expeditious movement of longer distance traffic'.

The site is immediately adjacent to the east wall of the churchyard, which Historic Environment Scotland state may raise issues of national significance, in relation to the setting of the monument. The Archaeology Officer also raised concerns that this is likely the site of a medieval village, with moderate to high archaeological potential. Furthermore, the site lies adjacent to the Category B listed building 'Old Broughton Parish Church' and care would be needed in any development, to respect the scale and setting of the remains of the Church.

In conclusion, taking into consideration the objection raised from the Roads Officer and the above constraints, the site will not be included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

# Cardrona

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
ACARD001	South of B7062	Cardrona	Western	Housing	25	3.5	Excluded

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

SEPA: Site is sufficiently elevated above the River Tweed. However, due to steep topography through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff. Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. I would, however, ask that due to the size of the development that surface water flooding is considered and it is ensured that any water would be routed around the housing.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	<p>A site at this location (albeit a larger site) was previously considered by the LP Reporter who stated that development should not extend south of the B road. The Reporter also commented that "The new building frontage would be obvious to those passing through on this road, as it would form what would be essentially ribbon development ... far from improving the character of the road, I consider that this would be very unwelcome and out of character on what is essentially a very scenic rural road, not a housing access." The development of the site is likely to result in a negative impact on the built environment.</p> <p>The same site (ACARD001) was considered as part of the Housing SG.</p>

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Good	Good	Good	Moderate	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response received.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located on the edge of Cardrona where there is good access to services and facilities and employment land at Innerleithen and Peebles. There is also good access to regular bus services. It should be noted that no response has been received to date from the Ecology Officer.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	On/adjacent to site

### Local impact and integration summary

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: No issues raised.

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: This is an area of moderate archaeological potential. Some assessment may be needed.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: The site lies on the north facing slope above the public road; the Cardrona Village development being on the flatter haughland. Development on this proposed site will impact on the setting of the category C listed former farm house and converted outbuildings.

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
Not applicable	On/adjacent to site			Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: This is an elevated site, particularly when viewed in relation to the existing settlement at Cardrona. Development here would also be visible in longer views from the A72. The indicative capacity suggests low density development, with a likely density of 7.14 dwellings per hectare if the whole of the site was used. This is lower than the density of the existing settlement (12 dwellings per hectare) and our advice is that landscape impacts could be lessened by designing for a higher density development on the lower slopes of the site.

LANDSCAPE OFFICER: No response received.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

**Near a trunk road?**

NETWORK MANAGER: Significant change to village with first properties on south side of B7062; a narrow but quite well used road. Any junction will be on inside of bend which limits visibility. May impact on existing 30 mph limit.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comment.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No issues raised.

ROADS PLANNING: I have no objections in principle to this land being zoned for development. Direct vehicular access to the B7062 is acceptable for the westerly portion of the site, but, in terms of junction visibility and level constraints, no access is possible to the B7062 east of The Court/Mains Farm Steading junction. The B7062 carriageway will have to have a minimum width of 6m with a roadside footway, lighting and 30 mph speed limit. Proper integration with the existing settlement is required and so a street feel to the B7062 needs to be created. A Transport Statement will be required.

<b>Right of way</b>	<b>TPOs</b>	<b>Contaminated land</b>	<b>Water supply</b>	<b>Sewerage</b>	<b>Gas Supply</b>	<b>Education provision</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Limited	Limited	Limited	Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed.

There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Safe route for non-vehicular access would be strongly advised from this site to the former station and Tweed Valley Railway Path.

HOUSING STRATEGY: No issues raised.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Site slopes up steeply from the road and is very much part of the landscaped setting of Cardrona. I think it would detract from the good focal point at the roundabout and around the shop.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No issues raised.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No Issues.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

### PP status

Excluded

### Overall assessment

Unacceptable

### Site capacity

25

## Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the 'Call for Sites' process for consideration, for housing. The site has good access to public transport, services and employment.

The site is separated from the rest of the settlement of Cardrona by the B7062. A site at this location (albeit a larger site) was previously considered by the Local Plan Reporter, who stated that development should not extend south of the B road. The Reporter also commented that "The new building frontage would be obvious to those passing through on this road, as it would form what would be essentially ribbon development ... far from improving the character of the road, I consider that this would be very unwelcome and out of character on what is essentially a very scenic rural road, not a housing access."

It is noted that this site (ACARD001) was considered as part of the Housing SG and was not included. The same site is currently under consideration and it is noted the applicant has submitted a Site Appraisal/Development Proposal. However, the proposal remains the same as the Housing SG proposal.

It is also noted that at this time, Cardrona already benefits from an undeveloped mixed use allocation, site MCARD006 for 25 units. Therefore, in conclusion, the site will not be included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b> ACARD002	<b>Site name</b> West of B7062	<b>Settlement</b> Cardrona	<b>SDA</b> Western	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 75	<b>Ha</b> 7.3	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site does not lie within the SEPA 1 in 200 year fluvial (river) or pluvial (surface water). I would have no objections on the grounds of flood risk. Due to the size of the site and number of units proposed SuDS should be incorporated into the development.

SEPA: Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at an increased risk of flooding. Extensive flooding to Cardrona occurred in 2005 and 2009.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> Early applications relating to the Golf Course Village Development.  A site at this location (albeit a larger site) was previously considered by the LP Reporter who stated that development should not extend south of the B road. The Reporter also commented that "The new building frontage would be obvious to those passing through on this road, as it would form what would be essentially ribbon development ... far from improving the character of the road, I consider that this would be very unwelcome and out of character on what is essentially a very scenic rural road, not a housing access." The development of the site is likely to result in a negative impact on the built environment.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located on the edge of Cardrona where there is good access to services and facilities and employment land at Innerleithen and Peebles. There is also good access to regular bus services. Proximity of River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Trees on boundary.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On site

### Garden and designed landscape

On/adjacent to site

### Local impact and integration summary

The site is located within the Cardrona Designed Landscape as surveyed by Peter McGowan.

ARCHAEOLOGY: HER records possible prehistoric enclosure in the site. Archaeology mitigation will be required.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Significant expansion of scale of Cardrona "new" village up from the valley floor. Potential adverse impacts of "urbanisation" of Tweed Valley with visibility from the main Gala – Peebles road and the character of the "back road" will change significantly. There may be some limited potential for some development on the very lower slope.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

On/adjacent to site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: We have previously commented on this site in our response of 15 August 2018:

"This is an elevated site, particularly when viewed in relation to the existing settlement at Cardrona. Development here would also be visible in longer views from the A72. The indicative capacity suggests low density development, with a likely density of 7.14 dwellings per hectare if the whole of the site was used. This is lower than the density of the existing settlement (~12 dwellings per hectare) and our advice is that landscape impacts could be lessened by designing for a higher density development on the lower slopes of the site."

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Existing settlement is contained on north and east side of B7062. This would introduce pedestrian desire lines across that road and accesses off it. A reduced speed limit on the B7062 would be a likely requirement.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Possible requirement for bus turning circle and/or bus stop infrastructure at eastern end of site.

ROADS PLANNING: I have no objections in principle to this land being zoned for development. Direct vehicular access to the B7062 is acceptable in a number of locations. Direct frontage access for some properties should be included in order to help create a street presence.

The B7062 carriageway will have to have a minimum width of 6m with roadside footways, lighting and a 30 mph speed limit. Proper integration with the existing settlement is required and so a street feel to the B7062 needs to be created.

A Transport Assessment will be required in due course for this level of development.

PG/DJI

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Limited

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

Limited

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed.

There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: CM - Ground steeply rises, shouldn't be encouraging development on this side of B Road. Ethylene Pipeline problems. SLA slopes encroachment and Cardrona sprawl.

Better on flat land at Horsbrugh Straight.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: CC- A huge addition to the village, potentially poorly related to it in terms of landscape fit and connectivity. The site is large enough to provide scope for creating a suitable layout, though it would create a substantial precedent for developing on this side of the B7062. I am not sure how this would relate as part of Cardrona given its general sense of detachment beyond the road. This seems at odds with the landscape setting of the village. An ethylene pipeline may affect the scope of development.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: EN = The access authority would seek non-vehicular connectivity to the path network and the main road; specifically the multi-use core path 180 from Peebles to Walkerburn and core path 160 through Cardrona Forest. These links are important in terms of facilitating access to the existing path network and mitigating against irresponsible access through farmland.

SCOTTISH WATER - WASTE: High pressure gas main through middle of site, growth project started but does not include this field or housing.

SCOTTISH WATER - WATER: There is a current growth Project for Innerleithen WTW. Water Impact Assessment probably required.

SEPA: Water Enviro: This site is adjacent to the public foul sewer network and hence foul water must connect to the public foul sewer. This is likely to require an upgrade to Cardrona stw given the number of houses proposed.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	75

### Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the MIR public consultation. The site has good access to public transport, services and employment.

This site is unacceptable as it is constrained in terms of archaeology and landscape. Cardrona has already seen substantial residential development in recent years. A site at this location was previously considered by the Local Plan Reporter who considered the objections into the Finalised Local Plan 2005 and who stated that development should not extend south of the B road. The Reporter also commented that "The new building frontage would be obvious to those passing through on this road, as it would form what would be essentially ribbon development ... far from improving the character of the road, I consider that this would be very unwelcome and out of character on what is essentially a very scenic rural road, not a housing access."

It is also noted that at this time, Cardrona already benefits from an undeveloped mixed use allocation, site MCARD006 for 25 units.

Therefore, in conclusion the site will not be included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b> ACARD003	<b>Site name</b> West of Cardrona	<b>Settlement</b> Cardrona	<b>SDA</b> Western	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 100	<b>Ha</b> 5.2	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Adjacent to site	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site does not lie within the SEPA 1 in 200 year fluvial (river) or pluvial (surface water) flood extent. I would have no objections on the grounds of flood risk. Due to the size of the site and number of units proposed. SuDS should be incorporated into the development.

SEPA: Site is sufficiently elevated above the River Tweed. Setting a buffer between lowest part of site and development will mitigate any residual fluvial flood risk. However, due to steep topography through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff.

Extensive flooding to Cardrona occurred in 2005 and 2009.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> Early applications relating to the Golf Course Village Development.  A site at this location (albeit a larger site) was previously considered by the LP Reporter who stated that development should not extend south of the B road. The Reporter also commented that "The new building frontage would be obvious to those passing through on this road, as it would form what would be essentially ribbon development ... far from improving the character of the road, I consider that this would be very unwelcome and out of character on what is essentially a very scenic rural road, not a housing access." The development of the site is likely to result in a negative impact on the built environment.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located on the edge of Cardrona where there is good access to services and facilities and employment land at Innerleithen and Peebles. Proximity of River Tweed SAC/SSSI. There is also good access to regular bus services.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Adjacent to site

### Scheduled Monument

Adjacent to site

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On/adjacent to site

### Garden and designed landscape

On/adjacent to site

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY: HER records possible prehistoric enclosure in the site. Northern section near a Scheduled standing stone. Archaeology mitigation will be required.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Significant expansion of scale of Cardrona "new" village up from the valley floor. Potential adverse impacts of "urbanisation" of Tweed Valley although with limited visibility from the main Gala –Peebles road but the character of the "back road" will change significantly. There may be some limited potential for some development on the very lower slope.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

On/adjacent to site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: We have previously commented on this site in our response of 15 August 2018:

"This is an elevated site, particularly when viewed in relation to the existing settlement at Cardrona. Development here would also be visible in longer views from the A72. The indicative capacity suggests low density development, with a likely density of 7.14 dwellings per hectare if the whole of the site was used. This is lower than the density of the existing settlement (~12 dwellings per hectare) and our advice is that landscape impacts could be lessened by designing for a higher density development on the lower slopes of the site."

ACARD003 aligns with our previous advice.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: As with ACARD002, this is a significant change to the existing village with the introduction of the first properties on south side of B7062; a narrow but quite well used road. Any junction will be on inside of bend which limits visibility. A reduced speed limit on the B7062 would be a likely requirement.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Possible requirement for bus turning circle and/or bus stop infrastructure at eastern end of site.

ROADS PLANNING: I have no objections in principle to this land being zoned for development. Direct vehicular access to the B7062 is acceptable in a number of locations. Direct frontage access for some properties should be included in order to help create a street presence.

The B7062 carriageway will have to have a minimum width of 6m with roadside footways, lighting and a 30 mph speed limit. Proper integration with the existing settlement is required and so a street feel to the B7062 needs to be created.

A Transport Assessment will be a requirement in due course should this site be allocated for Development.

PG/DJI

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Limited

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

Limited

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed.

There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: CM - Ground steeply rises, shouldn't be encouraging development on this side of B Road. Ethylene Pipeline problems. SLA slopes encroachment and Cardrona sprawl. Dilutes the sense of place of the village and the strength of the landscape buffer boundary. Better on flat land at Horsbrugh Straight.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: CC- This would be an arbitrary fit in landscape terms, unrelated to the settlement pattern of the village, resulting in a substantial linear development which will be very difficult to design consistently with Designing Streets. An ethylene pipeline may also affect the scope of development

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: EN = The access authority would seek non-vehicular connectivity to the path network and the main road; specifically the multi-use core path 180 from Peebles to Walkerburn and core path 160 through Cardrona Forest. These links are important in terms of facilitating access to the existing path network and mitigating against irresponsible access through farmland. Facilitating the link to the multi-use route, core path 180, should include safe crossing infrastructure over B702.

SCOTTISH WATER - WASTE: High pressure gas main through middle of site, growth project started but does not include this field or housing.

SCOTTISH WATER - WATER: There is a current growth Project for Innerleithen WTW. Water Impact Assessment probably required.

SEPA: Water Enviro: This site is adjacent to the public foul sewer network and hence foul water must connect to the public foul sewer. This is likely to require an upgrade to Cardrona stw given the number of houses proposed.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	100

### Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the MIR public consultation. The site has good access to public transport, services and employment.

This site is unacceptable as it is constrained in terms of archaeology and landscape. Cardrona has already seen substantial residential development in recent years. A site at this location was previously considered by the Local Plan Reporter who considered the objections into the Finalised Local Plan 2005 and who stated that development should not extend south of the B road. The Reporter also commented that "The new building frontage would be obvious to those passing through on this road, as it would form what would be essentially ribbon development ... far from improving the character of the road, I consider that this would be very unwelcome and out of character on what is essentially a very scenic rural road, not a housing access."

It is also noted that at this time, Cardrona already benefits from an undeveloped mixed use allocation, site MCARD006 for 25 units.

Therefore, in conclusion the site will not be included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b> SCARD002	<b>Site name</b> Land at Nether Horsburgh	<b>Settlement</b> Cardrona	<b>SDA</b> Western	<b>Proposed Use</b> Longer Term Mixed Use	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> N/A	<b>Ha</b> 23.8	<b>PP status</b> Included
-----------------------------------	----------------------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Adjacent to site	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site is not located within any international/national designation. However, the River Tweed SAC and SSSI lies to the south of the site, on the opposite side of the road.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourses which flow through and adjacent to the site as well as the River Tweed. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site which may exacerbate flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Site may be constrained due to flood risk.

There are multiple watercourses throughout the site. There is the potential that the development of this allocation could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard at this site. SEPA advise that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

Foul drainage should be connected to the SW foul network at Cardrona stw (the site is outwith the currently sewered area). Options for private drainage on site do not appear to be feasible. Std comments for SUDS. The small watercourses running through/alongside the development should be safeguarded and enhanced as part of any development. Depending on the use of any proposed units there may be a requirement for permissions to be sought for certain activities from SEPA.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with the fluvial 1 in 200 year flood extents. This site is shown to be affected by surface water flooding in some small areas in the North of the site. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk but would ask that surface water runoff be considered.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no planning application history within the site. Housing SG: As part of the SG, a smaller site overlapping this one was considered for mixed use development (MCARD008). LDP: As part of the LDP, a much larger site was considered for mixed use development (MPEEB005).
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> South
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	-----------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Moderate biodiversity impact. Site appears to be improved pasture with areas of scrub on parts of the boundary and a small coniferous plantation within part of the site. Pond located outside western boundary. Oystercatcher and curlew are recoded in Tetrads NT33E and NT23Z. Potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC/ SSSI via drains. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially badger and breeding birds. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC/SSSI. SEPA CAR construction site licence required (site >4ha 23.78ha)

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located adjacent to the A72 and is a short walking distance from Cardrona. The site is a potential longer term mixed use allocation. Cardrona has good access to public transport, services and employment. Furthermore, good bus connections to Edinburgh and Galashiels. Consideration will need to be given to how active travel between the site and the village of Cardrona will be achieved.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Remote site in a very prominent position would have a significant impact on the Tweed Valley.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Potential to impact on setting of SM 3118: Nether Horsburgh, Castle. There may be potential for development within this area, but without suitable evaluation it is not possible to determine impact and mitigate in line with policy.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Spoke to the Officer and they advised that there is potential for archaeology within the site.

---

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
Not applicable	On/adjacent to site			Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: Our previous advice on this site (in response to the Housing SG) - This site lies outwith the current settlement boundary as shown in the LDP and is within a Special Landscape Area. Due to its physical separation there is little relationship of this site to Cardrona or to Peebles and it appears likely that development here would essentially involve the creation of another new village. Due to the prominence and location of this site here is a high potential for adverse landscape and visual impacts within the SLA, even with mitigation. The overall assessment in Appendix 10 of the Housing SG was that the site is unacceptable due to high potential for adverse landscape and visual impacts and the need for a solution to access issues. We are not aware that mitigation has been identified that would address either of these issues and maintain our previous advice regarding the physical separation of this allocation and its potential landscape and visual impacts.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: If a Masterplanning exercise can demonstrate that this site on the north side of the A72 can successfully be connected to the Cardrona settlement to the south of the A72 and the Tweed, and that a scheme of mitigation planting would avoid diminishing the quality of this part of the Tweed valley SLA, this site has potential as a mixed use development. The re-alignment of A72 might help to create a development more unified with the existing settlement to the south.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

<b>Physical access/road capacity</b>	<b>Near a trunk road?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------

NETWORK MANAGER: No response received.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: This site has previously been considered for mixed use development. The difficulty of developing this site is the fact that the A72 runs along the southern boundary of this site with Cardrona being located on the opposite side of the main arterial route linking the Central Borders with the west and beyond. Any allocation of this site would have to include fundamental changes to

drastically change the characteristics of the A72 through this area. The idea would be to make the A72 more of a high street rather than bypassing or dividing Cardrona. By creating a high street with dual frontage, this would allow a reduction in the traffic speed limit and help integrate both sides of the A72 into one settlement. A Transport Assessment will be required for this level of development. Master planning of the site would also be required to ensure phasing of the development is carried out in a satisfactory manner. For a development of this scale, consideration should be given to the appropriate infrastructure and amenities required to serve this site and the existing settlement profile of Cardrona, such as retail opportunities and possibly a new school. In summary, developing this site is possible but will require careful planning and a significant investment in infrastructure to create a cohesive and safe residential environment which can sustain this level of development.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No response received.

<b>Right of way</b>	<b>TPOs</b>	<b>Contaminated land</b>	<b>Water supply</b>	<b>Sewerage</b>	<b>Gas Supply</b>	<b>Education provision</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Limited	Limited	Limited	Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No response received.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. Depending on the flow demand for this development, will determine if a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. Please note there is an existing 100mm water main running along side of site. Depending on flow demand for this development, will determine if a Water Impact Assessment (WIA) is required.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Requires non-vehicular links to path network and Peebles town and amenities.

CONTAMINATED LAND: There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: It is desirable for business premises to generally be on flat land as the building footprint is generally larger than residential, so this site affords an opportunity to accommodate future business premises so close to an existing small settlement. The location provides the opportunity for integration of developments with a properly thought out layout and modern design.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

## Overall assessment

<b>PP status</b>	<b>Overall assessment</b>	<b>Site capacity</b>
Included	Acceptable	N/A

### Conclusions

The site comprises a large, flat area to the north of the A72, at Cardrona. The site was identified as part of the 'Western Rural Growth Area: Development Options Study' which was undertaken by LUC, to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Central Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP and for the future, within the Tweeddale area, in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders. The site currently being considered is proposed for a longer term mixed use development site.

Cardrona has good access to services, employment and public transport. Further to a site assessment, the following constraints/issues were identified, which may require mitigation;

- Flood Risk Assessment required, in respect of potential flood risk and surface water runoff on the site. The small watercourses running through/alongside the development should be safeguarded and enhanced as part of any development;
- Multiple watercourses within the site, therefore a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6m wide must be provided between the watercourse and any built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures;
- The use of SUDS at the construction phase in order that the risk of pollution during construction to the water environment is minimised;
- Foul drainage should be connected to the SW foul network at Cardrona sewage treatment works (the site is outwith the currently sewered area);
- Potential connectivity to the River Tweed SAC/SSSI, mitigation required to ensure no likely significant effects;

- Protect and enhance the existing boundary features;
- Potential protected species, including breeding birds within the site, would require mitigation;
- Scheduled Monument 'Nether Horsburgh Castle' is located to the north east of this site, this would require appropriate mitigation measures;
- Potential for archaeology within the site;
- The site is located within a prominent location and would be visible from the A72;
- Located within the 'Tweed Valley' Special Landscape Area;
- SNH advise that there is the potential for adverse landscape and visual impacts within the SLA, as a result of any development. However, the Council's Landscape Officers advise that development on this site could be acceptable subject to a scheme of mitigation and masterplanning, which would avoid diminishing the quality of this part of the Tweed Valley SLA;
- The Roads Planning Officer does not raise any objections to the development of this site. However, advises that any proposal would include fundamental changes to drastically change the characteristic of the A72 through this area;
- Transport Assessment would be required;
- Non vehicular link would be required, linking to the path network and Peebles town & amenities;
- Potential for Drainage Impact Assessment, in respect of the WWTW; and
- Potential for Water Impact Assessment, in respect of the WTW.

It is acknowledged that this site, albeit smaller, was assessed as part of the Housing SG for a mixed use development. The site was ultimately not included within the Housing SG as it was considered there were more preferable sites and the site assessment concluded that there were a number of constraints and there was the potential for adverse landscape and visual impacts within the SLA, even with mitigation. Since this assessment, a more extensive and detailed study of the Tweeddale area has been undertaken by LUC, in order to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Tweeddale. This site was one option put forward for consideration, in respect of a longer term mixed use site. A re-assessment has therefore been undertaken, in light of the additional information contained within the LUC Study. It should also be noted that there are a lack of suitable development opportunities within the Tweeddale area going forward. Many sites need to be re-visited in order to find further development land.

Overall, taking the above into consideration, there are a number of constraints identified within and adjacent to the site. However, it is not considered that any of these constraints are insurmountable and could be mitigated, subject to appropriate site requirements. There are aspects which would require further investigation, such as the road infrastructure and layout. However, given the longer term nature of this allocation, it is considered that this allows time to look further into the constraints and mitigation measures in more detail, including potential masterplanning of the site.

In conclusion, the longer term mixed use site will be taken forward as a potential Longer Term Mixed Use site within the Proposed Local Development Plan. It should be noted that longer term sites will not be formal allocations within the LDP2, rather areas identified for potential development in the future. It is considered that a masterplan would be required for such a development and the site must accommodate an element of business land and a potential new school.

---

# Dolphinton

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
ADOLP004	Land to north of Dolphinton	Dolphinton	Rest of Borders	Housing	10	1.3	Excluded

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
1:200	Not applicable	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

SEPA: Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map and steep topography indicates that there may be flooding issues within/adjacent to site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff. There is the potential that the development of this site could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard identified at this site.

This development site does not appear to be served by the SW foul sewer network. However the foul network is not far from the proposed site and hence this is the preferred option. It is likely that the SW foul network/STW would require to be upgraded to accommodate the development site. Opportunity should also be taken to pick up the existing properties to the south and west of the development area.

Co-location issues: A PPC part B cement batcher is currently located south west of the development at 'Heywood'. Likely issues: dust.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial 1 in 200 year flood extents but small parts of the site are within the 1 in 200 year surface water flood extents. I would require that surface water runoff is considered before development.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Brownfield	Planning application 04/01122/FUL Erection of 12 houses - refused; 07/01379/FUL - Erection of 14 houses - refused. Housing SG: ADOLP004 - Exact same site was assessed as part of the Housing SG (Stage 1 RAG only)

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Limited	Limited	Limited	Moderate	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Moderate biodiversity impact. The site is poor, semi improved grassland. Hedgerow on part of the boundary and garden ground. No obvious connectivity with Dolphinton-West Linton Fens and Grassland SSSI. Protect boundary trees and mitigation for protected species including bats and breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located within Dolphinton. There are no services or facilities within the settlement. The nearest settlement is West Linton 4 miles away, which has a primary school, co-op and other facilities. There is a bus service to Edinburgh, however limited bus services to other towns. This means that there will be a reliance on car travel. Natural regeneration, adjacent trees and woodland should harbour young wildlife habitats. Retention of this where possible and extension to create woodland strip to south. Divisional garden hedges could create further opportunities for wildlife. Retain trees on eastern and northern boundaries if possible. The site appears unused and over grown. Bunds and embankments from railway workings, possibly minor huts/structures amongst vegetation.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There is a high concentration of archaeological sites and features in the surrounding landscape which increases the potential for unknown features to exist in the site. There is nothing known for this site, but archaeological mitigation is likely base on the potential.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific comment.

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
Not applicable	On/adjacent to site			Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: We recommend that if this site is to be allocated that a site brief is produced to identify the key natural heritage assets of the site to be protected and the key opportunities for the integration of green infrastructure within future development. Our advice on this site is based on prior knowledge and desktop assessment using GIS and streetview. We may provide further advice based on a site visit if the potential allocation is carried forward. This section of the A702 is characterised by small groups of houses, often screened wholly or partly by well-established woodland and boundary planting. If allocated, we recommend that a site brief is prepared, this should include:

- Retention of woodland along the A702 boundary of the site; and
- Maintain and enhance pedestrian and cycle access established by LDP1 allocation ADOLP003.

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: Opportunity to allow natural regeneration to develop and be managed as swathe of woodland; thinned and augmented as required. This young tree cover will in due course provide excellent screen planting from the road and a buffer between the existing and any proposed housing. The majority of it is in the most unsuitable part of the site where there appear to considerable railway workings. The area is low lying and likely to be shady. Houses built on upper part of site to maximise solar gain and views. Position new properties at suitable distance from existing mature trees on boundary to protect trees from development, ensure sufficient light levels and maintain open views across landscape from new development. Recommend low density to safeguard existing tree cover, retain views out of the site to distant hills and prevent adverse effect on the setting of the Pentland hills SLA.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

<b>Physical access/road capacity</b>	<b>Near a trunk road?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------

NETWORK MANAGER: Would be concerned if a new access was proposed directly off the A702, which is a fast unrestricted road at this location.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Access is not recommended to be taken from the A702 trunk road.

ROADS PLANNING: I have no objections in principle to the allocation of this site. Access is achievable from the allocated site (ADOLP003) to the south. There is a current live outline application for 5 units on the existing allocated site and any detailed design for that site would have to allow for a public road extension through to the site in question here. A pedestrian link will be required from any proposed development to the existing public transport provision on the A702. Any new access onto the A702 to serve this site would be for Transport Scotland (TS) to comment on. Likewise TS will comment on the

impact of any further development should it take access via the existing allocated site and onto the A702 via the existing junction.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Improved pedestrian crossing facilities across the A702 to and from bus stop layby.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Average

## Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Appears logical link between the two settlement envelopes either side of the A702. Good landscaping along A702 but would need robust landscaping on northern boundary.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. Sewer within site boundary.

Sufficient capacity in the network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Roseberry WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Connecting paths to core path 169 (RoW BT28) and existing pavements required.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the proposed development.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No Issues.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

### PP status

Excluded

### Overall assessment

Acceptable

### Site capacity

10

## Conclusions

The site is located within Dolphinton and was submitted as part of the 'Call for Sites' process. It should be noted that the site was also submitted and considered as part of the Housing SG and ultimately not included. An initial Stage 1 RAG assessment was undertaken as part of the Housing SG. At that stage, it was concluded that, a recent allocation was made within the LDP for Dolphinton, therefore that was considered to be sufficient for the LDP period.

The site itself includes derelict ground including the remains of the former railway platform and sections of old railroad in parts. The site is considered to be acceptable for housing and there are no insurmountable planning issues, which cannot be resolved through mitigation. Dolphinton has limited access to services, public transport and employment opportunities. The nearby settlement of West Linton has a school and shops. Further to the site assessment, the following constraints/mitigation were identified/proposed;

- The site is adjacent to the SSSI and within the SLA 'Pentland Hills';
- Potential flood risk and surface water hazard;
- Protection of boundary trees and retention of woodland along the A702 site boundary, where possible;
- Mitigation for protected species, including breeding birds;
- Potential archaeology within the site, evaluation/mitigation would be required;
- Maintain and enhance the pedestrian and cycle access established by LDP1 allocation (ADOLP003);
- New planting to the north and enhancement of the woodland along the eastern boundary will be required. Landscape buffers will be required and the long term maintenance of the landscaped areas must be addressed;
- A pedestrian link will be required to the existing public transport provision on the A702, either via this site or the adjacent allocation (ADOLP003);
- Co-location issues, as 'A PPC part B cement batcher' is currently located south west of the development at 'Heywood'. The likely issues are dust;
- The Roads Planning Officer has advised no objections and that access is acceptable via the existing housing allocation (ADOLP003) to the south; and

- Early discussions with Scottish Water, to ascertain whether a Water Impact Assessment will be required.

However, taking the above into consideration, it is noted that as a small settlement with an existing housing allocation for 5 units that has not yet seen development, it is not appropriate at this time to allocate an additional site. It is therefore recommended that this site is not allocated within the Proposed Local Development Plan. Nevertheless, it is acknowledged that the site could be considered again for inclusion in a future LDP.

---

# Eddleston

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
AEDDL006	Temple Hill East	Eddleston	Rest of Borders	Housing	50	2.4	Excluded

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
1:200	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

1:200 flood risk on north eastern section of site.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Longcote Burn which flows along the boundary of the site. Access/ egress will potentially be difficult and should be investigated at an early stage. Consideration will need to be given to any culverts/ bridges which may exacerbate flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within/ adjacent to site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Due to steep topography through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff. SEPA require a flood risk assessment (FRA) to be included as a site specific developer requirement prior to any development occurring on the site, and that the findings are used to inform the scale, layout and form of development.

Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. There are likely to be capacity issues at Eddleston STW for a development of this size. SW should confirm the situation. Opportunities should be taken to protect and enhance the watercourse which cuts across the site. Any river crossings should be designed in accordance with good practice and avoid in stream structures.

SEPA request a developer requirement attached to the site to ensure that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: Parts of the North Eastern side of this site are at risk of flooding at a 1 in 200 year flood event. I would require that a Flood Risk Assessment is undertaken for this site.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	03/00350/OUT Erection of two dwelliinghouses - Withdrawn.

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Good	Good	Good	Moderate	Not applicable

## Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response received.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the south east of Eddleston. Good bus route to Edinburgh and Peebles with connecting linkages. The village has a restaurant, hotel, village hall and a primary school. Eddleston is located 5 miles north from Peebles, on the A701 to Edinburgh.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Not applicable	<b>Open space</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Listed buildings</b> Not applicable	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> Not applicable	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> Not applicable
--------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

## Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There are no known archaeological implications.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific comment.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: No specific comment.

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b> Not applicable	<b>SLA</b> Not applicable	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b> Not applicable
------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------

## Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: Seek reasonable alternative. The site is likely to present significant and/ or adverse impacts on the natural heritage. We advise that reasonable alternatives may present less significant impacts and therefore they should be considered in advance of these sites. Our advice on this site is based on prior knowledge and desktop assessment using GIS and streetview. We may provide further advice based on a site visit if the potential allocation is carried forward. This is an elevated, prominent site that lies outwith the existing settlement boundary. The site boundary includes an area identified as 'new woodland along watercourse' in the adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance for Burnside (LDP1 allocation ref TE6B). It is not clear how this planting would be delivered if this site was allocated. Development of the site would represent a significant change to the character of the village. At present, dwellings are situated in lower-lying parts of the confluence of the Eddleston Water, the Longcote Burn and the Dean Burn.

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: I recommend that this site should not be approved for the following reasons:-

- Steep access up valley bluffs.
- Height of site on open exposed valley side, taking the development of Eddleston further up the valley sides than at present.
- Likely to be visible from the Black Barony Designed Landscape across the Eddleston Water valley , the Longcote Burn valley, from A703 and from local footpaths.
- Poor containment to this site and lack of existing mitigating factors.
- Road capacity.
- Contrary to Burnside Planning Brief: planting of riparian woodland anticipated along lower/eastern part of this site.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

<b>Physical access/road capacity</b>	<b>Near a trunk road?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------

NETWORK MANAGER: Access is off a 20 mph road. Number of direct frontage driveways onto this with reversing vehicles common.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Bus stop infrastructure on both sides of A703.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No issues raised.

ROADS PLANNING: The topography of the site represents a significant challenge in terms of achieving a suitable layout. The site would be reliant on a single point of access from Burnside, therefore internal connectivity is critical. Access from Burnside will require a suitable crossing of the existing burn. Existing infrastructure such as footways and street lighting would have to be extended to encompass the site. Support for this site allocation is marginal given the topography of the site and a single point of access. However the site is ideally located for the school and an engineering solution is likely to be achievable to allow this site to be developed in an appropriate manner. The site constraints will limit the extent of developable land. It would have been helpful to have seen a worked up indicative layout. A Transport Statement will be required.

#### Right of way

Adjacent to site

#### TPOs

Not applicable

#### Contaminated land

Not applicable

#### Water supply

Limited

#### Sewerage

Limited

#### Gas Supply

No

#### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. A Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

HOUSING STRATEGY: No issues raised.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Connecting path to core path 152 and existing pavements required.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Not a logical extension. Extending development up a hillside, likely to create pressure in adjoining fields. No defensible boundary.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

#### PP status

Excluded

#### Overall assessment

Unacceptable

#### Site capacity

50

### Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the 'Call for Sites' process for consideration, for housing. The site has good access to public transport, services and employment. The site lies to the south east of Eddleston.

LUC undertook a study as part of the MIR process, 'Western Rural Growth Area: Development Options Study', to identify and assess options for housing within the Central Tweeddale Area. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP for the Central Tweeddale area in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders. As part of this study, 34 search areas were identified and explored in more detail. Search Area number 4: Eddleston south east, included the proposed site (AEDDL006). The study concluded that development within this search area would be separate from, and would contrast with, Eddleston's historic valley location. Furthermore, as part of the site assessment, the proposal is not supported by either SNH or the Council's Landscape Architect.

Therefore, taking the above into consideration, this site will not be included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b> AEDDL007	<b>Site name</b> North of Bellfield II	<b>Settlement</b> Eddleston	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 35	<b>Ha</b> 4.4	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designation constraints. There are Surface Water Hazards to the west of the site, however not within the site itself.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Eddleston Water. Due to the gradients on site, the majority of the site will likely be developable. Consideration should be given to the lower parts of the site adjacent to the A703. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at an increased risk of flooding.

There is the potential that development at this allocation could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard identified at the site.

Foul sewage from this development should be connected into the SW public foul network (although the site is outwith the current sewered catchment). Failing that private sewage provision would be required although this could be challenging given the site location. The only possible discharge point would appear to be the Eddleston water for this scale of development. Further discussion would be required to determine whether such a discharge would be feasible in terms of the effluent standards required. Std comments re: SUDS.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. I would, however, ask that potential surface water is considered during development due to the large capacity of the site.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no planning application history on this site. The site has not been previously considered as part of a Local Development Plan.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Low biodiversity risk. Site appears to be an improved pasture sloping down to old A703 with stone dyke on the boundary. Site may require cut and fill. No obvious drainage connectivity to River Tweed SAC but is just outside of 1 in 200 year flood risk area. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including badger and breeding birds. SEPA CAR construction site licence required (site >4ha) (4.36ha).

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the north of Eddleston, directly to the north of the existing housing allocation (AEDDL002). The settlement currently runs along the A703. Good bus route to Edinburgh and Peebles with connecting linkages. The village has a restaurant, hotel, village hall and a primary school. Eddleston is located 5 miles north from Peebles, on the A701 to Edinburgh.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Adjacent to site

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Whilst not specific Listed Building or Conservation Area issues, at first sight, this land is remote from the village. However if the site to the south were to be developed (and I think this is an allocated site) then this proposal may be worthy of further consideration, especially as it is set back from the road behind a line of mature trees lining the old road.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Spoke to the Officer who advised that there is potential for archaeology on the site.

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable			Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: We note that existing allocation AEDDL002 is to have a planning brief produced and adopted. If AEDDL007 is to be allocated in the second LDP, we recommend that the proposed planning brief is extended in scope to include both AEDDL002 and AEDDL007.

Allocation of this site should lead to update of site requirements for AEDDL002, particularly "New structure planting/ landscaping, including woodland, to improve the setting of the areas, screen and shelter development". This requirement will need review if AEDDL007 is to be delivered as part of Eddleston rather than as a perceptually isolated extension. Consideration of the potential impact of development on the River Tweed SAC has been established through the prior assessment of AEDDL002 during preparation of the current LDP. We recommend a similar approach is adopted for this site.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: This site would effectively extend Eddleston northwards by .275km beyond the allocated but as yet undeveloped AEDDL002. The site is a sloping west facing field on the east side of the A703, the western boundary is defined by the old A703 which along this section is lined by a single line of mature lime trees. The slopes are no steeper than the allocated site to south and access could be achieved from existing access points off the A703 to the north (at Cottage Bank) and to the south along the old A703. Structure shelterbelt planting using deciduous/ mixed woodland species will be essential along the eastern elevated boundary to achieve a 'landscape fit' with potential to wrap this around the north boundary to create a structural limit extent of Eddleston.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

<b>Physical access/road capacity</b>	<b>Near a trunk road?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------

NETWORK MANAGER: No response received.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I am able to offer my support for housing development on this site, but the allocated site to the south (AEDDL002) would have to be developed first in order to integrate this proposed site with the settlement of Eddleston. In terms of access, I would be looking for the former section of public road, which runs along the western boundary of the site (Old Edinburgh Road), to be re-instated as a public road to provide access to the A703 to the north of Scots Pine Restaurant as well as well as to the A703 south near Bellfield Crescent. Access into the development site can be taken from a number of points on the former public road and a link from the allocated site to the south should also be a requirement.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No response received.

**Right of way**

Adjacent to site

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

Not applicable

**Water supply**

Limited

**Sewerage**

Limited

**Gas Supply**

No

**Education provision**

Good

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No response received.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. A Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network This proposed site is located a considerable distance from the public network. Any installation of network from site to the public sewers must be funded and carried out by the developer. These associated costs may be notable and not fully covered by Scottish Water's Reasonable Cost Contribution (RCC) scheme.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. A Water Impact Assessment (WIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. The nearest water main is some distance away and it will be the Developers responsibility to lay their water main to existing Scottish Water network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS: Core path 146 partly runs adjacent to the west side of this proposed site. Should a road be built over this then there would need to be a footpath/pavement to maintain non-vehicular access.

CONTAMINATED LAND: There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No response received.

NHS: No response received.

**Overall assessment****PP status**

Excluded

**Overall assessment**

Acceptable

**Site capacity**

35

**Conclusions**

The site is located to the north of Eddleston, directly to the north of the existing housing allocation (AEDDL002). The site was identified as part of the 'Western Rural Growth Area: Development Options Study' which was undertaken by LUC, to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP and for the future, within the Tweeddale area, in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders. The site currently being considered is proposed for housing development site.

Eddleston has good access to services, employment and public transport. Further to a site assessment, the following constraints/issues were identified, which may require mitigation;

- Flood Risk Assessment required, in respect of potential flood risk and surface water runoff on the site;
- Foul sewerage constraints, as the site is located outwith the current seweraged catchment;
- Protect and enhance the existing boundary features, where possible;
- Potential protected species, including breeding birds within the site, would require mitigation;
- The Designed Landscape (SBC) and Garden and Designed Landscape (HES) 'Portmore' are located to the north of the site;
- Consideration of the potential impact of the development on the River Tweed SAC/SSSI;
- Structure shelterbelt planting using deciduous/mixed woodland species will be essential along eastern elevation boundary to achieve a 'landscape fit'
- The Roads Planning Officer advised that the proposal is acceptable. (AEDDL002) would need to be developed first, in order to integrate this proposed site within the settlement. Access into the site can be taken from a number of points along the former public road and a link to (AEDDL002) would be required;
- Potential for archaeology on the site;
- Potential for Drainage Impact Assessment, in respect of the WWTW; and
- Potential for Water Impact Assessment, in respect of the WTW.

There are no insurmountable constraints, which would prevent the development of this site for housing, subject to mitigation measures. It is acknowledged that the site immediately to the south is already allocated for housing within the LDP and remains undeveloped to date. The Roads Planning Officer has confirmed that access would need to come via the allocated housing site (AEDDL002) and that that site should be developed prior to this one.

In conclusion, it is considered that this site will not be taken forward within the Proposed Plan as a housing option.

---

<b>Site reference</b> AEDDL008	<b>Site name</b> Land West of Elibank Park	<b>Settlement</b> Eddleston	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 40	<b>Ha</b> 5.5	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designations.

SEPA: Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at an increased risk of flooding. There is the potential that development of this allocation would increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard identified at the site.

Foul sewage from this development should be connected into the SW public foul network (although the site is outwith the current sewered catchment). Failing that private sewage provision would be required although this could be challenging given the site location. The only possible discharge point would appear to be the Eddleston water for this scale of development. Further discussion would be required to determine whether such a discharge would be feasible in terms of the effluent standards required. Std comments re: SUDS.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. I would, however, ask that potential surface water is considered during development due to the large capacity of the site.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no planning application history on this site.  The site has not previously been assessed as part of any Local Development Plan process.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Moderate biodiversity risk. Site appears to be an improved pasture but with Ancient Woodland (Ancient of semi-natural origin) (Cemetery wood) along northern boundary with record of red squirrel (10 +years) and beech hedgerow along roadside boundary. Potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC via the Dean burn. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats, badger and breeding birds. Planted buffer required to protect ancient woodland. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC (Eddleston water). SEPA CAR construction site licence required (site >4ha)(5.50ha)

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the south west of Eddleston. Good bus route to Edinburgh and Peebles with connecting linkages. The village has a restaurant, hotel, village hall and a primary school. Eddleston is located 5 miles north from Peebles, on the A701 to Edinburgh.

## Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area	Open space	Listed buildings	Scheduled Monument	Ancient woodland inventory	Archaeology	Garden and designed landscape
Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	On/adjacent to site	Adjacent to site	On/adjacent to site

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: There may be some minor issues about possible impact on the setting of the Black Barony, although the current woodland provides a buffer. The site is remote from the village.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Spoke to the Officer and he advised that there is potential for archaeology within the site.

## Landscape assessment

NSA	SLA	Over 200 metres?	Over 12 degree slope	Wild Land
Not applicable	Not applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: This is a large and partially open site on undulating ground. The proposed density of development over the site is very low and it is unclear how the proposal would seek to integrate or respond to the settlement character and siting principles established within the existing village. If allocated, we advise that a design brief should inform what would be intended for the development layout. Existing features such as the hedgerow should be retained and appropriate improvements made to allow safe access to the rest of the settlement established. For example the provision of pavements along the main road and access connections from the site to and through Elibank Park to Station Lye should be established.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: The site is an east facing gently sloping field to the west of the minor road that connects A703 at Eddleston through the Meldons to Lyne and A72 west of Peebles. The gradients are relatively gentle and the site sits contiguous with the ancient woodland associated with Dean Burn that runs through Barony Castle (local Designed Landscape) immediately to the north. A buffer of woodland planting along the north boundary should wrap around the west and south boundaries to ensure an appropriate 'landscape fit'. As far as is practicable boundary hedges should be retained and enhanced.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity	Near a trunk road?
	<input type="checkbox"/>

NETWORK MANAGER: No response received.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: While the site lies adjacent to the settlement boundary of Eddleston, the road leading out to it from the village is restrictive in width and there is no provision for pedestrians. Any development of this site will require carriageway widening, (at key locations on the section of road between the junction with Station Lye and the site entrance) and a pedestrian link with the village including street lighting provision. Such provision will require significant engineering work and will impact on land outwith the road boundary. That said, I understand the land on the south east side of the road (Elibank Park) is Council owned so that a pedestrian route, divorced from the carriageway, could be provided through the park towards the site, but it should be noted this will impact on the tree belt and roadside hedge and will require a footbridge over Dean Burn. From Dean Burn a new footway would be required to connect with the village footway which terminates near the bridge over Eddleston Water. The village street lighting and 30 mph speed limit would need to extend out to the site. In terms of the site itself, satisfactory access can be achieved, although a section of the roadside hedgerow would have to be removed in order to create appropriate visibility splays. In summary, I can on balance support this site being allocated for housing development, but there is a fair bit of work required for it to properly connect with the village. A Transport Statement would be required.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No response received.

**Right of way**

Not applicable

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

Not applicable

**Water supply**

Limited

**Sewerage**

Limited

**Gas Supply**

No

**Education provision**

Good

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No response received.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. A Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network .

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. A Water Impact Assessment (WIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: This site would need to have good non-vehicular links to the existing path network and recreation ground.

CONTAMINATED LAND: There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

---

**Overall assessment**

**PP status**

Excluded

**Overall assessment**

Acceptable

**Site capacity**

40

**Conclusions**

The site lies to the south west of Eddleston. The site was identified as part of the 'Western Rural Growth Area: Development Options Study' which was undertaken by LUC, to identify and assess options for housing within Central Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP for the Tweeddale area, in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders.

Eddleston has good access to public transport, services and employment, given it's proximity to Peebles. Further to a site assessment, the following constraints/issues were identified, which may require mitigation;

- Foul sewerage constraints, as the site is located outwith the current sewerage catchment;
- Potential surface water runoff issues;
- Ancient Woodland Inventory lies along the northern boundary of the site;
- Potential connectivity to the River Tweed SAC/SSSI;
- Protect and enhance the existing boundary features, including the beech hedgerow along the roadside;
- Potential protected species, including breeding birds within the site;
- Site lies within the 'Barony Castle' Designed Landscape (SBC);
- 2 HER records adjacent to the site;
- Pedestrian link to the village would be required;
- Planting/landscaping along the western and southern boundary of the site, to contain the development and form a settlement edge;
- Some form of separation buffer between the development and ancient woodland to the north;
- Transport Statement required; and
- Drainage Impact Assessment and Water Impact Assessment required, in respect of WWTW and WTW.

There are currently two allocated housing sites within Eddleston and it is considered that site AEDDL009 is a more preferable option than site AEDDL008 which the landowners are not keen to release. Consequently it is considered AEDDL008 should not be included within the Local Development Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b> AEDDL009	<b>Site name</b> Land South of Cemetery	<b>Settlement</b> Eddleston	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 35	<b>Ha</b> 3.7	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designation constraints. However, it does fall within the 1 in 200 floodrisk maps.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Eddleston Water. Any nearby small watercourses should be investigated as there was a mill dam upslope of the site in the past to ensure there are no culverted watercourses through the site. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within the site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at increased risk of flooding.

There is the potential that development at this allocation could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard at this site.

Foul sewage from this development should be connected into the SW public foul network (although the site is outwith the currently sewered catchment). Failing that private sewage provision would be required. The only possible discharge point would appear to be the Eddleston water for this scale of development. Further discussion would be required to determine whether such a discharge would be feasible in terms of the effluent standards required. Std comments re: SUDS.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site may be at risk of flooding from the Eddleston Water during a 1 in 200 year flood. The South part of this site is expected to flood so dependent on the outline drawings, I may require a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). However, if properties were located out with the Southern side, there would be scope for approval.

I would ask that potential surface water is considered during development due to the large capacity of the site.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no planning application history on the site. The site has not been previously considered as part of a Local Plan.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Moderate biodiversity risk. Site appears to be an improved pasture with beech hedgerow and treeline on boundary. Small part of site within SEPA 1 in 200 year indicative flood

risk area, potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including, badger and breeding birds. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC (Eddleston water) (3.7ha)

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the south west of Eddleston. Good bus route to Edinburgh and Peebles with connecting linkages. The village has a restaurant, hotel, village hall and a primary school. Eddleston is located 5 miles north from Peebles, on the A701 to Edinburgh.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Adjacent to site

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On/adjacent to site

### Garden and designed landscape

Adjacent to site

## Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: The site is remote from the village.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Spoke to the Officer who advised that there is potential for archaeology within the site.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: The site presents similar issues to AEDDL008. We highlight the potential for a planted linear path or green network along the dismantled railway to the east of the site and connecting to and through Elibank Park. We recommend that if both are to be allocated in the next LDP a planning brief for both sites should be prepared.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: Site is very gently sloping, almost valley bottom of Eddleston Water. It would effectively extend Eddleston southward by .270km. Both this site and AEDDL008 are highly visible from the A703 but the visual impact could be mitigated by carefully planned structural planting along the eastern and southern boundaries, ideally overrunning into the flood plain to create a more natural edge to the development and avoid using manmade features such as the railway line as rigid boundary.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: No response received.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: While the site lies adjacent to the settlement boundary of Eddleston, the road leading out to it from the village is restrictive in width and there is no provision for pedestrians. Any development of this site will require carriageway widening, (at key locations on the section of road between the junction with Station Lye and the site entrance) and a pedestrian link with the village including street lighting provision. Such provision will require significant engineering work and will impact on land outwith the road boundary. That said, I understand the land on the south east side of the road (Elibank Park) is Council owned so that a pedestrian route, divorced from the carriageway, could be provided through the park towards the site, but it should be noted this will impact on the tree belt and roadside hedge and will require a footbridge over Dean Burn. From Dean Burn a new footway would be required to connect with the village footway which terminates near the bridge over Eddleston Water. The village street lighting and 30 mph speed limit would need to extend out to the site. A pedestrian/cycle link from the lower part of the site to the village via the old railway line and/or Elibank Park needs to be explored too. In terms of the site itself, satisfactory access can be achieved at a number of locations provided visibility splays and acceptable gradients are met. In summary, I can on balance support this site being allocated for housing development, but there is a fair bit of work required for it to properly connect with the village. A Transport Statement would be required.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No response received.

#### Right of way

Not applicable

#### TPOs

Not applicable

#### Contaminated land

Not applicable

#### Water supply

Limited

#### Sewerage

Limited

#### Gas Supply

No

#### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No response received.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. Site is 145 meters away from the existing Scottish Water WwTw, odour and noise assessments will need to be carried out to consider the impact of the proximity. A Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. Please note there is an existing Scottish Water existing raw water main running along East and within the south edge of site. Additionally there is a 100mm water main running along East edge of site. A Water Impact Assessment (WIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Housing on this site and AEDDL008 would benefit greatly from a pavement down to the village as well as non-vehicular links to the existing path network and recreation ground.

CONTAMINATED LAND: There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

#### PP status

Excluded

#### Overall assessment

Acceptable

#### Site capacity

35

### Conclusions

The site lies to the south west of Eddleston. The site was identified as part of the 'Western Rural Growth Area: Development Options Study' which was undertaken by LUC, to identify and assess options for housing within Central Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP for the Tweeddale area, in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders.

Eddleston has good access to public transport, services and employment, given it's proximity to Peebles. Further to a site assessment, the following constraints/issues were identified, which may require mitigation;

- Foul sewerage constraints, as the site is located outwith the current sewered catchment;
- Flood Risk Assessment required, in respect of potential flood risk and potential surface water runoff on the site;
- Potential connectivity to the River Tweed SAC/SSSI, mitigation required to ensure no likely significant effects;
- Protect and enhance the existing boundary features, including the beech hedgerow and treeline along the roadside;
- Potential protected species, including breeding birds within the site, would require mitigation;
- The site is adjacent to 'Elibank Park' key greenspace and Eddleston Cemetery;
- 2 HER records adjacent to the site, 1 overlaps the eastern boundary of the site, potential mitigation required;
- Site located adjacent to the 'Barony Castle' Designed Landscape SBC;
- Pedestrian link with the village and explore the potential to connect with the old railway line and/or Elibank Park;
- Structure planting along the eastern and southern boundaries, to mitigate any visual impacts from the A703;
- Transport Statement required;

- Drainage Impact Assessment required, in respect of WWTW; and
- Water Impact Assessment required, in respect of WTW.

During the consultation period, it has come to light that the northern part of the site is owned by the Council for the specific intention to allow for the extension of the adjacent cemetery when required.

Overall, taking the above into consideration, it is considered that this site will not be included within the Proposed Local Development Plan, however a reduced site excluding the council owned land i.e. AEDDL010 will be included.

---

<b>Site reference</b> AEDDL010	<b>Site name</b> Land South of Cemetery	<b>Settlement</b> Eddleston	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 30	<b>Ha</b> 3.3	<b>PP status</b> Included
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designation constraints. However, it does fall within the 1 in 200 floodrisk maps.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Eddleston Water. Any nearby small watercourses should be investigated as there was a mill dam upslope of the site in the past to ensure there are no culverted watercourses through the site. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within the site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at increased risk of flooding.

There is the potential that development at this allocation could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard at this site.

Foul sewage from this development should be connected into the SW public foul network (although the site is outwith the currently sewered catchment). Failing that private sewage provision would be required. The only possible discharge point would appear to be the Eddleston water for this scale of development. Further discussion would be required to determine whether such a discharge would be feasible in terms of the effluent standards required. Std comments re: SUDS.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site may be at risk of flooding from the Eddleston Water during a 1 in 200 year flood. The South part of this site is expected to flood so dependent on the outline drawings, I may require a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). However, if properties were located out with the Southern side, there would be scope for approval.

I would ask that potential surface water is considered during development due to the large capacity of the site.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no planning application history on the site. A larger site (AEDDL009) was previously considered at the pre-MIR stage of LDP2 and was included as an alternative option within the MIR.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Moderate biodiversity risk. Site appears to be an improved pasture with beech hedgerow and treeline on boundary. Small part of site within SEPA 1 in 200 year indicative flood risk area, potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including, badger and breeding birds. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC (Eddleston water) (3.7ha)

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the south west of Eddleston. Good bus route to Edinburgh and Peebles with connecting linkages. The village has a restaurant, hotel, village hall and a primary school. Eddleston is located 5 miles north from Peebles, on the A701 to Edinburgh.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	On/adjacent to site	Adjacent to site

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: The site is remote from the village.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Spoke to the Officer who advised that there is potential for archaeology within the site.

---

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable			Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: The site presents similar issues to AEDDL008. We highlight the potential for a planted linear path or green network along the dismantled railway to the east of the site and connecting to and through Elibank Park. We recommend that if both are to be allocated in the next LDP a planning brief for both sites should be prepared.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: Site is very gently sloping, almost valley bottom of Eddleston Water. It would effectively extend Eddleston southward by .270km. Both this site and AEDDL008 are highly visible from the A703 but the visual impact could be mitigated by carefully planned structural planting along the eastern and southern boundaries, ideally overrunning into the flood plain to create a more natural edge to the development and avoid using manmade features such as the railway line as rigid boundary.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

<b>Physical access/road capacity</b>	<b>Near a trunk road?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------

NETWORK MANAGER: No response received.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: While the site lies adjacent to the settlement boundary of Eddleston, the road leading out to it from the village is restrictive in width and there is no provision for pedestrians. Any development of this site will require carriageway widening, (at key locations on the section of road between the junction with Station Lye and the site entrance) and a pedestrian link with the village including street lighting provision. Such provision will require significant engineering work and will impact on land outwith the road boundary. That said, I understand the land on the south east side of the road (Elibank Park) is Council owned so that a pedestrian route, divorced from the carriageway, could be provided through the park towards the site, but it should be noted this will impact on the tree belt and roadside hedge and will require a footbridge over Dean Burn. From Dean Burn a new footway would be required to connect with the village footway which terminates near the bridge over Eddleston Water. The village street lighting and 30 mph speed limit would need to extend out to the site. A pedestrian/cycle link from the lower part of the site to the village via the old railway line and/or Elibank Park needs to be explored too. In terms of the site itself, satisfactory access can be achieved at a number of locations provided visibility splays and acceptable gradients are met. In summary, I can on balance support this

site being allocated for housing development, but there is a fair bit of work required for it to properly connect with the village. A Transport Statement would be required.  
 PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No response received.

<b>Right of way</b>	<b>TPOs</b>	<b>Contaminated land</b>	<b>Water supply</b>	<b>Sewerage</b>	<b>Gas Supply</b>	<b>Education provision</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Limited	Limited	No	Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No response received.  
 HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.  
 SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. Site is 145 meters away from the existing Scottish Water WwTw, odour and noise assessments will need to be carried out to consider the impact of the proximity. A Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network .  
 SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. Please note there is an existing Scottish Water existing raw water main running along East and within the south edge of site. Additionally there is a 100mm water main running along East edge of site. A Water Impact Assessment (WIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.  
 OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Housing on this site and AEDDL008 would benefit greatly from a pavement down to the village as well as non-vehicular links to the existing path network and recreation ground.  
 CONTAMINATED LAND: There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.  
 NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.  
 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.  
 PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.  
 EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.  
 NHS: No response received.

## Overall assessment

<b>PP status</b>	<b>Overall assessment</b>	<b>Site capacity</b>
Included	Acceptable	30

### Conclusions

The site lies to the south west of Eddleston. The site was identified as part of the 'Western Rural Growth Area: Development Options Study' which was undertaken by LUC, to identify and assess options for housing within Central Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP for the Tweeddale area, in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders.

Eddleston has good access to public transport, services and employment, given it's proximity to Peebles. Further to a site assessment, the following constraints/issues were identified, which may require mitigation;

- Foul sewerage constraints, as the site is located outwith the current sewered catchment;
- Flood Risk Assessment required, in respect of potential flood risk and potential surface water runoff on the site;
- Potential connectivity to the River Tweed SAC/SSSI, mitigation required to ensure no likely significant effects;
- Protect and enhance the existing boundary features, including the beech hedgerow and treeline along the roadside;
- Potential protected species, including breeding birds within the site, would require mitigation;
- The site is adjacent to 'Elibank Park' key greenspace and Eddleston Cemetery;
- 2 HER records adjacent to the site, 1 overlaps the eastern boundary of the site, potential mitigation required;
- Site located adjacent to the 'Barony Castle' Designed Landscape SBC;
- Pedestrian link with the village and explore the potential to connect with the old railway line and/or Elibank Park;
- Structure planting along the eastern and southern boundaries, to mitigate any visual impacts from the A703;

- Transport Statement required;
- Drainage Impact Assessment required, in respect of WWTW; and
- Water Impact Assessment required, in respect of WTW.

It is noted that the Main Issues Report identified an enlarged site at this location, AEDDL009. However a part of that site is owned by the Council for the intention of extending the cemetery as and when required. This site AEDDL010, excludes the Council owned land.

Overall, taking the above into consideration, it is considered that there are no insurmountable planning issues and this site is proposed for inclusion in the Proposed Local Development Plan with an indicative site capacity of 30 units.

---

<b>Site reference</b> SEDDL001	<b>Site name</b> North of Bellfield II	<b>Settlement</b> Eddleston	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Longer Term Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> N/A	<b>Ha</b> 4.4	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designation constraints. There are Surface Water Hazards to the west of the site, however not within the site itself.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Eddleston Water. Due to the gradients on site, the majority of the site will likely be developable. Consideration should be given to the lower parts of the site adjacent to the A703. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at an increased risk of flooding.

There is the potential that development at this allocation could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard identified at the site.

Foul sewage from this development should be connected into the SW public foul network (although the site is outwith the current sewered catchment). Failing that private sewage provision would be required although this could be challenging given the site location. The only possible discharge point would appear to be the Eddleston water for this scale of development. Further discussion would be required to determine whether such a discharge would be feasible in terms of the effluent standards required. Std comments re: SUDS.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. I would, however, ask that potential surface water is considered during development due to the large capacity of the site.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b>	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no planning history on the site. The site has not been previously considered as part of a Local Plan.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	----------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Low biodiversity risk. Site appears to be an improved pasture sloping down to old A703 with stone dyke on the boundary. Site may require cut and fill. No obvious drainage connectivity to River Tweed SAC but is just outside of 1 in 200 year flood risk area. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including badger and breeding birds. SEPA CAR construction site licence required (site >4ha) (4.36ha)

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the north of Eddleston, directly to the north of the existing housing allocation (AEDDL002). The settlement currently runs along the A703. Good bus route to Edinburgh and Peebles with connecting linkages. The village has a restaurant, hotel, village hall and a primary school. Eddleston is located 5 miles north from Peebles, on the A701 to Edinburgh.

## Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area	Open space	Listed buildings	Scheduled Monument	Ancient woodland inventory	Archaeology	Garden and designed landscape
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Adjacent to site

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Whilst not specific Listed Building or Conservation Area issues, at first sight, this land is remote from the village. However if the site to the south were to be developed (and I think this is an allocated site) then this proposal may be worthy of further consideration, especially as it is set back from the road behind a line of mature trees lining the old road.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Spoke to the Officer who advised that there is potential for archaeology on the site.

## Landscape assessment

NSA	SLA	Over 200 metres?	Over 12 degree slope	Wild Land
Not applicable	Not applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: We note that existing allocation AEDDL002 is to have a planning brief produced and adopted. If AEDDL007 is to be allocated in the second LDP, we recommend that the proposed planning brief is extended in scope to include both AEDDL002 and AEDDL007. Allocation of this site should lead to update of site requirements for AEDDL002, particularly "New structure planting/ landscaping, including woodland, to improve the setting of the areas, screen and shelter development". This requirement will need review if AEDDL007 is to be delivered as part of Eddleston rather than as a perceptually isolated extension. Consideration of the potential impact of development on the River Tweed SAC has been established through the prior assessment of AEDDL002 during preparation of the current LDP. We recommend a similar approach is adopted for this site.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: This site would effectively extend Eddleston northwards by .275km beyond the allocated but as yet undeveloped AEDDL002. The site is a sloping west facing field on the east side of the A703, the western boundary is defined by the old A703 which along this section is lined by a single line of mature lime trees. The slopes are no steeper than the allocated site to south and access could be achieved from existing access points off the A703 to the north (at Cottage Bank) and to the south along the old A703. Structure shelterbelt planting using deciduous/ mixed woodland species will be essential along the eastern elevated boundary to achieve a 'landscape fit' with potential to wrap this around the north boundary to create a structural limit extent of Eddleston.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity	Near a trunk road?
	<input type="checkbox"/>

NETWORK MANAGER: No response received.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I am able to offer my support for housing development on this site, but the allocated site to the south (AEDDL002) would have to be developed first in order to integrate this proposed site with the settlement of Eddleston. In terms of access, I would be looking for the former section of public road, which runs along the western boundary of the site (Old Edinburgh Road), to be re-instated as a public road to provide access to the A703 to the north of Scots Pine Restaurant as well as well as to the A703 south near Bellfield Crescent. Access into the development site can be taken from a number of points on the former public road and a link from the allocated site to the south should also be a requirement.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No response received.

**Right of way**

Adjacent to site

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

Not applicable

**Water supply**

Limited

**Sewerage**

Limited

**Gas Supply**

No

**Education provision**

Average

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No response received.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. A Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. This proposed site is located a considerable distance from the public network. Any installation of network from site to the public sewers must be funded and carried out by the developer. These associated costs may be notable and not fully covered by Scottish Water's Reasonable Cost Contribution (RCC) scheme.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. A Water Impact Assessment (WIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. The nearest water main is some distance away and it will be the Developers responsibility to lay their water main to existing Scottish Water network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS: Core path 146 partly runs adjacent to the west side of this proposed site. Should a road be built over this then there would need to be a footpath/pavement to maintain non-vehicular access.

CONTAMINATED LAND: There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

**Overall assessment****PP status**

Excluded

**Overall assessment**

Acceptable

**Site capacity**

N/A

**Conclusions**

The site is located to the north of Eddleston, directly to the north of the existing housing allocation (AEDDL002). The site was identified as part of the 'Western Rural Growth Area: Development Options Study' which was undertaken by LUC, to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Central Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP and for the future, within the Central Tweeddale area, in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders. The site currently being considered is proposed for a longer term housing development site. It should be noted that the consultation was undertaken for site code (AEDDL007), however after the consultation the site code was altered to (SEDDL001) to reflect the longer term housing proposal.

Eddleston has good access to services, employment and public transport. Further to a site assessment, the following constraints/issues were identified, which may require mitigation;

- Flood Risk Assessment required, in respect of potential flood risk and surface water runoff on the site;
- Foul sewerage constraints, as the site is located outwith the current sewered catchment;
- Protect and enhance the existing boundary features, where possible;
- Potential protected species, including breeding birds within the site, would require mitigation;
- The Designed Landscape (SBC) and Garden and Designed Landscape (HES) 'Portmore' are located to the north of the site;
- Consideration of the potential impact of the development on the River Tweed SAC/SSSI;
- Structure shelterbelt planting using deciduous/mixed woodland species will be essential along eastern elevation boundary to achieve a 'landscape fit'
- The Roads Planning Officer advised that the proposal is acceptable. (AEDDL002) would need to be developed first, in order to integrate this proposed site within the settlement. Access into the site can be taken from a number of points along the former public road and a link to (AEDDL002) would be required;
- Potential for archaeology on the site;
- Potential for Drainage Impact Assessment, in respect of the WWTW; and

- Potential for Water Impact Assessment, in respect of the WTW.

There are no insurmountable constraints, which would prevent the development of this site for housing, subject to mitigation measures. It is acknowledged that the site immediately to the south is already allocated for housing within the LDP and remains undeveloped to date. The Roads Planning Officer has confirmed that access would need to come via the allocated housing site (AEDDL002) and that the site should be developed prior to this one.

In conclusion, given that (AEDDL002) remains undeveloped to date it is not recommended that this site will be included within the Proposed Local Development Plan at this time.

---

# Eshiels

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
BESHI001	Land at Eshiels	Eshiels	Western	Employment	N/A	4.9	Included

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable				

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not lie within any international/national designations.

SEPA RESPONSE IN RELATION TO SITE MESH1001: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Linn Burn and any small watercourses which flow through and adjacent to the site. The River Tweed may also require consideration. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site which may exacerbate flood risk. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at increased risk of flooding.

There is the potential that development on this allocation could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard on the site.

There is a water body immediately adjacent to the site. Therefore, SEPA advise that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development.

Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

There is no public foul sewer in the vicinity and if this site was to be developed this would be an opportunity to provide first time sewerage provision to Eshiels, picking up existing properties also. Any private sewage provision would be likely to require to discharge to the River Tweed rather than the Linn burn. The watercourse that runs through/adjacent to the site should be protected and enhanced as part of any development. Std comments for SUDS. Depending on the use of the proposed site there may be a requirement for permissions to be sought for certain activities from SEPA.

There are co-location issues regarding this site. Peebles STW (CAR) and Eshiels community recycling centre (WML) are located across the road and to the west of the site. These sites are however unlikely to have an impact on the site from SEPA's perspective. Possible odour issues from the STW would be dealt with by SBC Env health.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM IN RELATION TO SITE MESH1001: This site is out with the pluvial 1 in 200 year flood extents but there is a small section at the SE side (next to the road) that is shown to flood from the River Tweed. It is unlikely that a Flood Risk Assessment would be required but this would be dependent on the layout of the development. I would ask that due to the size of the development that surface water flooding is considered. I would recommend dealing with MESH1001 and MESH1002 at the same time from a flood risk perspective.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	N/A

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

**Access to public transport**

Limited

**Access to employment**

Good

**Access to services**

Good

**Wider biodiversity impacts**

Moderate

**Site aspect**

South

**Accessibility and sustainability summary**

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER ON SITE MESH1001: Moderate biodiversity impact. Site appears to be an improved pasture with mature broadleaf treeline on boundary and field boundary within site These feature on 1st Ed OS map). Small area along A72 boundary within SEPA 1 in 200 year indicative flood risk area. Potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC via the Linn burn. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats (EPS), badger and breeding birds. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC/SSSI. SEPA CAR construction site licence required (site >4ha (19.38ha)

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located at Eshiels, which is not an identified settlement within the current Local Development Plan, rather consists of a small cluster of houses and farm buildings. Immediately to the east of Eshiels, is the recreational hub of Glentress, and there is further development on the south side of the A72. Eshiels is within close proximity to Peebles, which is 2 miles to the west. As Eshiels is not a settlement, there are no services or employment opportunities at present. However, the close proximity to Peebles, including the cycle path along the former railway line, provides access to a wider range of services, employment and public transport opportunities. Furthermore, Edinburgh is within commuting distance. Bus stops are located on the main road, and there may be the potential for greater connectivity in relation to this mode of travel.

**Local impact and integration assessment****Conservation area**

Not applicable

**Open space**

Not applicable

**Listed buildings**

Not applicable

**Scheduled Monument**

Adjacent to site

**Ancient woodland inventory**

Not applicable

**Archaeology**

Adjacent to site

**Garden and designed landscape**

On/adjacent to site

**Local impact and integration summary**

HERITAGE & DESIGN RESPONSE ON MESHIE001: No additional comments from those on the original proposal – a prominent site on the approach to Peebles.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND RESPONSE ON MESHIE001: Site adjacent to SM 3667 Eshiels, Roman camps 90m SSW of No 4 Eshiels. Content with the principle of development in this area but would wish to see mitigation in the form of (a) an adequate buffer zone to protect the physical remains and setting of Eshiels Roman camps, and (b) a suitable management regime for the section of the monument within or adjacent to the development area.

ARCHAEOLOGY RESPONSE ON THIS SITE - BESHIE001: Spoke to the Archaeology Officer who advised that there is Scheduled Monument to the south east of the site and they advised that the setting of Eshiels Roman Camp to be considered in the design and layout of the site and that archaeology investigation, cultural heritage statement and appropriate mitigation thereafter would also be required.

**Landscape assessment****NSA**

Not applicable

**SLA**

On/adjacent to site

**Over 200 metres?** **Over 12 degree slope** **Wild Land**

Not applicable

**Landscape summary**

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE RESPONSE ON MESHIE001: This is a large and open site that is detached from the town of Peebles. There would likely be loss of openness and adverse effects on local landscape character experienced, particularly from the A72 and existing settled areas along the Linn Burn Road. If this site was to be considered (and noting the detached nature of the site) we would advise the need for a strong approach to place-making to be adopted in order ensure local identity and appropriate facilities, including green infrastructure. In this regard we advise that safe off-site active travel connections linking the site to the town should be secured in order to link the site through sustainable travel to nearby Peebles.

We also advise that a co-ordinated approach to landscape design, wider integration into setting and place design would also be needed and be set through a pre-agreed site development brief. Close

consideration of landscape structure and development densities should inform this approach. Existing natural features on the site should also be safeguarded and utilised in the development of the site should it be considered appropriate for development.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS RESPONSE ON MESHIE001: The logical development pattern for this relatively large block of land (circa 20 ha) would be industrial/business on the southernmost, more gently sloping fields with housing in the larger field to the north to take advantage of elevated views south across the valley to hills beyond. A masterplan will be necessary to establish the optimum access routes into the site, buffer planting to existing field boundary trees and the appropriate depth of shelterbelt planting along the southern boundary to mitigate the impacts of the development from sensitive receptors on A72.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER RESPONSE ON MESHIE001: No response received.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND RESPONSE ON MESHIE001: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER RESPONSE ON MESHIE001: Whilst I am not against the allocation of this site for mixed use development, the main consideration will be providing adequate access from the A72 to serve a development of this size. The existing access is unsuitable to support a substantial increase in dwellings. Therefore a new junction onto the A72 will be required to the west of the existing, with the existing junction closed off. A further access point will be required and can be achieved to the west of No 6 Eshiels Holdings which will help disperse traffic movements and will aid connectivity. Junction design for access to the A72 will have to be in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges and a Transport Assessment can address the most appropriate form of junctions. The site will have to connect and integrate with the existing body of Eshiels and with Site MESH1002 if it is to be developed. Options for improvements to the existing public transport infrastructure will need to be explored as will the suitability of pedestrian provision in the A72.

UPDATE: it is noted that in relation to this reduced site, Roads Planning are able to support the site and requires the creation of a single new vehicular access for the site.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT RESPONSE ON MESHIE001: No response received.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Limited

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT RESPONSE ON MESH1001: No response received.

HOUSING STRATEGY RESPONSE ON MESHIE001: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW) RESPONSE ON MESH1001: Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. A Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network .

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW) RESPONSE ON MESH1001: Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. A Water Impact Assessment (WIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM RESPONSE ON MESH1001: Requires non-vehicular links to path network and Peebles town and amenities.

CONTAMINATED LAND RESPONSE ON MESH1001: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed, with the exception of development in the north eastern corner of the site. The use of the buildings is not known but appear to possibly be agricultural/commercial in use. Therefore, part of the site is brownfield and its use may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURING SERVICES RESPONSE ON MESH1001: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH RESPONSE ON MESH1001: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM RESPONSE ON MESHIE001: No response received.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT RESPONSE ON MESH1001: This site has potential on the southern and western edge for accommodating a new industrial / business park development. We would prefer that a separate access to this site is made from the A72 rather than from a single access which would also service any proposed residential development. More detailed feasibility work is required to ascertain the best layout and access road locations before fully defining the boundary of the site allocation.

EDUCATION OFFICER RESPONSE ON MESH1001: Kingsland Primary and Halyrude RC Primary would be at full capacity if development went ahead, an extension or new school may need to be considered.

NHS RESPONSE ON MESH1001: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

## PP status

Included

## Overall assessment

Acceptable

## Site capacity

N/A

## Conclusions

The site lies at Eshiels, on the north side of the A72. It should be noted that Eshiels is not an identified settlement within the LDP, however it lies 2 miles to the east of Peebles. An enlarged site at this location was identified as part of the 'Western Rural Growth Area: Development Options Study' which was undertaken by LUC, to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Central Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP for the Central Tweeddale area, in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders. The site now identified is proposed for employment use.

Eshiels has good access to services, given its proximity to Peebles and limited access to public transport. Further to a site assessment, the following constraints/issues were identified, which may require mitigation;

- Flood Risk Assessment required, in respect of potential flood risk and surface water runoff on the site;
- Water body immediately adjacent to the site, therefore a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6m wide must be provided between the watercourse and any built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures. This is required given the watercourse(s) which run through and adjacent to the site;
- Foul sewerage constraints, as the site is located outwith the current sewered catchment;
- Possible co location issues with the Peebles and Eshiels recycling centres, located on the south of the A72;
- Potential connectivity to the River Tweed SAC/SSSI, mitigation required to ensure no likely significant effects;
- Protect and enhance the existing boundary features;
- Potential protected species, including breeding birds within the site, would require mitigation;
- Scheduled Monument 'Roman Camp' is located to the south east corner of the site, this would require appropriate mitigation measures;
- Site is located within the 'Eshiels' Designed Landscape (SBC);
- Archaeology HER's within the site, potential mitigation required;
- The site is prominent from the approach to Peebles;
- Historic Environment Scotland have set out mitigation requirements in respect of the proximity to the Scheduled Monument, including a) an adequate buffer zone to protect the physical remains and setting of Eshiels Roman camps, and (b) a suitable management regime for the section of the monument within or adjacent to the development area, however it is noted that this is a reduced site that does not abut the Scheduled Monument
- Located within the 'Tweed Valley' Special Landscape Area;
- There will be a requirement for a co-ordinated approach to landscape design and the wider integration into the setting and place design;
- Shelterbelt planting would be required along the southern boundary of the site, to mitigate the impacts of development from sensitive receptors on the A72;
- A new junction would be required onto the A72;
- Transport Assessment/Statement would be required;
- Potential for Drainage Impact Assessment, in respect of the WWTW;
- Potential for Water Impact Assessment, in respect of the WTW;
- Potential for contamination; and
- Economic Development advise that the site has potential on the southern and western edges for accommodating a new industrial/business park development.

Overall, taking the above into consideration, it is noted that there are a number of identified constraints within the site, however it is considered that there are no insurmountable planning issues which cannot be overcome through appropriate mitigation measures. The site is therefore proposed for Business and Industrial use within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

<b>Site reference</b> AESHI001	<b>Site name</b> Land at Eshiels III	<b>Settlement</b> Eshiels	<b>SDA</b> Western	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 75	<b>Ha</b> 7.5	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site does not lie within the SEPA 1 in 200 year fluvial (river) or pluvial (surface water) flood extents. However, there are two small burns / ditches that run to the South and West of the sites that are not modelled within SEPA's flood mapping due to their small size. I would require that the applicant considers the potential surface water flood risk from these two burns. If the applicant cannot suitably show there is no flood risk to the site from these burns / ditches then a FRA may be required.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourses which bound the site. Consideration should be given to any culverts/bridges might may exacerbate flood risk. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at an increased risk of flooding.

We note that there is a watercourse immediately adjacent to this site. We therefore recommend that a development requirement is attached to these sites to ensure that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6m wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

A culverted watercourse may run through this site. There may be opportunities to restore the water environment to its natural state by removing the culvert. We therefore recommend that a development requirement is attached to this site requiring a feasibility study including a flood risk assessment to be undertaken prior to development to assess the potential for channel restoration.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> 01/01648/FUL - Extensions to dwelling house - Falla Brae on part of the site.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Limited	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> South-west
----------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

South and south-westerly site aspect.

ECOLOGY: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact

Site appears to be improved pasture. Hedgerow, mature broad-leaved trees (lowland mixed deciduous) on the boundary and an area of young tree (plantation) within the site. Potential connectivity to River

Tweed SAC via the Linn burn. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats (lighting), badger and breeding birds. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC. SEPA CAR construction site licence required (site >4ha) (7.53ha)

## Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area	Open space	Listed buildings	Scheduled Monument	Ancient woodland inventory	Archaeology	Garden and designed landscape
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	On/adjacent to site

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY: Greenfield with hints of medieval rig and furrow suggesting good preservation. Good deal of prehistoric and medieval evidence in the area. Site has a moderate potential. Evaluation required.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Significant scale of development away from the valley floor. Will potentially have an adverse impact on the character of the area.

## Landscape assessment

NSA	SLA	Over 200 metres?	Over 12 degree slope	Wild Land
Not applicable	On site	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not applicable

### Landscape summary

The site is located within the Tweed Valley Special Landscape Area.

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: We have not previously commented on this site. However, we refer to the advice given on MESH1001 and MESH1002 in our MIR response:

“Development of this site would lead to a significant change in the landscape character of this area, which is currently rural and with dispersed dwellings. Despite its relative proximity to Peebles development of 75 houses on this site has the potential to be detrimental to landscape character and would lead to an isolated and low density development that is physically and perceptually detached from the town.

The draft site requirements in the MIR propose that planting, landscaping and shelterbelts will be required to provide mitigation and help integrate the site with its surroundings. At this location, we consider that such measures would change the character of this section of the Innerleithen Road, losing the sense of openness and views across this site towards Cardie Hill and Ven Law.

We consider that if allocating this site is required in order to meet housing requirements, part allocation in the southern part of the proposed site around Eshiels Steadings in the flatter part of the site should be considered. Development here would form a less dominant feature and would relate to the existing road and buildings. It would also be within an area where existing boundary features could be strengthened to further reduce impacts.

As with MESH1002, we strongly advise that if this site is to be allocated, in full or in part, that the placemaking aims for the site are clearly articulated in advance. We suggest that in combination with the neighbouring site at MESH1002, the design intention for neighbourhood functions, the urban form, the density of development and the approach to design led landscape mitigation, across both sites should be clearly set out by the LDP. We advise that in order to produce a coherent approach to a new settlement pattern in this location, an integrated approach to urban form which considers views and design relationship/ set back of development from the A72, will be required through a clearly communicated site development brief.

We also advise that measures to support sustainable transport in the form of safe cycling and walking to Peebles, along the A72 are considered through the site requirements and in association with MESH1002.”

The interest in developing sites around Eshiels demonstrates that extent, design solutions and phasing depends heavily on how all of the potential allocations (MESH1001, MESH1002 and AESHI001) are resolved and how any resulting allocation would relate to existing development and other potential allocations. This would include future aspirations for the development of the neighbouring facilities at Glentress.

The extent of this possible development leads us to suggest that a Development Boundary may be required for Eshiels. We consider it likely that its proximity to both Peebles and Glentress will lead to further development pressure. Allocating a Development Boundary would support the preparation of a Settlement Profile that would establish placemaking principles and help to guide future development of this area through LDP2 and beyond, while maintaining the key characteristics of the area.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

## Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Additional traffic on minor road off A72. May need to consider a right-turn lane.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Pedestrian links to and provision of bus stop infrastructure on A72 required. Pedestrian crossing/lights adjacent to bus stop.

ROADS PLANNING: The existing access road leading to this site is unable to support the level of development proposed and upgrading of the road is difficult due to its constrained nature. The only feasible way to access this site would be via Site MESH1002 which is also currently under consideration as part of the LDP2 process.

If this site is to be developed it will have to be demonstrated that it can connect and integrate with the existing building groups at Eshiels as well as with Site MESH1002.

MESH1002 requires the junction with the A72 to be relocated and that site would have to be developed in order to allow for access to AESHI001 to be developed.

A Transport Assessment will be required in due course for this level of development.

In summary I have no objections in principle to this site being allocated on the proviso that it can only be developed if Site MESH1002 is developed first and that it can be demonstrated that the site can connect and integrate with the existing building groups at Eshiels as well as Site MESH1002.

PG/DJI

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Limited

### Sewerage

No

### Gas Supply

Limited

### Education provision

Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed.

There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: CM - Worth investigating but again issues with steeply rising land. Would need public road upgrading from A72. Impacts on SLA and also expansion area too large in scale compared to building group. Better with sites adjoining A72.

RD - A large site which would probably have access issues. The road network from the A72 to the site is constrained.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: EN = The access authority will request non-vehicular links to the existing path network and the main road; specifically links to promoted route 8 in the Paths around Peebles booklet that follows the edge of Glentress Forest round to Peebles. These links are important in terms of facilitating access to the existing path network and mitigating against irresponsible access through farmland.

SCOTTISH WATER - WASTE: Private WWTW no connection to Peebles WWTW.

SCOTTISH WATER - WATER: There is a current growth Project for Bonnycraig WTW (Peebles). A Water Impact Assessment would probably be required.

SEPA: Water Enviro: This is a large proposed development within an area outwith Scottish Waters foul sewer network and not near to any large dilution watercourse. It is also in an area where there is already a proliferation of private drainage systems discharging into the Linn Burn. It therefore appears unlikely that the development could proceed based on lack of foul drainage options. The watercourses to the west and south of the site must be protected during any development and would not be suitable to receive a discharge of sewage from this development.

---

## Overall assessment

### PP status

Excluded

### Overall assessment

Unacceptable

### Site capacity

75

## Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the MIR public consultation. The site has good access to public transport, services and employment.

The site is Unacceptable as there is the potential for archaeology, Scottish Natural Heritage are of the opinion that development at this location has potential to have an adverse impact on the character of the area. It is noted that the site falls within the Tweed Valley Special Landscape Area.

Roads Planning state that vehicular access would be required off MESH1002 and this site would also need to integrate with established development. As site MESH1002 is not proposed for inclusion in the Plan, this site can not be supported.

In addition, following further investigation regarding access and in discussion with Historic Environment Scotland, it has been found that the necessary upgrade to the existing Eshiels junction that was necessary in the consideration of site MESH1001 and MESH1002 can not be undertaken without impacting negatively on the Scheduled Monument, for that reason, HES are unable to support the required

works needed to bring these sites forward.

Therefore, in conclusion the site will not be included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

---

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
MESHI001	Land at Eshiels I	Eshiels	Western	Mixed Use	200	19.4	Excluded

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable				

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not lie within any international/national designations.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Linn Burn and any small watercourses which flow through and adjacent to the site. The River Tweed may also require consideration. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site which may exacerbate flood risk. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at increased risk of flooding.

There is the potential that development on this allocation could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard on the site.

There is a water body immediately adjacent to the site. Therefore, SEPA advise that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

There is no public foul sewer in the vicinity and if this site was to be developed this would be an opportunity to provide first time sewerage provision to Eshiels, picking up existing properties also. Any private sewage provision would be likely to require to discharge to the River Tweed rather than the Linn burn. The watercourse that runs through/adjacent to the site should be protected and enhanced as part of any development. Std comments for SUDS. Depending on the use of the proposed site there may be a requirement for permissions to be sought for certain activities from SEPA.

There are co-location issues regarding this site. Peebles STW (CAR) and Eshiels community recycling centre (WML) are located across the road and to the west of the site. These sites are however unlikely to have an impact on the site from SEPA's perspective. Possible odour issues from the STW would be dealt with by SBC Env health.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with the pluvial 1 in 200 year flood extents but there is a small section at the SE side (next to the road) that is shown to flood from the River Tweed. It is unlikely that a Flood Risk Assessment would be required but this would be dependent on the layout of the development. I would ask that due to the size of the development that surface water flooding is considered. I would recommend dealing with MESHI001 and MESHI002 at the same time from a flood risk perspective.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	Planning consent for a dwellinghouse in the north eastern corner of the site. (16/00497/PPP). The site was considered, as part of a larger site, in the Local Development Plan (BPEEB005). The south west part of the site, was previously considered, in the Local Development Plan (BPEEB006).

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

**Access to public transport**

Limited

**Access to employment**

Good

**Access to services**

Good

**Wider biodiversity impacts**

Moderate

**Site aspect**

South

**Accessibility and sustainability summary**

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Moderate biodiversity impact. Site appears to be an improved pasture with mature broadleaf treeline on boundary and field boundary within site These feature on 1st Ed OS map). Small area along A72 boundary within SEPA 1 in 200 year indicative flood risk area. Potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC via the Linn burn. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats (EPS), badger and breeding birds. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC/SSSI. SEPA CAR construction site licence required (site >4ha (19.38ha)

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located at Eshiels, which is not an identified settlement within the current Local Development Plan, rather consists of a small cluster of houses, farm buildings and a sawmill. Immediately to the east of Eshiels, is the recreational hub of Glentress, and there is further development on the south side of the A72. Eshiels is within close proximity to Peebles, which is 2 miles to the west. As Eshiels is not a settlement, there are no services or employment opportunities at present. However, the close proximity to Peebles, including the cycle path along the former railway line, provides access to a wider range of services, employment and public transport opportunities. Furthermore, Edinburgh is within commuting distance.

**Local impact and integration assessment****Conservation area**

Not applicable

**Open space**

Not applicable

**Listed buildings**

Not applicable

**Scheduled Monument**

On/adjacent to site

**Ancient woodland inventory**

Not applicable

**Archaeology**

On/adjacent to site

**Garden and designed landscape**

On/adjacent to site

**Local impact and integration summary**

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No additional comments from those on the original proposal – a prominent site on the approach to Peebles.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Site adjacent to SM 3667 Eshiels, Roman camps 90m SSW of No 4 Eshiels. Content with the principle of development in this area but would wish to see mitigation in the form of (a) an adequate buffer zone to protect the physical remains and setting of Eshiels Roman camps, and (b) a suitable management regime for the section of the monument within or adjacent to the development area.

HES RESPONSE IN RELATION TO POTENTIAL WIDENING OF ROADS ADJACENT TO SM: If the widening is required to facilitate a new development, we would have significant concerns and recommend that an alternative route be sought.

If the widening is required to ensure safety for the existing use of the junction e.g. if there is an understanding that current users are at unacceptable risk right now, then we would have to seriously consider any application put forward for SMC on that basis. If an application were to be submitted, we would expect it to be supported by a thorough scheme for archaeological mitigation, and to provide full justification/explanation as to why the works were necessary and the need could not be met in a way that did not impact on the monument.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Spoke to the Archaeology Officer who advised that there is Scheduled Monument in the south east corner of the site. There is also a ring ditch within the site and there is potential for prehistoric burials and cemetery within the site. Justification likely against LDP policies.

**Landscape assessment****NSA**

Not applicable

**SLA**

On/adjacent to site

**Over 200 metres?** **Over 12 degree slope** **Wild Land**

Not applicable

**Landscape summary**

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: This is a large and open site that is detached from the town of Peebles. There would likely be loss of openness and adverse effects on local landscape character experienced, particularly from the A72 and existing settled areas along the Linn Burn Road. If this site was to be considered (and noting the detached nature of the site) we would advise the need for a strong approach to place-making to be adopted in order ensure local identity and appropriate facilities, including green infrastructure. In this regard we advise that safe off-site active travel connections linking

the site to the town should be secured in order to link the site through sustainable travel to nearby Peebles.

We also advise that a co-ordinated approach to landscape design, wider integration into setting and place design would also be needed and be set through a pre-agreed site development brief. Close consideration of landscape structure and development densities should inform this approach. Existing natural features on the site should also be safeguarded and utilised in the development of the site should it be considered appropriate for development.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: The logical development pattern for this relatively large block of land (circa 20 ha) would be industrial/business on the southernmost, more gently sloping fields with housing in the larger field to the north to take advantage of elevated views south across the valley to hills beyond. A masterplan will be necessary to establish the optimum access routes into the site, buffer planting to existing field boundary trees and the appropriate depth of shelterbelt planting along the southern boundary to mitigate the impacts of the development from sensitive receptors on A72.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: No response received.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: Whilst I am not against the allocation of this site for mixed use development, the main consideration will be providing adequate access from the A72 to serve a development of this size. The existing access is unsuitable to support a substantial increase in dwellings. Therefore a new junction onto the A72 will be required to the west of the existing, with the existing junction closed off. A further access point will be required and can be achieved to the west of No 6 Eshiels Holdings which will help disperse traffic movements and will aid connectivity. Junction design for access to the A72 will have to be in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges and a Transport Assessment can address the most appropriate form of junctions. The site will have to connect and integrate with the existing body of Eshiels and with Site MESH1002 if it is to be developed. Options for improvements to the existing public transport infrastructure will need to be explored as will the suitability of pedestrian provision in the A72.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No response received.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

On/adjacent to site

### Water supply

Limited

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No response received.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. A Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. A Water Impact Assessment (WIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Requires non-vehicular links to path network and Peebles town and amenities.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed, with the exception of development in the north eastern corner of the site. The use of the buildings is not known but appear to possibly be agricultural/commercial in use. Therefore, part of the site is brownfield and its use may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURING SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: This site has potential on the southern and western edge for accommodating a new industrial / business park development. We would prefer that a separate access to this site is made from the A72 rather than from a single access which would also service any proposed residential development. More detailed feasibility work is required to ascertain the best layout and access road locations before fully defining the boundary of the site allocation.

EDUCATION OFFICER: Kingsland Primary and Halyrude RC Primary would be at full capacity if development went ahead, an extension or new school may need to be considered.

NHS: No response received.

## Overall assessment

### PP status

Excluded

### Overall assessment

Unacceptable

### Site capacity

200

### Conclusions

The site lies at Eshiels, on the north side of the A72. It should be noted that Eshiels is not an identified settlement within the LDP, however lies 2 miles to the east of Peebles. The site was identified as part of the 'Western Rural Growth Area: Development Options Study' which was undertaken by LUC, to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Central Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP for the Central Tweeddale area, in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders. The site currently being considered, is proposed for a mixed use development with an indicative site capacity for 200 units.

The site was identified as a preferred option within the Main Issues Report however, following further investigation regarding access and in discussion with Historic Environment Scotland, it has been found that the necessary upgrade to the existing Eshiels junction can not be undertaken without impacting negatively on the Scheduled Monument, for that reason, HES are unable to support the required works needed to bring the site forward.

In addition, it is noted that from the MIR public consultation, not all of the land owners of the site were willing to release their land for development.

Overall, taking the above into consideration, it is not recommended to allocate site MESH1001 within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b>	<b>Site name</b>	<b>Settlement</b>	<b>SDA</b>	<b>Proposed Use</b>	<b>Indicative Capacity</b>	<b>Ha</b>	<b>PP status</b>
MESHI002	Land at Eshiels II	Eshiels	Western	Mixed Use	40	6.7	Excluded

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b>	<b>SAC</b>	<b>SPA</b>	<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
1:200	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

The site is not located within any international/national designation.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Linn Burn, Eshiels Burn and small watercourses which flow through and adjacent to the site. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site which may exacerbate flood risk as well as any transfer of water between catchments. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at increased risk of flooding. Site may be constrained due to flood risk.

There is the potential that development on this allocation could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard on the site.

There is a water body immediately adjacent to the site. Therefore, SEPA advise that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

There is no public foul sewer in the vicinity and if this site was to be developed this would be an opportunity to provide first time sewerage provision to Eshiels, picking up existing properties also. Any private sewage provision would be likely to require to discharge to the River Tweed rather than the Linn burn. The watercourse that runs through/adjacent to the site should be protected and enhanced as part of any development. Std comments for SUDS. Depending on the use of the proposed site there may be a requirement for permissions to be sought for certain activities from SEPA.

There are co-location issues regarding this site. Peebles STW (CAR) and Eshiels community recycling centre (WML) are located across the road and to the west of the site. These sites are however unlikely to have an impact on the site from SEPA's perspective. Possible odour issues from the STW would be dealt with by SBC Env health.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with the pluvial 1 in 200 year flood extents but there is a small section at the south side that is shown to flood from the River Tweed. It is unlikely that a Flood Risk Assessment would be required but this would be dependent on the layout of the development. I would ask that due to the size of the development that surface water flooding is considered. I would recommend dealing with MESHI001 and MESHI002 at the same time from a flood risk perspective.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b>	<b>Planning history references</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	There is no planning application history. The site has not previously been considered as part of any Local Plan.

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

**Access to public transport**

Limited

**Access to employment**

Good

**Access to services**

Good

**Wider biodiversity impacts**

Moderate

**Site aspect**

South-west

**Accessibility and sustainability summary**

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Moderate biodiversity risk. Site appears to be an improved pasture with mature broadleaf treeline on boundary and field boundary within site (these feature on 1st Ed OS map). The Southern boundary is within SEPA 1 in 200 year indicative flood risk area. Potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC via the Linn burn. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats (EPS), badger and breeding birds. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC/SSSI. SEPA CAR construction site licence required (site >4ha).

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located at Eshiels, which is not an identified settlement within the current Local Development Plan, rather consists of a small cluster of houses, farm buildings and a sawmill. Immediately to the east of Eshiels, is the recreational hub of Glentress, and there is further development on the south side of the A72. Eshiels is within close proximity to Peebles, which is 2 miles to the west. As Eshiels is not a settlement, there are no services or employment opportunities at present. However, the close proximity to Peebles, including the cycle path along the former railway line, provides access to a wider range of services, employment and public transport opportunities. Furthermore, Edinburgh is within commuting distance.

**Local impact and integration assessment****Conservation area**

Not applicable

**Open space**

Not applicable

**Listed buildings**

Not applicable

**Scheduled Monument**

Adjacent to site

**Ancient woodland inventory**

Not applicable

**Archaeology**

On/adjacent to site

**Garden and designed landscape**

On/adjacent to site

**Local impact and integration summary**

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No LB or CA issues. If MESH001 is developed, then, with this site as well, there will be a significant coalescence of development on the N side of the Tweed.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Site adjacent to SM 3667 Eshiels, Roman camps 90m SSW of No 4 Eshiels. Content with the principle of development in this area but have concerns that such a large allocation would require significant upgrades to access and service routes (water sewerage etc) that could have a direct physical impact on the scheduled remains. We would wish to see mitigation in the form of (a) an adequate buffer zone to protect the physical remains and setting of Eshiels Roman camps, (b) a suitable management regime for the section of the monument adjacent to the development area, and (c) any upgrades to road and service infrastructure necessitated by the development should be designed to avoid the scheduled monument.

HES RESPONSE IN RELATION TO POTENTIAL WIDENING OF ROADS ADJACENT TO SM: If the widening is required to facilitate a new development, we would have significant concerns and recommend that an alternative route be sought.

If the widening is required to ensure safety for the existing use of the junction e.g. if there is an understanding that current users are at unacceptable risk right now, then we would have to seriously consider any application put forward for SMC on that basis. If an application were to be submitted, we would expect it to be supported by a thorough scheme for archaeological mitigation, and to provide full justification/explanation as to why the works were necessary and the need could not be met in a way that did not impact on the monument.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Spoke to the Archaeology Officer who advised that there is a Scheduled Monument located to the south of the site. Also evidence of Roman Camps (unscheduled) into the site.

**Landscape assessment****NSA**

Not applicable

**SLA**

On/adjacent to site

**Over 200 metres?** **Over 12 degree slope** **Wild Land**

Not applicable

**Landscape summary**

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: This is a medium sized and open site that is detached from the town of Peebles. There would likely be loss of openness and adverse effects on local landscape character experienced, particularly from the A72 and existing settled areas along the Linn Burn Road, as well as the Glentress lodges and recreational area. We note however that there is a degree of set-back on this site from the A72 and this may aid integration with local landscape character. If this site was to be considered (and noting the detached nature of the site) we would advise the need for a strong approach to place-making to be adopted in order ensure local identity and appropriate facilities, including green infrastructure. In this regard we advise that safe off-site active travel connections linking the site to the

town should be secured in order to link the site through sustainable travel to nearby Peebles.

We also advise that a co-ordinated approach to landscape design, wider integration into setting and place design would also be needed and be set through a pre-agreed site development brief. Close consideration of landscape structure and development densities should inform this approach. Existing natural features on the site should also be safeguarded and utilised in the development of the site, should it be considered appropriate for development.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: This site, if constraints associated with access can be overcome, would be best suited to housing development, largely restricted to the upper ¾ of the site – the southern ¼ could be utilised for access and structure planting to mitigate effects of any development.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: No response received.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: Whilst I am not against the allocation of this site for mixed use development, the main consideration will be providing adequate access from the A72 to serve a development of this size. The existing access is unsuitable to support a substantial increase in dwellings. Therefore a new junction onto the A72 will be required to the west of the existing, with the existing junction closed off. Junction design for access to the A72 will have to be in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges and a Transport Assessment can address the most appropriate form of junction. The main access point into this site will need to be at the south westerly corner and the road between here and the new junction with the A72 will need to be upgraded to an appropriate standard. The site will have to connect and integrate with the existing body of Eshiels and with Site MESH10010 if it is to be developed. Pedestrian/cycle links with the Glentress Centre will be required and the merits of vehicular connectivity can be considered as part of the Transport Assessment. It should be noted that the southerly portion of this site is used as overspill parking for the Glentress Centre and any development on this site may need to take this into consideration. Options for improvements to the existing public transport infrastructure will need to be explored as will the suitability of pedestrian provision in the A72.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No response received.

### Right of way

On/adjacent to site

### TPOs

Adjacent to site

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Limited

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No response received.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. A Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. A Water Impact Assessment (WIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Requires non-vehicular links to path network and Peebles town and amenities.

CONTAMINATED LAND: There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: This mixed use site would appear to be more appropriate for commercial / tourism based mixed use development rather than for business / industrial uses. However, some class 4 or craft workshop use, tied towards serving the Glentress Tweed Valley Forest Park development tourist visitors, may be desirable.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues raised.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

<b>PP status</b>	<b>Overall assessment</b>	<b>Site capacity</b>
<b>Excluded</b>	Unacceptable	40

### **Conclusions**

The site lies at Eshiels, on the north side of the A72. It should be noted that Eshiels is not an identified settlement within the LDP, however lies 2 miles to the east of Peebles. The site was identified as part of the 'Western Rural Growth Area: Development Options Study' which was undertaken by LUC, to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Central Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP for the Central Tweeddale area, in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders. The site currently being considered, is proposed for a mixed use development with an indicative site capacity for 40 units.

The site was identified as a preferred option within the Main Issues Report however, following further investigation regarding access and in discussion with Historic Environment Scotland, it has been found that the necessary upgrade to the existing Eshiels junction can not be undertaken without impacting negatively on the Scheduled Monument, for that reason, HES are unable to support the required works needed to bring the site forward. In addition, it is also noted that not all landowners were supportive of releasing their land for development.

Overall, taking the above into consideration, it is not recommended to allocate site MESH1002 within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

---

# Heriot Station

<b>Site reference</b> AHERI003	<b>Site name</b> Heriot East	<b>Settlement</b> Heriot Station	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 5	<b>Ha</b> 0.4	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site does not lie within the SEPA 1 in 200 year fluvial (river) or pluvial (surface water) flood extents. As such, I would have no objections to this site on the grounds of flood risk.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Gala Water. Consideration should be given to any culverts/bridges might may exacerbate flood risk and blockage scenarios will require investigation. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at an increased risk of flooding. Site may be heavily constrained due to flood risk and may not be suitable for housing.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Brownfield	<b>Planning history references</b> N/A. The site was used as part of the construction of the railway, for storage of materials.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Limited	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Limited	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> South-west
----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

The site is adjacent to the railway however there is no station in Heriot, the nearest stations are Stow and Newtongrange.

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site appears to be bare ground (former construction compound) with an area of wet grassland at the north end and birch scrub along the A7 boundary. Possible connectivity with Gala water (65m to south) and River Tweed SAC, but no clear drainage link. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats (lighting), badger, breeding birds, reptiles and amphibia. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY: Site of railway station and 19th century post-office. Some mitigation may be required.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific H&D issues. The site was previously occupied by the station and goods sidings. The site is v close to the railway line and care will be needed to consider how some degree of acoustic insulation can be achieved?

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

Although the site is above 200m elevation, it is not considered that the site is in an elevated position.

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to size of site.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Very poor site sandwiched between railway and A72. Access is off busy A7 and too short a length for introducing a reduced speed limit.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding development on this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I am not in favour of the development of this land for housing. Access onto the derestricted A7 would be close to the bend in the road and this may result in rear end shunts. Furthermore, it is good practice to limit the extent of direct access to derestricted lengths of principal road. There also appears to be a requirement for access to the railway line at this location evidenced by the existence of a Network Rail permanent access point. Furthermore, the site is on the wrong side of the railway to be considered as an extension of the village so that there would be no real scope for proper street connectivity and integration.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Limited

### Sewerage

No

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have been developed as a railway station and siding. The site is brownfield land and its use may present development constraints.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: CC - This site is divorced from the village in an exposed location. It will not relate sympathetically to the village, and its location between the railway and road is likely to be a significant issue in terms of potential noise and vibration. This is not an appropriate site for housing development in my view.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: Background noise levels from transport are unknown but due to the site being bordered by the A7 to the east and Borders Railway to the west, it is possible that noise and

vibration levels may be higher than Environmental Health can accept.  
OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: EN = no comments required.  
SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): A Flow & Pressure test would probably be required.  
SCOTTISH WATER (Ww): No WWTW network.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	5

### Conclusions

This is was submitted for consideration as part of the MIR consultation process.

Previously the site has been used during the construction of the Borders railway, for storage of materials. The site has moderate biodiversity impact, and there may be the potential for archaeology on the site for which mitigation may be required. There is limited access to public transport, services and employment. Due to its location the site is separate from the rest of the settlement, physically separated by the railway and the Gala Water. The site abuts the railway line and the A7, meaning noise and vibration levels may be higher than can be accepted by Environmental Health. Roads planning do not support the site as access onto the derestricted A7 would be close to the bend in the road and this may result in rear end shunts. Furthermore, it is good practice to limit the extent of direct access to derestricted lengths of principal road. There also appears to be a requirement for access to the railway line at this location evidenced by the existence of a Network Rail permanent access point. Furthermore, the site is on the wrong side of the railway to be considered as an extension of the village so that there would be no real scope for proper street connectivity and integration.

Taking into consideration the above points, the site will not be included in the Proposed Plan.

---

# Innerleithen

---

<b>Site reference</b> AINNE004	<b>Site name</b> Kirklands/Willowbank II	<b>Settlement</b> Innerleithen	<b>SDA</b> Western	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 150	<b>Ha</b> 7.8	<b>PP status</b> Retain LDP Site
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------

---

## Initial assessment

**Floodrisk**                      **SAC**                                      **SPA**                                      **SSSI**                                      **Ramsar**

### Initial assessment summary

The site is already allocated for the proposed use within the current Local Development Plan and it is the intention of the council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2.

---

## Background information

**Minerals and coal**      **NNR**                      **Prime Quality  
Agricultural Land**      **Current use/s**      **Planning history references**

---

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

**Access to public transport**                      **Access to employment**                      **Access to services**                      **Wider biodiversity impacts**                      **Site aspect**

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

**Conservation area**      **Open space**                      **Listed buildings**                      **Scheduled Monument**                      **Ancient woodland  
inventory**                      **Archaeology**                      **Garden and  
designed landscape**

### Local impact and integration summary

---

## Landscape assessment

---

NSA

SLA

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

Wild Land

## Landscape summary

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

Right of way

TPOs

Contaminated land

Water supply

Sewerage

Gas Supply

Education provision

Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

SCOTTISH WATER - WASTE: Walkerburn WwTW has sufficient capacity. Part 3 upgrades required from the existing sewer from Innerleithen to Walkerburn.

SCOTTISH WATER - WATER: Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

EDUCATION OFFICER: Extension or New School may need to be considered.

---

## Overall assessment

**PP status**

**Overall assessment**

**Site capacity**

Retain LDP Site

150

### Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the Call for Sites process. However, the site is already allocated for the proposed use within the LDP. It is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2.

---

<b>Site reference</b> AINNE008	<b>Site name</b> South of Peebles Road	<b>Settlement</b> Innerleithen	<b>SDA</b> Western	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 75	<b>Ha</b> 6.8	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Adjacent to site	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

Surface water floodrisk on site.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the River Tweed. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map and steep topography indicates that there may be flooding issues adjacent to this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.

SEPA require a flood risk assessment (FRA) to be included as a site specific developer requirement prior to any development occurring on the site, and that the findings are used to inform the scale, layout and form of development.

Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. There maybe capacity issues at the STW. SW should confirm the position.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site in places within the 1 in 200 year surface water flood extent. I would have no objections on the grounds of flood risk however due to the size of the development I would require that surface water and SUDS is considered. Drainage Impact Assessment and SUDS required.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> Housing SG: AINNE008 was considered for housing and not included. LPA: Eastern part of the site AINNE001 was considered for housing.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> South
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	-----------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: It should be noted that the Ecology Officer did not provide detailed comments in respect of the consultation for (AINNE008). However, provided the following comments for the subsequent consultation on (MINNE003) which has the same site boundary.

Moderate biodiversity impact. Site appears to be an improved pasture with an area of scrub in the western corner and scrub and grassland along the disused railway. Provisional Local Biodiversity Site along old railway line (Innerleithen disused railway). Redshank, oystercatcher, lapwing and curlew recorded in Tetrad NT331 in breeding season. Site adjacent to SEPA 1 in 200 year indicative flood risk area. No obvious drainage linkage but on a precautionary basis potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC/ SSSI. Protect boundary features on disused railway and mitigation for protected species potentially badger and breeding birds. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC/SSSI. SEPA CAR construction site licence required (site >4ha).

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the west of Innerleithen. Innerleithen has good access to public transport, services and employment opportunities. There is a bus stop within walking distance

of this site, with good connectivity to Galashiels, Edinburgh and other settlements, including Peebles. Peebles is located 7 miles to the west, which also provides a wider range of services and employment opportunities. There is a primary school located within Innerleithen and the nearest High School is within Peebles. There are moderate biodiversity issues, which are highlighted in the consultation response from the Ecology Officer.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	On/adjacent to site	Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: The south east corner of the area contains the known site of a formerly Scheduled Roman camp. This should be avoided for preservation in situ. The remainder of the site may contain evidence for a Roman road. There is more generally archaeological potential given its topographic location. Evaluation will be required.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific comment.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: They did not provide a response to the consultation for (AINNE008), however provided the following response for (MINNE003) - 'Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site'.

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
Not applicable	On/adjacent to site			On/adjacent to site

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: Did not provide a consultation response in respect of the initial consultation for (AINNE008). However, provided the following response in respect of the consultation for (MINNE003), which is the same site. The overall assessment in Appendix 10 of the Housing SG was that the site should be excluded for the following reason: 'It is considered that the site forms part of the setting of Innerleithen, should development occur at this location it is considered that it would result in a dominant element on the western approach into the settlement and have a negative impact on the Tweed Valley SLA. There is also the potential for the site to impact on archaeology, in addition there is already substantial allocated land within the settlement.'. We agree with the assessment of potential landscape impacts and consider that the site should remain unallocated. Partial allocation could however be considered if there was a wider or over-riding need for housing in this area. In such circumstances close attention should be paid to allocations and site briefings which allow retain open views to the wider landscape as experienced from the road and existing dwellings.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: Did not provide a response for the consultation on (AINNE008). However, provided the following response for the consultation on (MINNE003). The site is a large field to the south of A72 approaching Innerleithen from the west. The ground slopes steeply down from the A72 before levelling out in the south eastern part that borders the existing settlement boundary west of Buchan Place off Traquair Road. Careful consideration will be required to achieve a scheme of structure planting that mitigates the visual impact of the development when seen from the elevated A72 coming into Innerleithen from the west, while maintaining views southward across the Tweed valley.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

<b>Physical access/road capacity</b>	<b>Near a trunk road?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------

NETWORK MANAGER: Any new access to/from the A72 will be off a section of carriageway where there has been an accident issue in recent years. Improvements made recently including making 40 mph. PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comment.

ROADS PLANNING: I have no objections to the allocation of this site. There is ample opportunity for the easterly portion of the site to be well integrated with and connected to the surrounding street network i.e. Tweed View and Angle Park. The close proximity of the multi-use path to the south of the site offers a great opportunity to provide a pedestrian/cycle link to the site. I would not necessarily rule out direct access from the A72 into the site, however this would need to be carefully designed to ensure the appropriate gradients and visibility splays can be achieved. A strong street frontage would help have a

positive impact on driver behaviour along this section of the A72.

A Transport Assessment will be a prerequisite for development on this site to address matters of accessibility and sustainable transport.

#### Right of way

Adjacent to site

#### TPOs

Not applicable

#### Contaminated land

Not applicable

#### Water supply

Limited

#### Sewerage

Limited

#### Gas Supply

Yes

#### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT:** The following comments were made as part of the consultation for (MINNE003). The site lies to the south west of the town immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary edge and would appear to be a logical extension of the town. The land slopes from the main public road A72 south to the River Tweed SAC. The site lies within the Tweed Valley Special Landscape Area. The site will be visible from main public road A72 on approach from Peebles and would become the new edge of the settlement. Landscaping would be an important consideration in order to soften the edge of any development. Low density development of high quality may appropriate for edge of settlement area. The site lies immediately north and adjacent to an area which is considered to be at a high risk of flooding from the River Tweed (SAC) and is thus a potentially vulnerable area. Surface water drainage may be an issue/would require to be considered. Potential for access from existing development may be a consideration. West end of site is steeper and located adjacent to sharp bend in the A72.

**HOUSING STRATEGY:** No comments.

**SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW):** Walkerburn WwTW has sufficient capacity. Part 3 upgrades required from the existing sewer from Innerleithen to Walkerburn.

**SCOTTISH WATER (WTW):** Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

**OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM:** Connecting paths to existing pavements and possibly existing path network; certainly consideration in the layout design should consider non-vehicular movement into the countryside creating passage ways between houses.

**CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER:** The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

**NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES:** No response received.

**ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH:** No response received.

**PROJECTS TEAM:** No comments.

**EDUCATION OFFICER:** Extension or New School may need to be considered. Primary School would be at full/over capacity if this development went ahead.

**NHS:** No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

#### PP status

Excluded

#### Overall assessment

Acceptable

#### Site capacity

75

### Conclusions

The site lies to the west of Innerleithen, just outwith the settlement boundary, on the south side of the A72. The site was submitted as part of the 'Call for Sites' process, for consideration as housing. It should be noted that the site was considered as part of the Housing SG for housing development and was ultimately not included. An initial Stage 1 RAG assessment was undertaken as part of the Housing SG. It is acknowledged that concerns were raised in the conclusions at that stage, regarding the prominent location, impact upon the SLA and potential archaeology.

However since that assessment, a more extensive study of the Central Tweeddale area has been undertaken by LUC, in order to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Central Tweeddale. The site was one option put forward for consideration, in respect of a mixed use site. A re-assessment has therefore been undertaken, in light of the additional information contained within the LUC Study and consultation responses. It should also be noted that there are a lack of suitable development opportunities within the Tweeddale area going forward. It is acknowledged that the landowners provided the following additional information as part of the Call for Sites process; Access Appraisal, Archaeology Appraisal, Constraints & Opportunities Plan and Development Framework Plan.

Innerleithen has good access to public transport, services and employment, given the proximity to Peebles and good links to Galashiels and Edinburgh. Further to a site assessment, the following constraints/issues were identified, which may require mitigation;

- Flood Risk Assessment required, in respect of potential flood risk and surface water runoff on the site;

- Potential connectivity to the River Tweed SAC/SSSI, mitigation required to ensure no likely significant effects;
- Protect and enhance the existing boundary features and protect boundary features on dis-used railway;
- Potential protected species, including breeding birds within the site, would require mitigation;
- Located within the 'Tweed Valley' Special Landscape Area;
- The western part of the site is constrained within the Landscape Capacity Study;
- SNH advise that the site should remain unallocated, given the potential for any development to result in a dominant element on the western approach into the settlement. However, structure planting is proposed and it is considered that this would mitigate any visual impacts of the development from the A72;
- Transport Assessment or at least Statement required;
- Evidence of archaeology within the site, therefore mitigation required. The Officer would prefer in-situ protection, full investigation would be required for the area within the Roman Camp;
- Roads Planning Officer raised no objections to the allocation;
- Potential for Drainage Impact Assessment, in respect of the WWTW;
- Potential for Water Impact Assessment, in respect of the WTW; and
- Non vehicular links to existing path network and Peebles town/amenities.

Overall, taking the above into consideration, it is considered that there are no insurmountable planning issues which cannot be overcome through appropriate mitigation measures. However, given the existing pressures to find business & industrial land within the Tweeddale area, it is considered that a mixed use allocation on this site (which accommodates an element of both housing and employment land) would be the most appropriate way for the site to be developed. Therefore this proposal for housing (AINNE008) will not be taken forward into the Proposed Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b> AINNE009	<b>Site name</b> Kirklands II	<b>Settlement</b> Innerleithen	<b>SDA</b> Western	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 80	<b>Ha</b> 7.6	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Adjacent to site	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourses which flow on the northern and southern boundaries of the site. Consideration should also be given to the interaction with the Leithen Water (and the adjacent mill lade) as well as bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site which may exacerbate flood risk. Due to steep topography through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff. SEPA require a flood risk assessment (FRA) to be included as a site specific developer requirement prior to any development occurring on the site, and that the findings are used to inform the scale, layout and form of development.

There are 2 small tribs running across the site along the northern and southern boundaries. These should be protected and enhanced and there should be no culverting for land gain. SEPA request a developer requirement attached to the site to ensure that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures. Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. SW should confirm the position with capacity.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. For this size of development I would request that surface water and SUDS be considered especially as this site is extremely steep.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> Housing SG: The same site was considered for housing (AINNE009)  The site is already identified as a potential longer term housing site within the Local Development Plan.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: The Officer did not provide a response in relation to the consultation on (AINNE009), however was previously consulted on this site as part of the Local Plan Amendment and offered the following comments. Public transport would be good from settlement centre, with reasonable pedestrian access available. The site would have good access to employment sites within Innerleithen. The River Tweed (via the Leithen Water) SAC is adjacent to the site.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the north of Innerleithen, adjacent to the existing housing allocations (AINNE004 and TI200). The site provides good access to services, employment and public transport.

## Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area	Open space	Listed buildings	Scheduled Monument	Ancient woodland inventory	Archaeology	Garden and designed landscape
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

It is considered that there would be limited local impact on the surrounding area and that the site would integrate well into its surroundings.

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There is some archaeological potential within the site. Assessment will be required.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific comment.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: No issues raised.

## Landscape assessment

NSA	SLA	Over 200 metres?	Over 12 degree slope	Wild Land
Not applicable	On/adjacent to site	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not applicable

### Landscape summary

GENERAL COMMENTS: Site has potential to improve the landscaping of the locality. The site was identified as a development opportunity within the Development and Landscape Capacity Study.

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comments received.

LANDSCAPE OFFICER: No comments received.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Quite divorced from town centre. New access required onto B709.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comment.

ROADS PLANNING: This site is currently zoned for longer term housing; therefore the principle of housing on this site has been accepted. However, access would be reliant on a link from the allocated site AINNE004. The possibility of a link onto the B709 to the north of the existing Kirklands development should be explored but the topography of the land might prove difficult. Improvements are required to the B709 towards the A72 – High Street in terms of carriageway width, footway provision/width and parking provision. This could entail minor encroachment onto land immediately adjacent to the east side of the road. A Transport Assessment will help determine the extent of adjustments required to the road infrastructure to ensure adequate access means and sustainable transport provision. The site developer will be expected to pay for or contribute towards the cost of identified off-site transport work required as a result of the development of the site and/or the cumulative effect of development in the town.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No issues raised.

Right of way	TPOs	Contaminated land	Water supply	Sewerage	Gas Supply	Education provision
Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	Limited	Yes	Limited	Average

Northern HMA

Innerleithen

AINNE009

## Planning & infrastructure summary

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is already identified within the Local Development Plan for Longer Term Housing. However, access into this site would have to be through two of the allocated housing sites which already contribute 205 units and where development has not commenced. It is therefore unlikely that site AINNE009/SINNE001 (longer term site) would be required during the lifetime of LDP2. In that respect, it should be noted that should a shortfall in the housing land supply occur any application on this site would be assessed against Policy HD4 Meeting the Housing Land Requirement/Further Housing Land Safeguarding.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No concerns raised.

HOUSING STRATEGY: No issues raised.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Walkerburn WWTW has sufficient capacity. Part 3 upgrades required from the existing sewer from Innerleithen to Walkerburn.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Connecting paths to existing pavements and possibly existing path network; certainly consideration in the layout design should consider non-vehicular movement into the countryside creating passage ways between houses.

EDUCATION OFFICER: Extension or New School may need to be considered. Primary school would be at full/over capacity if this development went ahead.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

### PP status

Excluded

### Overall assessment

Doubtful

### Site capacity

80

## Conclusions

It should be noted that this site was initially coded as (AINNE011) however it became evident that the site boundary was actually the same as (AINNE009) which was previously considered. It should be noted that the site was recently submitted for consideration as part of the Housing SG. An initial stage 1 RAG assessment was undertaken, however concluded that the site should not be taken forward as part of the Housing SG.

This site is identified within the Local Development Plan for longer term housing (SINNE001). The Roads Planning Officer has indicated this site (AINNE009) would rely on the development of the existing housing allocation (AINNE004) in order to provide a link to the site. It should be noted that (AINNE004) has not yet been commenced.

Therefore, taking the above into consideration, the site will not be included within the Proposed Plan as a housing option. However, it will be retained as a potential longer term housing option for the future.

---

<b>Site reference</b> AINNE010	<b>Site name</b> Upper Kirklands	<b>Settlement</b> Innerleithen	<b>SDA</b> Western	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 40	<b>Ha</b> 5.0	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourse which flows along the boundary of the site. Consideration will need to be given to any culverts/ bridges which may exacerbate flood risk. Due to steep topography through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff.

SEPA require a flood risk assessment (FRA) to be included as a site specific developer requirement prior to any development occurring on the site, and that the findings are used to inform the scale, layout and form of development.

There is a small trib running across the site along the northern boundary. This should be protected and enhanced and there should be no culverting for land gain. The southern boundary of the site is also close to a well - this should be protected.

SEPA request a developer requirement attached to the site to ensure that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. SW should confirm the position with capacity.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. For the size of development I would request that surface water and SUDS be considered especially as this site is extremely steep.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> N/A
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response received in respect of the consultation on (AINNE010).

GENERAL COMMENTS: Public transport would be good from settlement centre, with reasonable pedestrian access available. The site would have good access to employment sites within Innerleithen. However with the extent of the site, the site becomes increasingly further away from the settlement centre and becomes less accessible as the slope rises.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Adjacent to site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There is some archaeological potential within the site. Assessment will be required.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: The site appears to be detached from the existing built form of the settlement and lies outwith the conservation area, there are two category C listed buildings to the east.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: No issues raised.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

On/adjacent to site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comments.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No response received.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located with the Tweed Valley Special Landscape Area. Site is constrained within the Development and Landscape Capacity Study. It is considered that development of this site could result in unacceptable encroachment further up the hill which would negatively impact on the settlement.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Quite divorced from town centre. New access required onto B709.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comment.

ROADS PLANNING: I am not in favour of this site being allocated for housing. Whilst access can be achieved from the allocated site AINNE004, the gradient of the site is such that a suitable layout is unlikely to be achieved.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No response received.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Limited

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Limited

### Education provision

Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No issues raised.

HOUSING STRATEGY: No issues raised.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Walkerburn WwtW has sufficient capacity. Part 3 upgrades required from the existing sewer from Innerleithen to Walkerburn.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No issues raised.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Connecting paths to existing pavements and possibly existing path network; certainly consideration in the layout design should consider non-vehicular movement into the countryside creating passage ways between houses, in such a way there should be connectivity between AINNE008 and AINNE010.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	40

### Conclusions

The site was submitted for consideration as part of the Call for Sites process. The site is located to the north west of the existing housing allocation (AINNE004).

There is some archaeological potential within the site, which would require further investigation. The site is constrained within the Landscape Capacity Study and the site is located within the Tweed Valley SLA. It is considered that development of this site would result in unacceptable encroachment further up the hill which could negatively impact on the settlement. Furthermore the Roads Planning Officer is unable to support development at this site. The Officer advised that whilst access can be achieved from the allocated site (AINNE004), the gradient of the site is such that a suitable layout is unlikely to be achieved. Therefore, there are significant constraints which would prevent this site from being developed.

Therefore, taking the above into consideration, the site will not be included within the Proposed Plan for housing.

---

<b>Site reference</b> TI200	<b>Site name</b> Kirklands	<b>Settlement</b> Innerleithen	<b>SDA</b> Western	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 55	<b>Ha</b> 5.2	<b>PP status</b> Retain LDP Site
--------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------

---

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b>	<b>SAC</b>	<b>SPA</b>	<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
------------------	------------	------------	-------------	---------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site is already included for the proposed use within the current Local Development Plan and it is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2.

---

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b>	<b>Planning history references</b>
--------------------------	------------	--------------------------------------------	----------------------	------------------------------------

---

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b>	<b>Access to employment</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b>	<b>Site aspect</b>
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
--------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------------------	--------------------	------------------------------------------

### Local impact and integration summary

---

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
------------	------------	--------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	------------------

### Landscape summary

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

Right of way

TPOs

Contaminated land

Water supply

Sewerage

Gas Supply

Education provision

### Planning & infrastructure summary

SCOTTISH WATER - WASTE: Walkerburn WwTW has sufficient capacity. Part 3 upgrades required from the existing sewer from Innerleithen to Walkerburn.

SCOTTISH WATER - WATER: Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No Issues.

---

## Overall assessment

**PP status**

**Overall assessment**

**Site capacity**

Retain LDP Site

55

### Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the Call for Sites process. However, the site is already allocated for the proposed use within the LDP. It is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2.

---

<b>Site reference</b> MINNE002	<b>Site name</b> Traquair Road East	<b>Settlement</b> Innerleithen	<b>SDA</b> Western	<b>Proposed Use</b> Mixed Use	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 12	<b>Ha</b> 0.6	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	----------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Adjacent to site	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

SEPA: As the area is at significant flood risk, it is essential that any new development will have a neutral impact on flood risk. We would only support redevelopment of a similar use in line with our land use vulnerability guidance. The FRA is required to investigate all sources of flooding to the site and be used to inform the area of redevelopment, type of development, finished floor levels and ensure that the development has a neutral impact on flood risk. SEPA require a flood risk assessment (FRA) to be included as a site specific developer requirement prior to any development occurring on the site, and that the findings are used to inform the scale, layout and form of development. Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. Depending on the use there maybe additional requirements for SUDS/capacity issues in the foul sewer. SW should confirm.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is located within the fluvial 1:200 year flood map. I would require that a flood risk assessment is undertaken for this site.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Brownfield	<b>Planning history references</b> The site is part of a Business and Industrial Allocation.  06/00272/FUL - Erection of seven blocks of industrial/commercial units - Approved subject to conditions.  08/00507/FUL - Erection of storage shed, office and workshop units and extension of access road - Approved with conditions and informatives.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Major	<b>Site aspect</b> South
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	-----------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response received.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is an existing Business and Industrial site zEL16, that has seen some recent development. This is the only remaining undeveloped Business and Industrial Proposal within Innerleithen. Whilst the Proposal is for Mixed Use the submission by the applicant seeks residential development on the remaining undevelopment land and the submission takes in the area of land that the access roads would be constructed and where a single Business unit has already been constructed. The loss of the remaining undeveloped land to housing would result no available land for Business and Industrial land.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site would be accessed through the existing Business and Industrial site currently safeguarded within the Local Development Plan. The proposed site is located adjacent to residential development but cannot be accessed through any of the existing sites. The site integrates better with the existing Business and Industrial site and lends itself better for employment use.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: No issues.

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There are no known archaeological issues.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Potential for residential development.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to size and location.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: Roughly a triangular area of land, surrounded by development on all sides. The site is accessed through the existing Business and Industrial Land. There is a minor change in levels in the site although it is not considered that this would prevent development.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: No issues raised.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No issues raised.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No issues raised.

ROADS PLANNING: The site is currently zoned for Business and Industrial use and given the lack of allocations of this nature in the town there is a strong argument for the current allocation remaining. I would be concerned about this land being zoned for mixed use development due to the current industrial nature off the end of the public road resulting in an inappropriate means of access for traffic associated with mixed use, especially for residential use. That said, if the existing businesses can be managed and controlled to ensure the potential extension of the existing public road can be free of conflict of traffic types then a mixed use allocation could be supported. The indicative sketch layout supporting the submission shows residential development at the eastern end of the site with the potential for good pedestrian/cycle connectivity with the surrounding residential development and towards the town centre. This is a positive in terms of supporting sustainable transport. A Transport Statement can address matters of accessibility and sustainable transport.

### Right of way

On/adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

On/adjacent to site

### Water supply

Limited

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

Innerleithen has currently three allocated housing sites and a mixed use site within the Local Development Plan amounting to an indicative capacity of 245 units.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Walkerburn WwTW has sufficient capacity. Please note there is a Sewer just within North edge of site. Part 3 upgrades required from the existing sewer from Innerleithen to Walkerburn.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site was developed as railway sidings. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Raised no issues.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Maintain a line for CP181, the current line for the multi-use TVRP is poor.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: There may be right of way requirements.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS: No response received.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: This site is now partly developed with a warehouse. The access to the site is just a track and any new development would mean that this would likely need to be upgraded to adoptable standard and make the development value low. The site being for mixed use, with housing, would be impractical and would not be an attractive entrance to a housing site. The site is best retained for employment use, but the upgrading road cost and difficulties with existing HV electricity cables may make development uneconomic.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	12

## Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the 'Call for Sites' process, for a mixed use. The site is currently allocated within the LDP for business and industrial land. The majority of the site submitted is for housing, with the mixed use element being a part of the site already developed. The area immediately to the west is allocated as safeguarded business and industrial land. There are pressures to find new business and industrial land within the Tweeddale area. As part of the MIR process, LUC have undertaken a study to identify business and industrial opportunities within the Tweeddale area. The development of housing at this location, would ultimately lead to the loss of allocated business and industrial land, would not be supported. This is the only un-developed business and industrial allocation within the LDP for Innerleithen. Furthermore, it is not considered that development here would relate well with the existing industrial estate.

Furthermore, the Roads Planning Officer has concerns for a mixed use on this site. Economic Development state that housing on this site would be impractical.

In conclusion, taking the above into consideration, the site will not be taken forward for inclusion within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b> MINNE003	<b>Site name</b> Land West of Innerleithen	<b>Settlement</b> Innerleithen	<b>SDA</b> Western	<b>Proposed Use</b> Mixed Use	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 50	<b>Ha</b> 6.8	<b>PP status</b> Included
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site is not located within any international/national designation.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the River Tweed. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within the site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. In addition, surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue and may require mitigation measures during design stage.

There is the potential that development at this allocation could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard at this site.

Foul drainage from the development must be connected to the existing SW foul sewer network. Std comments for SUDS.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with the fluvial 1 in 200 year flood extents. This site is shown to be affected by surface water flooding in some small areas in the South of the site. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk but would require that surface water runoff be considered.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no planning application history on the site. Housing SG: The site was considered for housing as part of the Housing SG (AINNE008). Local Plan Amendment: The eastern part of the site was considered as part of the Housing SG (AINNE001).
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> South-west
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Moderate biodiversity impact. Site appears to be an improved pasture with an area of scrub in the western corner and scrub and grassland along the disused railway. Provisional Local Biodiversity Site along old railway line (Innerleithen disused railway). Redshank, oystercatcher, lapwing and curlew recorded in Tetrad NT33I in breeding season. Site adjacent to SEPA 1 in 200 year indicative flood risk area. No obvious drainage linkage but on a precautionary basis potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC/ SSSI. Protect boundary features on disused railway and mitigation for protected species potentially badger and breeding birds. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC/SSSI. SEPA CAR construction site licence required (site >4ha)

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the west of Innerleithen. Innerleithen has good access to public transport, services and employment opportunities. There is a bus stop within walking distance of this site, with good connectivity to Galashiels, Edinburgh and other settlements, including Peebles. Peebles is located 7 miles to the west, which also provides a wider range of services and employment opportunities. There is a primary school located within Innerleithen and the nearest High School is within Peebles. There are moderate biodiversity issues, which are highlighted in the consultation response from the Ecology Officer.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific LB and CA issues – Caerlee House is listed category C but is located in woodland so development unlikely to have an impact on its setting.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: The south-east corner of the area contains the known site of a formerly Scheduled Roman camp. This should be avoided for preservation in situ. The remainder of the site may contain evidence for a Roman road. There is more generally archaeological potential given its topographic location. Evaluation will be required.

---

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
Not applicable	On/adjacent to site			On/adjacent to site

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: The overall assessment in Appendix 10 of the Housing SG was that the site should be excluded for the following reason: 'It is considered that the site forms part of the setting of Innerleithen, should development occur at this location it is considered that it would result in a dominant element on the western approach into the settlement and have a negative impact on the Tweed Valley SLA. There is also the potential for the site to impact on archaeology, in addition there is already substantial allocated land within the settlement.'. We agree with the assessment of potential landscape impacts and consider that the site should remain unallocated. Partial allocation could however be considered if there was a wider or over-riding need for housing in this area. In such circumstances close attention should be paid to allocations and site briefings which allow retain open views to the wider landscape as experienced from the road and existing dwellings

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: The site is a large field to the south of A72 approaching Innerleithen from the west. The ground slopes steeply down from the A72 before levelling out in the south eastern part that borders the existing settlement boundary west of Buchan Place off Traquair Road. Careful consideration will be required to achieve a scheme of structure planting that mitigates the visual impact of the development when seen from the elevated A72 coming into Innerleithen from the west, while maintaining views southward across the Tweed valley.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

<b>Physical access/road capacity</b>	<b>Near a trunk road?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------

NETWORK MANAGER: No response received.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I have no objections to the allocation of this site for mixed use. There is ample opportunity for the easterly portion of the site to be well integrated with and connected to the surrounding street network i.e. Tweed View, St Ronan's Health Centre and Angle Park. The close proximity of the multi-use path to the south of the site offers a great opportunity to provide a pedestrian/cycle link to the site. I would not necessarily rule out direct access from the A72 into the site, however this would need to be carefully designed to ensure the appropriate gradients and visibility splays can be achieved. A strong street frontage would help have a positive impact on driver behaviour along this section of the A72. A Transport Assessment, or at least a Transport Statement, will be a prerequisite for

development on this site to address matters of accessibility and sustainable transport.

ROADS PLANNING CONT'D: Following further consideration with the Roads Planning Officer and with Economic Development colleagues in relation as to how the site may be developed, the Roads Planning Officer seeks the following site requirements:

- A new vehicular access off the A72 Peebles Road will be required with connection to Angle Park
- Pedestrian and cycle connectivity with Tweed View, Health Centre and the Multi Use Path will be required
- Transport Assessment, or at least Transport Statement required.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No response received.

#### Right of way

Adjacent to site

#### TPOs

Not applicable

#### Contaminated land

Not applicable

#### Water supply

Limited

#### Sewerage

Limited

#### Gas Supply

Yes

#### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: The site lies to the south west of the town immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary edge and would appear to be a logical extension of the town. The land slopes from the main public road A72 south to the River Tweed SAC. The site lies within the Tweed Valley Special Landscape Area. The site will be visible from main public road A72 on approach from Peebles and would become the new edge of the settlement. Landscaping would be an important consideration in order to soften the edge of any development. Low density development of high quality may be appropriate for edge of settlement area. The site lies immediately north and adjacent to an area which is considered to be at a high risk of flooding from the River Tweed (SAC) and is thus a potentially vulnerable area. Surface water drainage may be an issue/would require to be considered. Potential for access from existing development may be a consideration. West end of site is steeper and located adjacent to sharp bend in the A72.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Walkerburn WWTW has sufficient capacity. A Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. Please note there is an existing 100m water main within the site boundary. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Requires non-vehicular links to path network and Peebles town and amenities.

CONTAMINATED LAND: There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Whilst the site is likely to be mainly housing, an area of mixed use of commercial / business use would be desirable adjacent to the health centre and other similar business uses.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

#### PP status

Included

#### Overall assessment

Acceptable

#### Site capacity

50

### Conclusions

The site lies to the west of Innerleithen, just outwith the settlement boundary, on the south side of the A72. The site was identified as part of the 'Western Rural Growth Area: Development Options Study' which was undertaken by LUC, to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Central Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP for the Central Tweeddale area, in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders. The site currently being considered, is proposed for a mixed use development with an indicative site capacity for 50 units.

Innerleithen has good access to public transport, services and employment, given the proximity to Peebles and good links to Galashiels and Edinburgh. Further to a site assessment, the following

constraints/issues were identified, which may require mitigation;

- Flood Risk Assessment required, in respect of potential flood risk and surface water runoff on the site;
- Potential connectivity to the River Tweed SAC/SSSI, mitigation required to ensure no likely significant effects;
- Protect and enhance the existing boundary features and protect boundary features on dis-used railway;
- Potential protected species, including breeding birds within the site, would require mitigation;
- Located within the 'Tweed Valley' Special Landscape Area;
- The western part of the site is constrained within the Landscape Capacity Study;
- SNH advise that the site should remain unallocated, given the potential for any development to result in a dominant element on the western approach into the settlement. However, structure planting is proposed and it is considered that this would mitigate any visual impacts of the development from the A72;
- Transport Assessment or at least Statement required;
- Evidence of archaeology within the site, therefore mitigation required. The Officer would prefer in-situ protection, full investigation would be required for the area within the Roman Camp;
- Roads Planning Officer raised no objections to the allocation;
- Potential for Drainage Impact Assessment, in respect of the WWTW;
- Potential for Water Impact Assessment, in respect of the WTW; and
- Non vehicular links to existing path network and Peebles town/amenities.

The site was identified within an extensive study of the Tweeddale area that was undertaken by LUC, in order to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Tweeddale. The site was one option put forward for consideration, in respect of a mixed use site.

Overall, taking the above into consideration, it is considered that there are no insurmountable planning issues which cannot be overcome through appropriate mitigation measures. These will be set out within the site requirements. Overall, the site is proposed for inclusion within the Proposed LDP for mixed used development, with an indicative site capacity of 50 units. It should be noted that the site should accommodate an element of business land.

---

<b>Site reference</b> RINNE003	<b>Site name</b> St Ronans Terrace/Hall Street	<b>Settlement</b> Innerleithen	<b>SDA</b> Western	<b>Proposed Use</b> Redevelopment	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 9	<b>Ha</b> 0.1	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site is a small site within a residential area, it is considered that development for nine units as submitted may represent over development of the site.

SEPA: Due to steep topography through the allocation site and residual risk from Chapman's Well/ Burn, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff.

Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The site is out with SEPA's flood map. Innerleithen Flood Study also shows this site to be out with the 1:200 year flood extent for fluvial and surface water flooding. I have no objections to the proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Combination	<b>Planning history references</b> 00/01078/FUL Siting of storage container.  The site has not been considered in any previous Local Plans.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate. Site appears to be residential dwelling with garden ground and garage within boundary trees. No obvious connectivity with River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Potential for EPS (bats). Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC. Protect boundary features and trees, mitigation for protected species including potentially bats and breeding birds.

GENEAL COMMENTS: Public transport would be good from settlement centre, with reasonable pedestrian access available. The site would have good access to employment sites within Innerleithen.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Adjacent to site

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There are no known archaeological issues.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Whilst there is scope for redevelopment of this site, the general density of the surrounding area is low; 9 units and appropriate parking as an indicative density looks too high; given that there is currently only one unit on the site.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Raised no issues.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to size and location.

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: This is currently a single house plot of similar size to others adjacent and across the road. The site appears too small to accommodate 9 properties unless apartments. I suggest that more than 2 (or possibly 3 small houses in a semi-detached arrangement) would constitute 'over development'. Recommend reinstatement hedgerow boundary treatment using deciduous species eg beech.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: Road on west side is private.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comment.

ROADS PLANNING: I have no objections in principle to some form of redevelopment on this plot which currently has a single dwelling unit. The road to the west is private; therefore any proposed redevelopment should be served by the existing public road to the north. The site is well located for accessing the local amenities. The appropriate parking provision must be accommodated within the plot boundary. This would be 225% for curtilage parking and 150-175% for communal. Given the limitations of the size of site, I would not object to a limited amount of development.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No issues raised.

### Near a trunk road?

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Limited

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

GENERAL COMMENTS: Innerleithen has three allocated housing sites and a mixed use site within the Local Development Plan amounting to an indicative capacity of 245 units. Whilst redevelopment of the site could be supported it is unlikely that an allocation of 5 units or more could be achieved.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Walkerburn WwTW has sufficient capacity. Part 3 upgrades required from the existing sewer from Innerleithen to Walkerburn.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped prior to being developed with a residential dwelling. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: No comment, existing house plot bound by roads and neighbouring properties.

HOUSING STRATEGY: No issues raised.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: This is a site that could take a replacement house but nothing more.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No Issues.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	9

### Conclusions

The site was submitted for consideration as part of the 'Call for Sites' process, with an indicative site capacity of 9 units (social rent/retirement units). There is an existing bungalow on the site at present. It is considered that development of the site for residential purposes is regarded as acceptable in principle. However, the site is small and it is considered that development for 9 units, as submitted, would represent over development of the site. Whilst redevelopment of the site could be supported, it is unlikely that an allocation for 5 units or more could be achieved within the site. The Council would not allocate a site which cannot accommodate less than 5 units. The site is located within the Innerleithen settlement boundary and could offer an opportunity for infill development through the planning application process. Given the uncertainty relating to the capacity of the site, it is considered that this proposal is better considered through the planning application process, as a potential infill development. Therefore, the site will not be included within the Proposed Local Development Plan for Redevelopment.

---

# Lamancha

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
ALAMA001	Grange Courtyard	Lamancha	Rest of Borders	Housing	6	0.6	Excluded

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable				

### Initial assessment summary

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site does not lie within the SEPA 1 in 200 year fluvial (river) or pluvial (surface water) flood extents. As such, I would have no objections to this site on the grounds of flood risk.

SEPA: There is a field drain down slope of the A701 and site. Review of historic maps does not show any watercourses on site. However this may require investigation during site investigation. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at an increased risk of flooding.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
On/Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	Combination	N/A

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Limited	Limited	Limited	Moderate	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

GENERAL COMMENTS: Lamancha is located 11 minutes drivetime away from West Linton where there are limited services and facilities, whilst Peebles is located 21 minutes drivetime away and benefits from a greater range of services and facilities including employment opportunities.

ECOLOGY: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact

Site appears to consist of yard/storage area and former pasture (semi-improved neutral grassland). Hedgerows on boundary.

Potential for bat roosts (EPS) and breeding birds. Mitigation for protected species potentially including bats (lighting), badger and breeding birds.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

On/adjacent to site

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY: Nothing known.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific H&D issues.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: This is a split site which is partly on a slope behind existing dwellings. However, the more elevated part is generally well screened. No further comment.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: No issues.

ROADS PLANNING: Any development at this site is likely to require part of the existing private road to be upgraded to an adoptable standard, the extent of this requirement being dependent on the access configuration. This would include upgrading the construction makeup of the existing private road, the provision of drainage, street lighting and a turning facility amongst other requirements. Acceptable access onto the A701 can be achieved.

PG/DJI

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

On site

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

No

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

GENERAL COMMENT: Lamancha is not an established settlement as identified within the Local Development Plan. Any development could therefore be considered under the Development in the Countryside policies.

CONTAMINATED LAND: A portion of the site appears to have been developed as part of a vehicle repair garage.

The site is brownfield land and its use may present development constraints.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Appears logical.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: EN = no comments required.

SCOTTISH WATER - WASTE: Private WWTW.

SCOTTISH WATER - WATER: No concerns for 6 units.

SEPA: Water Enviro: This site is in a village where there is no public foul sewer provision. Foul drainage would therefore need to be treated via private systems. It would appear that the only option would be closed soakaways as there is no nearby watercourse for any foul discharge. Likely to require detailed site investigations due to volume of sewage to be disposed of to land and potential impacts on groundwater from any such disposal. Sewage disposal at this site may prove to be infeasible.

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Doubtful	6

### Conclusions

The site was submitted in response to the MIR public consultation.

Lamancha is not recognised as a settlement within the Local Development Plan, and has limited access to public transport and services, as well as limited access to employment.

SEPA state that consideration should be given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at an increased risk of flooding.

However, the site does appear to integrate well with the rest of the established development. The contaminated land officer has indicated that there is potential for contamination on part of site. The Roads Planning section have also stated that the development would require the upgrading of private access road. The site would also rely on private WWTW.

In conclusion, the site will not be taken forward for inclusion within the Proposed Local Development Plan for housing. There is however, potential for the site to be considered through the Planning Application process under the development in the countryside policies.

---

<b>Site reference</b> MLAMA001	<b>Site name</b> Lamancha Mixed Use Site	<b>Settlement</b> Lamancha	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Mixed Use	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 23	<b>Ha</b> 2.3	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site does not lie within the SEPA 1 in 200 year fluvial (river) flood extent.

The 1:200 year pluvial (surface water) flood map indicates there is a risk of surface water flooding at the north/east boundary of the site. I do not expect this risk to cause significant issue and would not object to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

I would ask the applicant to consider surface water runoff issues on site and ensure no properties are at risk of this type of flooding.

SEPA: A small watercourse issues from adjacent to the site on the other side of the A701. There is no historic evidence of a small watercourse on site. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at an increased risk of flooding.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> On/Adjacent to site	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Combination	<b>Planning history references</b> N/A
-------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Limited	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Limited	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

GENERAL COMMENTS: Lamancha is located 11 minutes drivetime away from West Linton where there are limited services and facilities, whilst Peebles is located 21 minutes drivetime away and benefits from a greater range of services and facilities including employment opportunities.

ECOLOGY: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact

Site appears to consist of improved pasture and an area of marshy grassland. Mature trees on boundary and plantation strip runs through middle of the site (features on OS 1st Ed. map). Records of low numbers of lapwing and curlew in tetrad NT 25B Potential for bat roosts (EPS) in trees, badger and breeding birds. Mitigation for protected species potentially including bats (roosts and lighting), badger and breeding birds.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Adjacent to site

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Adjacent to site

### Garden and designed landscape

On/adjacent to site

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY: Nothing known.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific H&D issues.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: This is a large site when considered in the context of the existing settlement. If allocated, the existing roadside planting should be retained to maintain character and screen development.

To further help development here fit with the wider landscape and the existing development, requirements for the mass, colour / finish and orientation of buildings should be clearly set out.

We suggest retaining the woodland within this site as a means of maintaining a higher quality gateway to Lamancha than a built edge would create.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Need to carefully consider access arrangements onto A701.

ROADS PLANNING: I am not in favour of this site being zoned for mixed use.

The current profile of Lamancha is made up of housing on the south side of the A701 with business/industrial use at the northern end. By zoning the site for mixed use could lead to housing being separated by the existing business/industrial land which would not be conducive to pedestrian movements between the two housing areas.

I would not seek to encourage any new access points to the north onto this derestricted section of the A701 due to the narrow verges and would seek to contain access to the existing access points. It would also be advisable to review the existing access arrangements whereby three access points lie within close proximity of each other with a view to rationalising and upgrading these access points.

I would not be opposed to the site, or at least the south westerly portion of it, being zoned for some form of business and/or industrial use.

PG/DJI

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

On site

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

No

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

GENERAL COMMENT: Lamancha is not an established settlement as identified within the Local Development Plan.

CONTAMINATED LAND: A portion of the site appears to have been developed as part of a vehicle repair garage.

The site is brownfield land and its use may present development constraints.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Adjacent to an existing yard and the public road. Retention of some of the trees along the road side if such a large allocation is proposed would be preferable. Strategic planting on the north east edge would be advantageous.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: We are supportive of some opportunity for local employment in small settlements and this site benefits from being adjacent to existing business premises. The demand is not

normally high for a lot of business land, but small local businesses often require a small building or yard and this could be accommodated here. We do not consider that the whole site should be allocated and the woodland, splitting the site on the NE, could act as a natural enclosed edge to the land. It may be preferable for the land allocation to be in a SE direction with business use towards the road and any other development on the small area of rising ground to the rear.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: EN = A non-vehicular link to any commercial development here would be requested.

SCOTTISH WATER - WASTE: Private WWTW.

SCOTTISH WATER - WATER: A Water Impact Assessment would probably be required.

SEPA: Water Enviro: This site is in a village where there is no public foul sewer provision. Foul drainage would therefore need to be treated via private systems. It would appear that the only option would be closed soakaways as there is no nearby watercourse for any foul discharge. Likely to require detailed site investigations due to volume of sewage to be disposed of to land and potential impacts on groundwater from any such disposal. Sewage disposal at this site may prove to be infeasible. Part of the site appears to be on marshland and thus any development must ensure protection of the water environment. Depending on the intended future use of the site certain activities/ industrial type processes may require additional permissions from SEPA to operate.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	23

### Conclusions

The site was submitted in response to the MIR public consultation.

Lamanca is not recognised as a settlement within the Local Development Plan, and has limited access to public transport and services, as well as limited access to employment.

SEPA state that consideration should be given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at an increased risk of flooding.

The contaminated land officer has indicated that the site is a brownfield site and may present development constraints.

The Roads Planning section are unable to support the full extent of the site for mixed use however, they may be able to support a reduced site for business and industrial use.

The site would also rely on private WWTW.

In conclusion, the site will not be taken forward for inclusion within the Proposed Local Development Plan for Mixed Use.

# Lauder

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
ALAUD008	Maitland Park (Phase 2)	Lauder	Rest of Borders	Housing	60	4.4	Excluded

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
1:200	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

Flood risk on substantial part of site along southerly edge.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Lauder Burn. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues at this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. There is a pond located on site. SEPA require a flood risk assessment (FRA) to be included as a site specific developer requirement prior to any development occurring on the site, and that the findings are used to inform the scale, layout and form of development. Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. SW should confirm the position with capacity/network issues. The Lauder burn runs along the southern boundary of the site - this should be protected as part of any development. There is also a pond shown within the development site which should be protected and enhanced as part of any development. Any development at this site should not utilise the pond in order to treat surface water. SEPA request a developer requirement attached to the site to ensure that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site lies within the 1 in 200 year flood extent for the Lauder Burn and there is also a large pond on site. I would require a Flood Risk Assessment for this site.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	01/00805/OUT - Residential development, erection of school and formation of car park for cemetery. Approved subject to conditions and legal agreement. Note, no built development approved on this site.  Previous Local Plan Inquiry Reporter Decision - "development at this location would be less suitable than development on the west side of Lauder".

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Good	Good	Limited	Moderate	South

## Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response received.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Limited services and facilities available in Lauder. Lauder also has a business and industrial site to the north of the settlement. The settlement is located on the A68 and is also located close to the train station at Stow.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area	Open space	Listed buildings	Scheduled Monument	Ancient woodland inventory	Archaeology	Garden and designed landscape
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Adjacent to site

## Local impact and integration summary

The site is on the southern edge of the settlement. Currently an established landscape belt encloses the settlement at this location. Development at this location would elongate the settlement.

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There is some archaeological potential for this site. Some mitigation may be required.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: A significant development on the southern approach to Lauder. Extreme care will be needed to ensure that appropriate robust boundary treatments are implemented.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: No issues raised.

---

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable			Not applicable

## Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comments.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No comments received.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The Development and Landscape Capacity Study states that development at this location would "disrupt the potentially fine sense of arrival which will be created when the young planting has matured to complement the stand of mature broadleaves at the B6362/A68 junction". It is considered that development of the site would impact negatively on the settlement approach from the south.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

<b>Physical access/road capacity</b>	<b>Near a trunk road?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------

NETWORK MANAGER: No comment.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Consideration for bus stop layby's on A68 both directions .

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Access would have to be from local roads north of site as indicated by site layout.

ROADS PLANNING: I have no objections in principle to this land being zoned for housing. The adjoining residential development to the north west of the proposed site has been specifically designed to allow suitable vehicular and pedestrian/cycle connectivity linkage into this land. In addition, development of the site will have to allow for pedestrian connectivity with the existing footpath adjacent to Lauder Burn. Although it does not appear essential, some consideration of providing a roundabout at the A68/B6362 junction, with a link into this site, needs to be investigated, and the views of Transport Scotland sought

in this respect. This could have the advantage of helping with dispersion of traffic and calming the speed of traffic entering the town. Notwithstanding a roundabout, or any other new access on to the A68 associated with the development of this site, the comments of Transport Scotland should be sought. A Transport Assessment would be required to address accessibility and sustainable transport.

Right of way	TPOs	Contaminated land	Water supply	Sewerage	Gas Supply	Education provision
On site	Not applicable	Not applicable	Yes	Yes	Limited	Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

GENERAL COMMENTS: Lauder has already two allocated housing sites with an indicative capacity of 130 units. It is therefore considered that Lauder does not require additional housing land at this time.  
 HOUSING STRATEGY: No concerns raised.  
 SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Lauder WwTW has sufficient capacity. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.  
 SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.  
 CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed.  
 There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.  
 OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Potential opportunity to improve pedestrian/cycle access into the village. Enhancement to existing path network would also be recommended.  
 EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.  
 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.  
 NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.  
 PROJECTS TEAM: No concerns.  
 EDUCATION: No issues.  
 NHS: No response received.

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Doubtful	60

### Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the Call for Sites process for consideration for housing, and again during the Main Issues Report consultation.

There is flood risk on substantial part of site along southerly edge. The settlement has limited access to services and potentially a moderate impact on biodiversity. The site contributes to the immediate setting of the settlement. Development at this location would also result in elongating the settlement. The site is constrained within the Development and Landscape Capacity Study and it is considered that development of the site would impact negatively on the settlement approach from south. This is clearly a major issue to be addressed. Lauder has already two allocated housing sites with an indicative capacity of 130 units. The Reporter at a previous Local Plan Inquiry stated “development at this location would be less suitable than development on the west side of Lauder”.

At this point in time, it is not considered that there is any need for a further allocation within Lauder. Therefore, the site will not be included within the Proposed Plan.

<b>Site reference</b> MLAUD002	<b>Site name</b> Stow Road Mixed Use	<b>Settlement</b> Lauder	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Mixed Use	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 8	<b>Ha</b> 0.8	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------	-----------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designations.

SEPA: Watercourse catchment less than 3km<sup>2</sup> on the boundary of the site. The development of the allocation could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a watercourse within or immediately adjacent to the site. SEPA therefore recommend that a development requirement is attached to these sites to ensure that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6m wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures. There are potential de-culverting opportunities.

We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourse which flows along the boundary of the site. Consideration should be given to any culverts/bridges might may exacerbate flood risk. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at an increased risk of flooding.

Waste water drainage from the site would exacerbate an existing point source, private drainage in this instance. This site is not within the existing sewered catchment and hence unless the sewered catchment were to be extended the site would require private foul drainage arrangements. However there is no immediately obvious watercourse for any foul discharge to be made into as the trib of Washing burn which runs through the site is likely to be too small to receive any discharge. Hence the site may prove to be challenging from a drainage perspective. The Trib of Washing burn which runs through the site must be protected as part of any development - SEPA has a policy against culverting for land gain. Depending on the intended future use of the site certain activities/ industrial type processes may require additional permissions from SEPA to operate.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site does not lie within the SEPA 1 in 200 year fluvial (river) or pluvial (surface water) flood extents. However, there is a small burn/ditch running on the South Western boundary of the site that is not picked up within the SEPA mapping. Within any proposal, the risk from this burn/ditch should be considered. If this cannot be achieved, a FRA may be required.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Brownfield	<b>Planning history references</b> 13/00256/FUL: Erection of 3 no replacement poultry buildings 13/0100/FUL: Erection of 2 replacement poultry buildings (amendment to previous consent 13/00256/FUL)
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Limited	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Former poultry sheds on site with some mature broad-leaved trees. Potential for bat roosts (EPS) in adjacent trees and breeding birds. Buildings unsuitable for bats. Potential connectivity with River Tweed SAC via drain and Washing burn to Leader water. Mitigation for protected species potentially including bats (lighting), badger and breeding birds. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC. Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the west of Lauder and lies directly outwith the development boundary. Lauder has good access to public transport and employment, while limited access to services. Lauder has an allocated business and industrial site (BLAUD002) to the north of the settlement and a safeguarded business and industrial allocation (zEL61). The settlement is located on the A68 and is also located close to the train station at Stow.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

## Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE AND DESIGN: Whilst the site is currently developed and had been used for poultry sheds, it forms a detached site outwith Lauder development boundary. If the site were to be considered suitable overall, then care would be needed to tackle this as an integrated site; possible a “steading” type linked development rather than a series of separate boxes.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any objections to the proposed development.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Nothing known.

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable			Not applicable

## Landscape summary

The site does not fall within an identified SLA, NSA, wild land or landscape designation.

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to size and nature of site – redevelopment of poultry farm.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: Nothing received.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

**Near a trunk road?**

NETWORK MANAGER: Divorced from existing housing. Outwith 30 mph limit.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I have no objections to this site being zoned for mixed use development. Depending on the proposed use of the site an adoptable standard road, or at least some access improvement work, may be required along with the provision of appropriate pedestrian linkage with the town.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

**Right of way**

On/adjacent to site

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

On site

**Water supply**

Yes

**Sewerage**

Yes

**Gas Supply**

Yes

**Education provision**

Average

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: I note that the allocated site to the north east (ALAUD001) has not yet been developed. A site requirement was for woodland structure planting on the western boundary and there appears to be a tree belt along this boundary; this provides a natural edge to the settlement and so the site does not appear to be a logical extension to the development boundary. Contamination may be an issue given the currently use of the site.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): There is sufficient capacity at the Lauder WWTW.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): There is sufficient capacity at the Howden WTW. 90mm water main located within the northern boundary of this site. Protection measures must be in place to mitigate any impact of development.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Right of Way BE45 links into the existing path network. Should be taken into account when assessing vehicle access.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site has been developed as poultry houses. The site is brownfield land and its use may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response recieved.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: We do not consider this is an ideal site for modern business use at this time. There are better options adjacent to the existing industrial estate. This site is also remote from the settlement, is outwith the 30's zone and may be costly to develop with the necessary services infrastructure.

EDUCATION: No response received.

NHS: No response received.

**Overall assessment****PP status**

Excluded

**Overall assessment**

Doubtful

**Site capacity**

8

**Conclusions**

The site (MLAUD002) was submitted for mixed use development, as part of the MIR Consultation stage. The land owner states, within their submission, that the site is currently used for agricultural use, however would like the site to be considered for an alternative use (i.e.) industrial, residential or retail. Therefore, the site is currently under consideration as a mixed use proposal. The site is located to the west, immediately adjacent to the existing development boundary for Lauder and includes a range of poultry buildings. The site is separated from the housing allocation (ALAUD001) by a stone wall.

The following constraints were identified within the site:

- Maintenance buffer strip required, in respect of the watercourse within or adjacent to the site;
- Flood Risk Assessment required;
- MOD safeguarded site;
- Potential for protected species, mitigation required;
- Potential connectivity with the River Tweed SAC, via drain and washing burn to Leader Water;
- Core Path runs along the northern boundary of the site;
- Outer zone of the hazard pipeline is within the site;
- Protection measures required for the water main located within the northern boundary of the site; and
- Potential contamination, due to previous use of the site.

In addition to the above, it is noted that Lauder is located outwith any of the Strategic Development Areas, and it is considered that the settlement has already a sufficient housing land supply with two allocated housing sites - sites ALAUD001 and ELA12B with a combined indicative capacity of 130 units. The site is also located outwith a recognised strong boundary finish to this part of the town.

Taking the above issues into consideration, the site will not be taken forward for inclusion within the Proposed Local Development Plan for mixed use.

<b>Site reference</b> MLAUD003	<b>Site name</b> Whitlaw Road Mixed Use	<b>Settlement</b> Lauder	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Mixed Use	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 10	<b>Ha</b> 1.2	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	-----------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designations.

SEPA: Watercourse catchment less than 3km<sup>2</sup> on the boundary of the site. Potential development of the allocation could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. Localised flooding in 1987 and 1988 resulted in a flood scheme being built. Lauder Station Yard FPS 1990 is located adjacent to the site. Low standard of protection provided. We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the tributary of the Washing Burn. As there is a scheme downstream, discharge from the site will need carefully managed. There can be no increase in flood risk from the development. There is possibly a small burn/drain on the southern side of the site leading to 'sks' marked on the map.

The site is within the sewered catchment and must discharge foul effluent into the foul sewer. There may be a small burn/drain along the southern edge of the development which must be protected as part of any development. Depending on the intended future use of the site certain activities/ industrial type processes may require additional permissions from SEPA to operate.

There is a water body within, forming part of the site boundary, or immediately adjacent to the site. SEPA recommend that a development requirement is attached to the site to ensure that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6m wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures. We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the tributary of the Washing Burn. As there is a scheme downstream, discharge from the site will need carefully managed. There can be no increase in flood risk from the development.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is not located within the SEPA 1 in 200 year fluvial (river) or pluvial (surface water) flood extents. I would have no objections to this site on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Brownfield	<b>Planning history references</b> The site is currently allocated within the LDP as a safeguarded business and industrial site (zEL61).
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Limited	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the north west of Lauder and lies within the settlement boundary for Lauder. The site is currently allocated for safeguarded employment land (zEL61) and an additional business & industrial allocation (BLAUD002) lies to the north west of the site. Lauder has good access to public transport and employment, while limited access to services. The settlement is

located on the A68 and is also located close to the train station at Stow. Allocation of this site for mixed use, could result in the loss of safeguarded employment land.

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No comments received.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE AND DESIGN: No specific H&D issues.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Nothing known.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: Principle of development here is established in the LDP. No comment on proposed change of use.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No response.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: State they have no observations.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I have no objections to this site being zoned for mixed use development. There is ample opportunity for access to the site and suitable pedestrian provision will be required, connecting into the existing network. The access to the site is through an industrial estate so it is unlikely that housing will be appropriate in this location.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Did not raise any comments to the proposal.

### Near a trunk road?

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

On/adjacent to sit

### Contaminated land

On site

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: The site is zoned as zEL61 in the current Plan and is part of Lauder Industrial Estate, a district and industrial site which is safeguarded for business and industrial uses.

Introducing residential uses to the industrial estate could result in a potential conflict of uses. Policy ED1 already allows for some flexibility outwith Class 4, 5 and 6 uses.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): There is sufficient capacity at the Lauder WWTW.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): There is sufficient capacity at the Howden WTW. No concerns.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Housing on this site would benefit greatly from a pavement down to the town.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site has been developed as poultry houses. The site is brownfield land and its use may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: We do not support this as a mixed use site, especially if it includes housing. We do not consider it is appropriate for housing development to be accessed through the estate if possible as there are other more appropriate sites available. The current zoning should be protected and we suggest the site may be more practical to redevelop if it was larger and encroaching into the adjacent scrubland and farmland.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No response.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Doubtful	10

### Conclusions

The site (MLAUD003) was submitted for mixed use development, as part of the MIR Consultation stage. The land owner states, within their submission, that the site is currently used for agricultural use, however would like the site to be considered for an alternative use (i.e.) industrial, residential or retail. Therefore, the site is currently under consideration as a mixed use proposal. The site includes a range of poultry buildings and is allocated within the LDP as a safeguarded (district) industrial & business site (zEL61), which is protected under Policy ED1. Therefore, the principle of developing on the site has already been established. The following constraints were identified within the site;

- Flood Risk Assessment required;
- Maintenance buffer strip required, as there is a water body within/forming part of the site boundary; and
- Brownfield site, potential contamination.

Economic Development do not support a mixed use proposal on this site, especially if this includes a housing element. They do not consider it is appropriate for housing development to be accessed through the estate if possible, as there are other more appropriate sites available. They advise that the current zoning should be protected.

As outlined above, the site is a safeguarded business and industrial site (district), under Policy ED1. Policy ED1 aims to ensure that adequate supplies of business and industrial land are retained and not diluted by the proliferation of other uses. Policy ED1 states that development other than Classes 4,5 and 6, may be accepted on district business and industrial sites, in order, where appropriate, allow a more mixed use area. This is subject to assessment against criteria contained within Policy ED1. Therefore, the current Policy ED1 allows, in certain cases, a mix of uses within district sites. However, it should be noted that this excludes retail proposals.

There are no insurmountable constraints which would prevent the development of this site, which cannot be addressed through mitigation. The land owner is seeking an alternative use for this site, other than the current employment use. However, it is considered that the existing flexibility within Policy ED1 allows for such alternative, mixed use proposals to be considered, albeit with the exception of retail. Furthermore, business and industrial land is increasingly challenging to find within settlements and a mixed use allocation would result in the loss of part of the allocation (zEL61). It is further noted that a housing development would likely result in a conflict of land uses, being located within an established industrial estate.

In addition to the above, it is noted that Lauder is located outwith any of the Strategic Development Areas, and it is considered that the settlement has already a sufficient housing land supply with two allocated housing sites - sites ALAUD001 and ELA12B with a combined indicative capacity of 130 units.

In conclusion, for the reasons above, the proposed mixed use site will not be included within the Proposed Plan. However, it is proposed to retain the site as a safeguarded business and industrial site. This would allow alternative, mixed use proposals to be assessed against the Policy ED1.

<b>Site reference</b> RLAUD002	<b>Site name</b> Burnmill	<b>Settlement</b> Lauder	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Redevelopment	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 5	<b>Ha</b> 0.8	<b>PP status</b> Retain LDP Site
-----------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------

---

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b>	<b>SAC</b>	<b>SPA</b>	<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
------------------	------------	------------	-------------	---------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site is currently allocated for Redevelopment within the LDP.

---

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b>	<b>Planning history references</b>
--------------------------	------------	----------------------------------------	----------------------	------------------------------------

---

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b>	<b>Access to employment</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b>	<b>Site aspect</b>
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
--------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------------

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: No consultation undertaken.

---

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
------------	------------	--------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	------------------

### Landscape summary

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

Right of way

TPOs

Contaminated land

Water supply

Sewerage

Gas Supply

Education provision

Planning & infrastructure summary

---

## Overall assessment

PP status

Overall assessment

Site capacity

Retain LDP Site

5

### Conclusions

Retain the allocation for Redevelopment within the LDP2.

---

# Nether Blainslie

<b>Site reference</b>	<b>Site name</b>	<b>Settlement</b>	<b>SDA</b>	<b>Proposed Use</b>	<b>Indicative Capacity</b>	<b>Ha</b>	<b>PP status</b>
ANETH002	Nether Blainslie East	Nether Blainslie	Rest of Borders	Housing	20	2.5	Excluded

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b>	<b>SAC</b>	<b>SPA</b>	<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourses (Kitty Burn tributaries) which flow through and adjacent to the site. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site.

SEPA require a flood risk assessment (FRA) to be included as a site specific developer requirement prior to any development occurring on the site, and that the findings are used to inform the scale, layout and form of development. Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network however it is likely that this would require upsizing for any new development. There is a small trib that runs through the south of the site. This should be protected and enhanced as part of any development. There should be no culverting for land gain. SEPA request a developer requirement attached to the site to ensure that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b>	<b>Planning history references</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	LDP: The same site was considered as part of the LDP process (ANETH002).

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b>	<b>Access to employment</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b>	<b>Site aspect</b>
Limited	Good	Good	Minor	South

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response received.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Limited access to public transport. The site benefits from a southerly aspect. Nearest services are located at Earlston and Lauder.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Adjacent to site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: No known issues.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific comment.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No response received.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No response received.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site contributes to the setting of the settlement. The site is also considerable in size and is located to the east of the settlement and separated by the road. Site slopes down gently to the south.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Housing should not have direct frontage. May introduce need for a reduced speed limit at this location.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No Comment.

ROADS PLANNING: There are access constraints between the A68 Trunk Road and the village due to the public roads being narrow and generally single lane with limited passing opportunities. There is no real village infrastructure to justify this scale of extension and while the site can easily be served by the adjacent minor public road, it would not relate to, or connect at all well with, the existing development opposite. I have to recommend against this site being allocated for housing.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

HOUSING STRATEGY: No concerns.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the network.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: No Comment

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Not keen on this on landscape and placemaking grounds.  
EDUCATION OFFICER: No Issues.  
ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.  
NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.  
PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.  
NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	20

### Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the Call for Sites process, for consideration as housing. The site has limited public transport and the nearest services are located at Earlston and Lauder. The site benefits from a southerly aspect. The site is an extensive site to the east of the settlement that appears disconnected. The site also contributes to the setting of the settlement. Furthermore, the Roads Planning Officer is unable to support the allocation of this site. Therefore, taking the above into consideration the site will not be included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

---

# Oxton

<b>Site reference</b> AOXTO009	<b>Site name</b> South west of Oxton	<b>Settlement</b> Oxton	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 25	<b>Ha</b> 1.5	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

SEPA: Foul water must be connected to the existing SW foul network. SW should confirm any capacity/network issues.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> Local Plan Amendment: Part of this site was considered as part of the LPA (AOXTO002).
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Limited	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response received.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Development will help sustain local services in the settlement such as the school, shop and village hall. Settlement is near the strategic public transport network on the A68(T). The site has other local services a 10 minutes driving distance away in Lauder.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Not applicable	<b>Open space</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Listed buildings</b> Not applicable	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> Not applicable	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> Not applicable
--------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

## Local impact and integration summary

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is visually separated from the settlement because it is part of a field screened by a hedge along a countryside lane. Upgrading the road could result in a loss of this hedge. It would result in elongating the form of the settlement to the south. The site is adjacent to the rear of housing to the north and is separated from the housing to the east by a lane and open space.

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There are no known issues, although there is generally a low to moderate potential in the wider area. Some mitigation may be required depending on the development.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific comment.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: No issues raised.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to size and location.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No response received.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is part of the wider countryside and is part of a large field bounded by a hedge. It is relatively flat land so a new natural boundary would be required.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Additional traffic being added to junction with A68. May impact on location of existing 30 mph limit.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Possible bus stop infrastructure.

ROADS PLANNING: I have concerns with this site for a housing allocation. The Loan leading to the site often has extensive lengths of parking on the street which forces single file traffic over significant lengths all the way from the junction with the Main Street/Station Road and round the horizontal curve in the road. This already causes issues with traffic flow. Furthermore, junction visibility where The Loan joins Main Street/Station Road is restricted due to the close proximity of the corner building on the east side combined with the alignment of the Main Street/Station Road. There are no obvious solutions to these concerns and additional traffic would exacerbate the situation. If this site was to be allocated for housing, The Loan would have to be widened adjacent to the site and a footway and street lighting be provided. An extension of the 30 mph speed limit would also likely be required. A Transport Statement would be required to address accessibility and sustainable travel. All matters concerned I would find it difficult to offer my support for this proposed allocation.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No issues raised.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Average

## Planning & infrastructure summary

GENERAL COMMENTS: Oxton already benefits from an existing housing allocation on a brownfield site within the settlement. New site will assist in viability of local school and services.

HOUSING STRATEGY: No concerns.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Oxton WwTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic

uses may present development constraints.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Opportunity to provide pedestrian path.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Could work. Appears constraint free.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No Issues.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No concerns.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	25

### Conclusions

The site was submitted for consideration as part of the Call for Sites process, for housing development. The site lies to the south west of Oxton. The settlement of Oxton has limited access to services. It is considered that development at this location would not integrate well with the rest of the settlement. The Roads Planning Officer is unable to support development at this location. Part of the site is affected by the HSE zoning. Therefore, taking the above into consideration, the site will not be included within the Proposed Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b> AOXTO010	<b>Site name</b> Deanfoot Road North	<b>Settlement</b> Oxton	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 30	<b>Ha</b> 2.1	<b>PP status</b> Included
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designation constraints.

SEPA: OS Map indicates a sufficient height difference between site and Leader Water. Surface Water Flood Map is picking up the low point of the dismantled railway.

Foul water must be connected to the existing SW foul network. SW should confirm any capacity/network issues.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Combination	<b>Planning history references</b> N/A
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Limited	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Moderate biodiversity impact. Site consists of farm buildings and agricultural outbuildings, garden ground (mature broadleaves) and improved pasture. Potential for EPS (bats) and breeding birds to use built structures within the site. No obvious connectivity with the River Tweed SAC (Leader water). Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC. Mitigation for protected species including bats and breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the east of Oxton, just outwith the settlement boundary. Development will help sustain local services in the settlement such as the school, shop and village hall. Settlement is near the strategic public transport network on the A68(T). The site has other local services a 10 minutes driving distance away in Lauder.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There are no known issues, although there is generally a low to moderate potential in the wider area. Some mitigation may be required depending on the development.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific comment.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Adjacent to site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to size and location.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: There are clearly issues with access that need to be addressed if the original Nether Howden building group is retained. A 10m wide belt of woodland planting along the east boundary would help to provide containment to the development from the east and separation from the farm buildings immediately to the east.

GENERAL COMMENTS: It is noted that despite the comments above from the Landscape section, Roads Planning are able to support the development of the site.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Additional traffic being added to junction with A68.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Possible bus stop infrastructure.

ROADS PLANNING: In order to achieve satisfactory access to this site the existing farm will have to be redeveloped and some of the farm buildings will have to be demolished. A footway and street lighting will be required from the site along the minor road to link in with Station Road (Main Street). Widening of the minor road carriageway will also be required. A secondary access from the extreme south westerly corner of the site which links into Justice Park and the possibility of a further pedestrian/cycle linkage between plots 26/27 Justice Park should be explored in the best interests of connectivity and integration of the existing street network. Depending on the scale of development a Transport Statement is likely to be required.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

On site

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Appears to be constraint free.

HOUSING STRATEGY: No issues.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Oxton WwTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: No Comment.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: An area of the site appears to have been previously developed with agricultural buildings. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No issues.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Included	Acceptable	30

### Conclusions

The site is located to the north east of Oxton, adjacent to the existing settlement boundary. The site currently consists of farm land, buildings and agricultural buildings. Oxton has good access to public transport and employment, however limited access to services. However, it is considered that this site would assist in supporting the existing services within the settlement. It is considered that the site has the potential to integrate with the rest of the settlement. The consultation process highlighted the following constraints/issues, which may require mitigation measures;

- There is potential for breeding birds and bats, given the existing buildings on site;
- Potential connectivity with the River Tweed SAC/SSSI;
- Potential for archaeology within the site, mitigation may be required;
- The Lammermuir Hills SLA lies to the north east;
- Planting along the eastern boundary, would help to provide containment to development from the east and separation from the farm buildings to the east. The landscaping would help to assist in enhancing and enclosing the site;
- Footway and street lighting would be required, to link with Station Road;
- Access from the south west corner of the site and the possibility of further pedestrian/cycle linkage should be explored, in the best interests of connectivity and integration of existing street network;
- Transport Statement required;
- Water Impact Assessment required, in respect of the WTW network capacity
- Surface water to be managed through the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems; and
- Part of the site is brownfield land and may have contaminated land constraints.

Overall, it is considered that there are no insurmountable constraints, to prevent the development of this site, subject to appropriate mitigation measures being put in place. In conclusion, the site will be taken forward within the Proposed Plan for housing, with an indicative site capacity for 30 units.

<b>Site reference</b> AOXTO011	<b>Site name</b> Former Railway	<b>Settlement</b> Oxton	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 19	<b>Ha</b> 1.9	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	------------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

SEPA: Part of the site appears to be on an old inert landfill site, therefore this land may or may not be suitable for development. Further site investigations would be required.

A surface water hazard has been identified at the site, review of the surface water map shows it is following a historic railway line cut. No evidence of a watercourse has been found.

This site is immediately adjacent to the Scottish Water foul sewer network and as such foul drainage must connect to the foul sewer. With this and the other proposed sites in Oxton there is likely to be capacity issues at the STW.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site does not lie within the SEPA 1 in 200 year fluvial (river) or pluvial (surface water) flood extents. As such, I would have no objections to this site on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b>
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Limited	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No comments received.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Not applicable	<b>Open space</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Listed buildings</b> Not applicable	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> Not applicable	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> Not applicable
--------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

## Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE AND DESIGN: No specific Heritage and Design issues, but out with current settlement boundary.

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: Projected line of Roman road through the site. Burials have been discovered nearby. Evaluation required.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: No comments.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

SNH: Sites AOXTO011, AOXTO012, AOXTO013 and MOXTO001 appear to generally fit with principles set out in the Settlement Profile for Oxton. Given their proximity and relationship to each other we recommend that these sites are considered together and that a Development Framework or Brief is developed.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

ROADS PLANNING TEAM (GENERAL - OXTON): There are 3 road junctions with the A68 Trunk Road which serve Oxton: one just south of Carfraemill Roundabout, one just north of the roundabout, and another a bit further north. The main one (most direct) is the one just north of the roundabout. The suitability of these junctions to serve an increase in development will be a matter for Transport Scotland to comment on as Trunk Road Authority.

The main road junction serving Oxton from the A68 has bus laybys on either side of the A68 and a short length of footway to access the laybys. These laybys are no longer in use as the bus service comes into the village. Passenger Transport has raised a concern that the buses have to do a three point turn at St Cuthberts View and would be keen for potential development sites such as AOXTO013, AOXTO014, AOXTO018 and MOXTO001 to incorporate a bus turning circle if at all possible.

The main road into Oxton, over the Leader Water and via Station Road has its limitations which means that Oxton does not lend itself to any significant extent of development. It is difficult for two vehicles to pass at the pinch point at the property known as Leader Bank and there is no roadside footway between the A68 and the village and no real scope for providing one at parts though this is not too big a concern so long as the bus service continues to come into the village. There are lengths of road in the village absent of footway provision and the absence of off-street parking in the village results in traffic movements being hindered by on-street parking, in particular in The Loan, the road opposite The Loan at the crossroads and to a lesser extent in the main part of Station Road in the heart of the village. Junction visibility is restricted by building presence where The Loan meets Main Street/Station Road in the village centre, but drivers appear to edge out from The Loan and treat the junction with the respect it demands so that road safety seems to not be unduly compromised.

All matters considered, the road infrastructure serving Oxton does not lend itself to serving any significant extent of development.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM (SITE SPECIFIC - AOXTO011): I have concerns with this site for a housing allocation. The Loan leading to the site often has extensive lengths of parking on the street which forces single file traffic over significant lengths all the way from the junction with the Main Street/Station Road and round the horizontal curve in the road. This already causes issues with traffic flow. A solution to this would be fundamental to gaining my support for the development of this site. One solution would be to widen the carriageway on the west side of the initial length of The Loan to facilitate on-street parking and two-way traffic flow past the parked cars. This would require a retaining structure, would impact on an embankment and hedging adjacent to the road and would appear to affect third party land.

Furthermore, junction visibility where The Loan joins Main Street/Station Road is restricted due to the close proximity of the corner building on the east side combined with the alignment of the Main Street/Station Road. There are no obvious solutions to these concerns and additional traffic would exacerbate the situation. That said, the visibility restrictions appear to control traffic speeds to acceptable levels for the situation.

If this site was to be allocated for housing, The Loan would have to be widened beyond the Heriotfield junction and a footway and street lighting be provided to link in with the existing systems. An extension of the 30 mph speed limit is also likely to be required.

All matters considered, I would find it difficult to offer my support for this proposed allocation unless solutions to my concerns can be offered. Even then, the site offers little scope for integration with the existing street network in the village. A Transport Statement is likely to be required in due course if this site is to be allocated for development.

ROAD NETWORK MANAGER: Shortening of recreational route? Outwith existing 30 mph limit.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: There are a number of potential sites identified within Oxton that total 239 units. As above the potential cumulative impact on the A68(T), alongside other potential developments, would require to be determined prior to the publication of the proposed Plan. Information relating to any required mitigation measures and how these will be funded and delivered would require to be identified within the plan.

<b>Right of way</b>	<b>TPOs</b>	<b>Contaminated land</b>	<b>Water supply</b>	<b>Sewerage</b>	<b>Gas Supply</b>	<b>Education provision</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	On site	Yes	Limited	No	Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Any additional housing at Oxton should make contribution towards a bus turning circle and bus stop infrastructure at west end of village. Buses currently have to do a 3 point turn at St Cuthbert's View.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: No comments.

EDUCATION: If all sites developed across village, impact on school would be significant.

SCOTTISH WATER (WASTE): Limited capacity - outwith current network but could be accommodated.

SCOTTISH WATER (WATER): Sufficient capacity - a Water Impact Assessment would probably be required.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: This site would extend the village into open countryside so should be avoided if sufficient land can be allocated elsewhere.

CONTAMINATED LAND: A portion of the site was previously occupied by railway running lines within a cutting. The site is brownfield land and its use may present development constraints.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Housing on this site would benefit greatly from a pavement to the village, potentially utilizing the disused railway line and linking to the Oxton to Lauder path.

WASTE MANAGEMENT: No comments.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

PROJECTS MANAGER: No comments.

---

## Overall assessment

<b>PP status</b>	<b>Overall assessment</b>	<b>Site capacity</b>
Excluded	Unacceptable	19

### Conclusions

This site was submitted as part of the Main Issues Report consultation process. The site is located outwith the Oxton development boundary, to the south of the playing field. Development at this location would extend the village into open countryside. It is considered that development of the site offers little scope for integration with the existing street network in the village.

The Roads Planning Officer is unable to support development at this location due to road safety concerns along The Loan and at the Main Street/Station Road junction. The southern part of the site is affected by the HSE zoning due a hazardous pipeline.

Therefore, taking the above into consideration, the site will not be included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b> AOXTO012	<b>Site name</b> Heriotfield South	<b>Settlement</b> Oxton	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 18	<b>Ha</b> 0.9	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

SEPA: This site is immediately adjacent to the Scottish Water foul sewer network and as such foul drainage must connect to the foul sewer. With this and the other proposed sites in Oxton there is likely to be capacity issues at the STW.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site does not lie within the SEPA 1 in 200 year fluvial (river) or pluvial (surface water) flood extents. As such, I would have no objections to this site on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b>
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Limited	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Low impact. Site appears to be amenity grassland with hedgerow and small number of broad-leaved trees on the boundary. No obvious connectivity to River Tweed SAC. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats (lighting), badger and breeding birds.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Not applicable	<b>Open space</b> On site	<b>Listed buildings</b> Not applicable	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> Not applicable	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> Not applicable
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE AND DESIGN: No specific Heritage and Design issues, currently within settlement boundary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: Projected line of Roman road through the site. Evaluation required.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: No comments.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SNH: Sites AOXTO011, AOXTO012, AOXTO013 and MOXTO001 appear to generally fit with principles set out in the Settlement Profile for Oxton. Given their proximity and relationship to each other we recommend that these sites are considered together and that a Development Framework or Brief is developed.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

ROADS PLANNING TEAM (GENERAL - OXTON): There are 3 road junctions with the A68 Trunk Road which serve Oxton: one just south of Carfraemill Roundabout, one just north of the roundabout, and another a bit further north. The main one (most direct) is the one just north of the roundabout. The suitability of these junctions to serve an increase in development will be a matter for Transport Scotland to comment on as Trunk Road Authority.

The main road junction serving Oxton from the A68 has bus laybys on either side of the A68 and a short length of footway to access the laybys. These laybys are no longer in use as the bus service comes into the village. Passenger Transport has raised a concern that the buses have to do a three point turn at St Cuthberts View and would be keen for potential development sites such as AOXTO013, AOXTO014, AOXTO018 and MOXTO001 to incorporate a bus turning circle if at all possible.

The main road into Oxton, over the Leader Water and via Station Road has its limitations which means that Oxton does not lend itself to any significant extent of development. It is difficult for two vehicles to pass at the pinch point at the property known as Leader Bank and there is no roadside footway between the A68 and the village and no real scope for providing one at parts though this is not too big a concern so long as the bus service continues to come into the village. There are lengths of road in the village absent of footway provision and the absence of off-street parking in the village results in traffic movements being hindered by on-street parking, in particular in The Loan, the road opposite The Loan at the crossroads and to a lesser extent in the main part of Station Road in the heart of the village. Junction visibility is restricted by building presence where The Loan meets Main Street/Station Road in the village centre, but drivers appear to edge out from The Loan and treat the junction with the respect it demands so that road safety seems to not be unduly compromised.

All matters considered, the road infrastructure serving Oxton does not lend itself to serving any significant extent of development.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM (SITE SPECIFIC - AOXTO012): I have concerns with this site for a housing allocation. The Loan leading to the site often has extensive lengths of parking on the street which forces single file traffic over significant lengths all the way from the junction with the Main Street/Station Road and round the horizontal curve in the road. This already causes issues with traffic flow. A solution to this would be fundamental to gaining my support for the development of this site. One solution would be to widen the carriageway on the west side of the initial length of The Loan to facilitate on-street parking and two-way traffic flow past the parked cars. This would require a retaining structure, would impact on an embankment and hedging adjacent to the road and would appear to affect third party land.

Furthermore, junction visibility where The Loan joins Main Street/Station Road is restricted due to the close proximity of the corner building on the east side combined with the alignment of the Main Street/Station Road. There are no obvious solutions to these concerns and additional traffic would exacerbate the situation. That said, the visibility restrictions appear to control traffic speeds to acceptable levels for the situation.

If this site was to be allocated for housing, The Loan would have to be widened beyond the Heriotfield junction and a footway and street lighting be provided to link in with the existing systems. An extension of the 30 mph speed limit is also likely to be required. The site would have to integrate with the existing street network as best as possible and I would be interested to know if the playing field is to be provided elsewhere in the village and, if so, where?

All matters considered, I would find it difficult to offer my support for this proposed allocation unless solutions to my concerns can be offered. A Transport Statement is likely to be required in due course if this site is to be allocated for development.

ROAD NETWORK MANAGER: Loss of playing field. Would link up with proposal AOXT0011.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: There are a number of potential sites identified within Oxton that total 239 units. As above the potential cumulative impact on the A68(T), alongside other potential developments, would require to be determined prior to the publication of the proposed Plan. Information relating to any required mitigation measures and how these will be funded and delivered would require to be identified within the plan.

<b>Right of way</b>	<b>TPOs</b>	<b>Contaminated land</b>	<b>Water supply</b>	<b>Sewerage</b>	<b>Gas Supply</b>	<b>Education provision</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Yes	Limited	No	Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

GENERAL COMMENT: It is noted that the site is currently used as a football pitch and is therefore protected by Policy EP11, although the site is not identified as a Key Greenspace in the Plan.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Any additional housing at Oxton should make contribution towards a bus turning circle and bus stop infrastructure at west end of village. Buses currently have to do a 3 point turn at St Cuthbert's View.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: No comments.

EDUCATION: If all sites developed across village, impact on school would be significant.

SCOTTISH WATER (WASTE): Limited capacity - outwith current network but could be accommodated.

SCOTTISH WATER (WATER): Sufficient capacity - a Water Impact Assessment would probably be required.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Site is the playing fields, which provides a large area of usable open space within the village, so allocation of this site should be avoided if sufficient land can be found elsewhere.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Housing on this site would benefit greatly from a pavement to the village.

WASTE MANAGEMENT: No comments.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

PROJECTS MANAGER: No comments.

---

## Overall assessment

<b>PP status</b>	<b>Overall assessment</b>	<b>Site capacity</b>
Excluded	Unacceptable	18

### Conclusions

This site was submitted as part of the Main Issues Report consultation process. The site is located within the Oxton development boundary with residential development to the north at Heriotfield and to the west at Justice Park. The site is currently in use as a playing field, which provides a large area of usable open space within the village however the site is not identified as a key greenspace within the existing Local Development Plan.

The Roads Planning Officer is unable to support development at this location due to road safety concerns along The Loan and at the Main Street/Station Road junction. The settlement of Oxton has limited access to services. Therefore, taking the above into consideration, the site will not be included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b> AOXTO013	<b>Site name</b> West of St Cuthbert's View	<b>Settlement</b> Oxton	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 34	<b>Ha</b> 1.7	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	------------------------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

SEPA: This site is immediately adjacent to the Scottish Water foul sewer network and as such foul drainage must connect to the foul sewer. With this and the other proposed sites in Oxton there is likely to be capacity issues at the STW.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site does not lie within the SEPA 1 in 200 year fluvial (river) or pluvial (surface water) flood extents. As such, I would have no objections to this site on the grounds of flood risk.

Due to the size of the development, surface water runoff and the routing of overland flow should be considered within the placement of housing.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b>
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Limited	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Low impact. Site appears to be improved grassland with hedgerow on the boundary. Possible connectivity to River Tweed SAC via Clora burn but separated by road and field from burn. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats (lighting), badger and breeding birds.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Not applicable	<b>Open space</b> Not applicable	<b>Listed buildings</b> Not applicable	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> Not applicable
--------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE AND DESIGN: No specific Heritage and Design issues, but out with current settlement boundary.

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: Finds of prehistoric artefacts found nearby. Projected line of Roman road near the site. Evaluation required.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: No comments.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SNH: Sites AOXT0011, AOXT0012, AOXT0013 and MOXT0001 appear to generally fit with principles set out in the Settlement Profile for Oxton. Given their proximity and relationship to each other we recommend that these sites are considered together and that a Development Framework or Brief is developed.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

ROADS PLANNING TEAM (GENERAL - OXTON): There are 3 road junctions with the A68 Trunk Road which serve Oxton: one just south of Carfraemill Roundabout, one just north of the roundabout, and another a bit further north. The main one (most direct) is the one just north of the roundabout. The suitability of these junctions to serve an increase in development will be a matter for Transport Scotland to comment on as Trunk Road Authority.

The main road junction serving Oxton from the A68 has bus laybys on either side of the A68 and a short length of footway to access the laybys. These laybys are no longer in use as the bus service comes into the village. Passenger Transport has raised a concern that the buses have to do a three point turn at St Cuthberts View and would be keen for potential development sites such as AOXT0013, AOXT0014, AOXT0018 and MOXT0001 to incorporate a bus turning circle if at all possible.

The main road into Oxton, over the Leader Water and via Station Road has its limitations which means that Oxton does not lend itself to any significant extent of development. It is difficult for two vehicles to pass at the pinch point at the property known as Leader Bank and there is no roadside footway between the A68 and the village and no real scope for providing one at parts though this is not too big a concern so long as the bus service continues to come into the village. There are lengths of road in the village absent of footway provision and the absence of off-street parking in the village results in traffic movements being hindered by on-street parking, in particular in The Loan, the road opposite The Loan at the crossroads and to a lesser extent in the main part of Station Road in the heart of the village. Junction visibility is restricted by building presence where The Loan meets Main Street/Station Road in the village centre, but drivers appear to edge out from The Loan and treat the junction with the respect it demands so that road safety seems to not be unduly compromised.

All matters considered, the road infrastructure serving Oxton does not lend itself to serving any significant extent of development.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM (SITE SPECIFIC - AOXT0013): There is a difference in level between this site and the public road, but a main access into the site should be achievable at the south westerly end of the road frontage close to the existing track. There is potential for direct access from the existing public road to individual dwellings if the accesses can be dug in at suitable gradients.

The existing carriageway would require to be widened adjacent to the site and the 30mph limit, street lighting and footway would have to be extended out from the village.

There is little scope for integration of this site with the existing street network in the village, but, on balance, I am able to offer my support (just) for this site for development. A Transport Statement will be required in due course if this site is to be allocated for development.

ROAD NETWORK MANAGER: Extends village and speed limit.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: There are a number of potential sites identified within Oxton that total 239 units. As above the potential cumulative impact on the A68(T), alongside other potential developments, would require to be determined prior to the publication of the proposed Plan. Information relating to any required mitigation measures and how these will be funded and delivered would require to be identified within the plan.

**Right of way**

Not applicable

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

Not applicable

**Water supply**

Yes

**Sewerage**

Limited

**Gas Supply**

No

**Education provision**

Average

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Road layout to incorporate bus turning area. Buses presently undertake three point turn at St Cuthbert's View.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: No comments.

EDUCATION: If all sites developed across village, impact on school would be significant.

SCOTTISH WATER (WASTE): Limited capacity - outwith current network but could be accommodated.

SCOTTISH WATER (WATER): Sufficient capacity - a Water Impact Assessment would probably be required.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: This would only be a logical extension to the village if no sites can be allocated within the existing development boundary. The ground levels would make this a difficult site to develop and there may be overbearing and overlooking issues to St Cuthbert's View.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: The site is adjacent to an existing haulier's yard which is likely to be considered as class 5 or 6. Environmental Health is aware that the yard itself is listed on LDP2 as site AOXTO014 ('housing'). If site AOXTO014 is developed first then Environmental Health will be able to support the adjacent sites for residential use.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Housing on this site would benefit greatly from a pavement to the village.

WASTE MANAGEMENT: No comments.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

PROJECTS MANAGER: No comments.

**Overall assessment****PP status**

Excluded

**Overall assessment**

Unacceptable

**Site capacity**

34

**Conclusions**

This site was submitted as part of the Main Issues Report consultation process. The site is located outwith the Oxton development boundary to the west of the village. The surrounding land uses include agricultural, residential and a haulage yard. The existing haulage yard is operational and Environmental Health have raised this as a potential issue.

The site is elevated and due to the site levels there may be difficulty accessing the site and there also may be issues with residential properties at St Cuthbert's View being overlooked. There is also a hazard pipeline running through the site and a Health and Safety Executive (HSE) PADHI+ assessment has been carried out via the HSE website. The outcome of this stated: HSE's Advice: Advise Against. The assessment indicates that the risk of harm to people at the proposed development site is such that HSE's advice is that there are sufficient reasons on safety grounds, for advising against the granting of planning permission in this case.

In conclusion, due to the reasons mentioned above it is not considered appropriate to include this site within the Proposed Plan.

<b>Site reference</b>	<b>Site name</b>	<b>Settlement</b>	<b>SDA</b>	<b>Proposed Use</b>	<b>Indicative Capacity</b>	<b>Ha</b>	<b>PP status</b>
AOXTO014	North of Main Street	Oxton	Rest of Borders	Housing	15	0.8	Excluded

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b>	<b>SAC</b>	<b>SPA</b>	<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

SEPA: There is a water body within/immediately adjacent to the site. Therefore, SEPA advise that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

A culverted watercourse may run through this site. There may be opportunities to restore the water environment to its natural state by removing the culvert. We therefore recommend that a development requirement is attached to this site requiring a feasibility study including a flood risk assessment to be undertaken prior to development to assess the potential for channel restoration.

We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Clora Burn and tributary. Consideration should be given to any culverts/bridges might may exacerbate flood risk. Site may be constrained due to flood risk.

This site is within/immediately adjacent to the Scottish Water foul sewer network and as such foul drainage must connect to the foul sewer. With this and the other proposed sites in Oxton there is likely to be capacity issues at the STW. The Clora burn runs through the northerly part of the site and must be protected as part of any development - SEPA has a policy against culverting for land gain.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site does not lie within the SEPA 1 in 200 year fluvial (river) or pluvial (surface water) flood extents. However, the Clora Burn runs through this site on the Northern boundary. I would require that there is no development on, or within close proximity to this burn. The applicant should consider any surface water runoff issues.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b>	<b>Planning history references</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Combination	03/01236/FUL - Erection of general purpose shed (Approved)

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b>	<b>Access to employment</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b>	<b>Site aspect</b>
Good	Good	Limited	Moderate	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Old school building with slate roof, stone built cottage/store with steel roof and modern, steel agricultural barns. Farm yard and storage area, areas of scattered scrub. Potential connectivity via Clora burn to River Tweed SAC (Leader water). Potential for bat roosts (EPS) and breeding birds. Mitigation for protected species potentially including bats (loss of roosts and lighting), and breeding birds. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

On site

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE AND DESIGN: No specific Heritage and Design issues.

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: Likely core of medieval village. Evaluation needed.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: No comments.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SNH: No comment due to location and current use of site.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

ROADS PLANNING TEAM (GENERAL - OXTON): There are 3 road junctions with the A68 Trunk Road which serve Oxton: one just south of Carfraemill Roundabout, one just north of the roundabout, and another a bit further north. The main one (most direct) is the one just north of the roundabout. The suitability of these junctions to serve an increase in development will be a matter for Transport Scotland to comment on as Trunk Road Authority.

The main road junction serving Oxton from the A68 has bus laybys on either side of the A68 and a short length of footway to access the laybys. These laybys are no longer in use as the bus service comes into the village. Passenger Transport has raised a concern that the buses have to do a three point turn at St Cuthberts View and would be keen for potential development sites such as AOXTO013, AOXTO014, AOXTO018 and MOXTO001 to incorporate a bus turning circle if at all possible.

The main road into Oxton, over the Leader Water and via Station Road has its limitations which means that Oxton does not lend itself to any significant extent of development. It is difficult for two vehicles to pass at the pinch point at the property known as Leader Bank and there is no roadside footway between the A68 and the village and no real scope for providing one at parts though this is not too big a concern so long as the bus service continues to come into the village. There are lengths of road in the village absent of footway provision and the absence of off-street parking in the village results in traffic movements being hindered by on-street parking, in particular in The Loan, the road opposite The Loan at the crossroads and to a lesser extent in the main part of Station Road in the heart of the village. Junction visibility is restricted by building presence where The Loan meets Main Street/Station Road in the village centre, but drivers appear to edge out from The Loan and treat the junction with the respect it demands so that road safety seems to not be unduly compromised.

All matters considered, the road infrastructure serving Oxton does not lend itself to serving any significant extent of development.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM (SITE SPECIFIC - AOXTO014): I have no objections in principle to the redevelopment of this site and would welcome the removal of the haulage firm from the centre of the village. It would be beneficial however to have confirmation of where the current haulage business is proposed to relocate to as part of any future proposal.

If the primary school is to remain then there would be an opportunity for improved means of access to it. If the intention is to relocate the school then details are required for my consideration.

The existing carriageway (Main Street) would require to be widened adjacent to the site and the 30mph limit, street lighting and footway would have to be extended out from the village as appropriate.

If site AOXT0015 is also to be allocated for development, consideration should be given to integration of the two sites, depending on the intentions for the school, and improving the initial section of the private road between the two sites to an adoptable standard.

A Transport Statement is likely to be required in due course if this site is to be allocated for development.

ROAD NETWORK MANAGER: Extends village and speed limit but to a lesser extent than AOXT0013.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: There are a number of potential sites identified within Oxton that total 239 units. As above the potential cumulative impact on the A68(T), alongside other potential developments, would require to be determined prior to the publication of the proposed Plan. Information relating to any required mitigation measures and how these will be funded and delivered would require to be identified within the plan.

#### Right of way

Not applicable

#### TPOs

Not applicable

#### Contaminated land

On site

#### Water supply

Yes

#### Sewerage

Limited

#### Gas Supply

No

#### Education provision

Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Any additional housing at Oxton should make contribution towards a bus turning circle and bus stop infrastructure at west end of village. Buses currently have to do a 3 point turn at St Cuthbert's View.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: No comments.

EDUCATION: If all sites developed across village, impact on school would be significant.

SCOTTISH WATER (WASTE): Limited capacity - outwith current network but could be accommodated.

SCOTTISH WATER (WATER): Sufficient capacity - a Water Impact Assessment would probably be required.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: The site is a haulier's yard within the development boundary. Seems a logical infill site. Not sure what the position is with the primary school, which seems to have been included in the site. Contamination may be an issue.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have been developed as a school and a haulier's yard. The site is brownfield land and its use may present development constraints.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Safe routes to Channelkirk Primary School should be considered.

WASTE MANAGEMENT: No comments.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

PROJECTS MANAGER: No comments.

ESTATES TEAM: This site forms part of an operational primary school.

---

## Overall assessment

#### PP status

Excluded

#### Overall assessment

Doubtful

#### Site capacity

15

### Conclusions

This site was submitted as part of the Main Issues Report consultation process. The site is currently in use as a haulage yard and a Primary School. It is not known if the haulage yard proposes to relocate and there are no current plans to relocate Channelkirk Primary School.

Although the Roads Planning Team support redevelopment of the site, as the future of the existing uses is not known it is not felt that this site should be allocated. It is not considered that this site would be effective within the five year period and therefore it should not be included within the Proposed Plan.

In conclusion, it should be noted that the site is within the Oxton development boundary and should the uses on the site change the site could be redeveloped and an application submitted as part of the

development management process.

---

<b>Site reference</b> AOXTO015	<b>Site name</b> Bridgend	<b>Settlement</b> Oxton	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 15	<b>Ha</b> 1.0	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Clora Burn and tributary. Consideration should be given to any culverts/bridges might may exacerbate flood risk. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at an increased risk of flooding. Site may be constrained due to flood risk.

This site is immediately adjacent to the Scottish Water foul sewer network and as such foul drainage must connect to the foul sewer. With this and the other proposed sites in Oxton there is likely to be capacity issues at the STW.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site does not lie within the SEPA 1 in 200 year fluvial (river) or pluvial (surface water) flood extents. As such, I would have no objections to this site on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Combination	<b>Planning history references</b> 90/01359/OUT and 90/01360/REM - Erection of a dwellinghouse (Approved) 08/00181/OUT - Erection of dwellinghouse (Withdrawn) 08/00182/OUT - Erection of dwellinghouse (Withdrawn)
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Limited	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site contains house with slate roof, outbuildings, garden ground with mature trees, and improved pasture. Hedgerow and mature, broad-leaved trees on boundary. Potential connectivity via Clora burn to River Tweed SAC (Leader water). Potential for bat roosts (EPS) and breeding birds. Mitigation for protected species potentially including bats (loss of roosts and lighting), and breeding birds. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE AND DESIGN: No specific Heritage and Design issues.

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: Likely core of medieval village. Evaluation needed.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: No comments.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SNH: Relatively well contained site within existing settlement boundary. No further comment.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

ROADS PLANNING TEAM (GENERAL - OXTON): There are 3 road junctions with the A68 Trunk Road which serve Oxton: one just south of Carfraemill Roundabout, one just north of the roundabout, and another a bit further north. The main one (most direct) is the one just north of the roundabout. The suitability of these junctions to serve an increase in development will be a matter for Transport Scotland to comment on as Trunk Road Authority.

The main road junction serving Oxton from the A68 has bus laybys on either side of the A68 and a short length of footway to access the laybys. These laybys are no longer in use as the bus service comes into the village. Passenger Transport has raised a concern that the buses have to do a three point turn at St Cuthberts View and would be keen for potential development sites such as AOXTO013, AOXTO014, AOXTO018 and MOXTO001 to incorporate a bus turning circle if at all possible.

The main road into Oxton, over the Leader Water and via Station Road has its limitations which means that Oxton does not lend itself to any significant extent of development. It is difficult for two vehicles to pass at the pinch point at the property known as Leader Bank and there is no roadside footway between the A68 and the village and no real scope for providing one at parts though this is not too big a concern so long as the bus service continues to come into the village. There are lengths of road in the village absent of footway provision and the absence of off-street parking in the village results in traffic movements being hindered by on-street parking, in particular in The Loan, the road opposite The Loan at the crossroads and to a lesser extent in the main part of Station Road in the heart of the village. Junction visibility is restricted by building presence where The Loan meets Main Street/Station Road in the village centre, but drivers appear to edge out from The Loan and treat the junction with the respect it demands so that road safety seems to not be unduly compromised.

All matters considered, the road infrastructure serving Oxton does not lend itself to serving any significant extent of development.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM (SITE SPECIFIC - AOXTO015): I have no objections this site being allocated for housing. Some road widening along with footway works will be required on the minor public road leading to the site from the village centre. If Site AOXTO014 is also to be allocated for development, consideration will have to be given to integration of the two sites, depending on the intentions for the school, and improving the initial section of the private road between the two sites to an adoptable standard.

ROAD NETWORK MANAGER: Extends village and speed limit but to a lesser extent than AOXTO013.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: There are a number of potential sites identified within Oxton that total 239 units. As above the potential cumulative impact on the A68(T), alongside other potential developments, would require to be determined prior to the publication of the proposed Plan. Information relating to any required mitigation measures and how these will be funded and delivered would require to be identified within the plan.

<b>Right of way</b>	<b>TPOs</b>	<b>Contaminated land</b>	<b>Water supply</b>	<b>Sewerage</b>	<b>Gas Supply</b>	<b>Education provision</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Yes	Limited	No	Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Any additional housing at Oxton should make contribution towards a bus turning circle and bus stop infrastructure at west end of village. Buses currently have to do a 3 point turn at St Cuthbert's View.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: No comments.

EDUCATION: If all sites developed across village, impact on school would be significant.

SCOTTISH WATER (WASTE): Limited capacity - outwith current network but could be accommodated.

SCOTTISH WATER (WATER): Sufficient capacity - a Water Impact Assessment would probably be required.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Seems a logical development site (though has a house on it) within the development boundary.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have been developed with residential properties, with wider areas remaining undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to currently indicate that the sites historic uses may present development constraints.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: The site is adjacent to an existing haulier's yard which is likely to be considered as class 5 or 6. Environmental Health is aware that the yard itself is listed on LDP2 as site AOXTO014 ('housing'). If site AOXTO014 is developed first then Environmental Health will be able to support the adjacent sites for residential use.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: No comment required.

WASTE MANAGEMENT: No comments.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

PROJECTS MANAGER: No comments.

---

## Overall assessment

<b>PP status</b>	<b>Overall assessment</b>	<b>Site capacity</b>
Excluded	Acceptable	15

### Conclusions

This site was submitted as part of the Main Issues Report consultation process. Within the site is a single detached dwellinghouse with access road and the remainder of the site is undeveloped. No insurmountable constraints were identified as part of the site assessment process.

The site is within the Oxton development boundary and therefore an application could be submitted through the development management process. Therefore it is not considered necessary to include this site within the Proposed Plan.

<b>Site reference</b> AOXTO016	<b>Site name</b> Oxton North West	<b>Settlement</b> Oxton	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 42	<b>Ha</b> 2.1	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

SEPA: Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at an increased risk of flooding.

This site is immediately adjacent to the Scottish Water foul sewer network and as such foul drainage must connect to the foul sewer. With this and the other proposed sites in Oxton there is likely to be capacity issues at the STW.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site does not lie within the SEPA 1 in 200 year fluvial (river) or pluvial (surface water) flood extents. As such, I would have no objections to this site on the grounds of flood risk. Due to the size of the development, surface water runoff and routing of overland flow should be considered.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> 07/02468/OUT - Erection of fourteen affordable dwellinghouses (Withdrawn)
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Limited	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No comments received.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Not applicable	<b>Open space</b> Not applicable	<b>Listed buildings</b> Not applicable	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> Not applicable	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> Not applicable
--------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE AND DESIGN: No specific Heritage and Design issues, but out with current settlement boundary.

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: Projected line of Roman road through the site. Evaluation required.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: No comments.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SNH: Our brief appraisal of this site suggests that the west of AOXTO016 is more elevated and may be prominent in views from A68. The overall character of the site is rural and we recommend that, if allocated, massing and site layout should reflect this. The site benefits from well-established boundary hedgerows that should also be retained and incorporated into development if site is allocated.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

ROADS PLANNING TEAM (GENERAL - OXTON): There are 3 road junctions with the A68 Trunk Road which serve Oxton: one just south of Carfraemill Roundabout, one just north of the roundabout, and another a bit further north. The main one (most direct) is the one just north of the roundabout. The suitability of these junctions to serve an increase in development will be a matter for Transport Scotland to comment on as Trunk Road Authority.

The main road junction serving Oxton from the A68 has bus laybys on either side of the A68 and a short length of footway to access the laybys. These laybys are no longer in use as the bus service comes into the village. Passenger Transport has raised a concern that the buses have to do a three point turn at St Cuthberts View and would be keen for potential development sites such as AOXTO013, AOXTO014, AOXTO018 and MOXTO001 to incorporate a bus turning circle if at all possible.

The main road into Oxton, over the Leader Water and via Station Road has its limitations which means that Oxton does not lend itself to any significant extent of development. It is difficult for two vehicles to pass at the pinch point at the property known as Leader Bank and there is no roadside footway between the A68 and the village and no real scope for providing one at parts though this is not too big a concern so long as the bus service continues to come into the village. There are lengths of road in the village absent of footway provision and the absence of off-street parking in the village results in traffic movements being hindered by on-street parking, in particular in The Loan, the road opposite The Loan at the crossroads and to a lesser extent in the main part of Station Road in the heart of the village. Junction visibility is restricted by building presence where The Loan meets Main Street/Station Road in the village centre, but drivers appear to edge out from The Loan and treat the junction with the respect it demands so that road safety seems to not be unduly compromised.

All matters considered, the road infrastructure serving Oxton does not lend itself to serving any significant extent of development.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM (SITE SPECIFIC - AOXTO016): This site appears remote from the village and I have concerns over the initial section of public road that serves this site from the village centre due to its generally narrow width, lack of a pedestrian footway and its obvious shortfall of parking provision for the existing properties. I also have concerns on adding traffic onto the minor road to the north. The minor public road leading to the site from the village centre is not capable of accommodating development of this level without third party land and excessive engineering works.

I am not in favour of this land being allocated for housing.

If allocated, consideration should be given to integration with Site AOXTO015, if allocated, and a Transport Assessment, or at least a Transport Statement, will be required depending on the scale of development.

The existing village infrastructure would have to be extended out from the village and carriageway widening and pedestrian provision improved as best as possible.

ROAD NETWORK MANAGER: Extends village and speed limit.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: There are a number of potential sites identified within Oxton that total 239 units. As above the potential cumulative impact on the A68(T), alongside other potential developments, would require to be determined prior to the publication of the proposed Plan. Information relating to any required mitigation measures and how these will be funded and delivered would require to be identified within the plan.

#### Right of way

Not applicable

#### TPOs

Not applicable

#### Contaminated land

Not applicable

#### Water supply

Yes

#### Sewerage

Limited

#### Gas Supply

No

#### Education provision

Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Any additional housing at Oxton should make contribution towards a bus turning circle and bus stop infrastructure at west end of village. Buses currently have to do a 3 point turn at St Cuthbert's View.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: No comments.

EDUCATION: If all sites developed across village, impact on school would be significant.

SCOTTISH WATER (WASTE): Limited capacity - outwith current network but could be accommodated.

SCOTTISH WATER (WATER): Sufficient capacity - a Water Impact Assessment would probably be required.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: These sites (including AOXT0017) appear too large and detached from the village for an appropriate extension to the village. They would also be prominent from the A68. Other, smaller sites seem more appropriate.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Housing on this site would benefit greatly from a pavement to the village.

WASTE MANAGEMENT: No comments.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

PROJECTS MANAGER: No comments.

---

## Overall assessment

#### PP status

Excluded

#### Overall assessment

Unacceptable

#### Site capacity

42

### Conclusions

This site was submitted as part of the Main Issues Report consultation process. The site is a greenfield site outwith the Oxton development boundary and is located to the north of the village.

The Roads Planning Team state that the site appears remote from the village and raise concerns over the initial section of public road that serves this site from the village centre due to its generally narrow width, lack of a pedestrian footway and its obvious shortfall of parking provision for the existing properties. They also have concerns on adding traffic onto the minor road to the north. The minor public road leading to the site from the village centre is not capable of accommodating development of this level without third party land and excessive engineering works.

Therefore, taking the above into consideration, the site will not be included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b>	<b>Site name</b>	<b>Settlement</b>	<b>SDA</b>	<b>Proposed Use</b>	<b>Indicative Capacity</b>	<b>Ha</b>	<b>PP status</b>
AOXTO017	Oxton North East	Oxton	Rest of Borders	Housing	60	3.0	Excluded

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b>	<b>SAC</b>	<b>SPA</b>	<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

SEPA: There is sufficient height between site and the Leader Water. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at an increased risk of flooding.

This site is immediately adjacent to the Scottish Water foul sewer network and as such foul drainage must connect to the foul sewer. With this and the other proposed sites in Oxton there is likely to be capacity issues at the STW.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site does not lie within the SEPA 1 in 200 year fluvial (river) or pluvial (surface water) flood extents. As such, I would have no objections to this site on the grounds of flood risk. However, due to the size of the site, surface water flooding should be considered by the applicant.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b>	<b>Planning history references</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b>	<b>Access to employment</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b>	<b>Site aspect</b>
Good	Good	Limited	Moderate	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site appears to be improved grassland with hedgerow and small number of trees on the boundary. No obvious connectivity to River Tweed SAC but 100m from site boundary to Leader water. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats (lighting), badger and breeding birds. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

## Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE AND DESIGN: No specific Heritage and Design issues, but out with current settlement boundary.

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: Projected line of Roman road near the site. Evaluation required.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: No comments.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

SNH: The site appears to fall within these restrictions of the Settlement Profile for Oxton: "Development to the north and east of the settlement will be resisted where it would have significant effect on the international conservation value of the Leader Water or impact on the countryside setting of the settlement as viewed from the A68 trunk road." Reflecting this, we consider that it is a far more prominent site than AOXT0016 and that it would impact on the current gateway/ arrival to Oxton.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

ROADS PLANNING TEAM (GENERAL - OXTON): There are 3 road junctions with the A68 Trunk Road which serve Oxton: one just south of Carfraemill Roundabout, one just north of the roundabout, and another a bit further north. The main one (most direct) is the one just north of the roundabout. The suitability of these junctions to serve an increase in development will be a matter for Transport Scotland to comment on as Trunk Road Authority.

The main road junction serving Oxton from the A68 has bus laybys on either side of the A68 and a short length of footway to access the laybys. These laybys are no longer in use as the bus service comes into the village. Passenger Transport has raised a concern that the buses have to do a three point turn at St Cuthberts View and would be keen for potential development sites such as AOXT0013, AOXT0014, AOXT0018 and MOXT0001 to incorporate a bus turning circle if at all possible.

The main road into Oxton, over the Leader Water and via Station Road has its limitations which means that Oxton does not lend itself to any significant extent of development. It is difficult for two vehicles to pass at the pinch point at the property known as Leader Bank and there is no roadside footway between the A68 and the village and no real scope for providing one at parts though this is not too big a concern so long as the bus service continues to come into the village. There are lengths of road in the village absent of footway provision and the absence of off-street parking in the village results in traffic movements being hindered by on-street parking, in particular in The Loan, the road opposite The Loan at the crossroads and to a lesser extent in the main part of Station Road in the heart of the village. Junction visibility is restricted by building presence where The Loan meets Main Street/Station Road in the village centre, but drivers appear to edge out from The Loan and treat the junction with the respect it demands so that road safety seems to not be unduly compromised.

All matters considered, the road infrastructure serving Oxton does not lend itself to serving any significant extent of development.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM (SITE SPECIFIC - AOXT0017): This site appears remote from the village and I have concerns over the initial section of public road that serves this site from the village centre due to its generally narrow width, lack of a pedestrian footway and its obvious shortfall of parking provision for the existing properties. I also have concerns on adding traffic onto the minor road to the north. The minor public road leading to the site from the village centre is not capable of accommodating development of this level without third party land and excessive engineering works.

I am not in favour of this land being allocated for housing.

If allocated a Transport Assessment, or at least a Transport Statement, will be required depending on the scale of development.

The existing village infrastructure would have to be extended out from the village and carriageway widening and pedestrian provision improved as best as possible.

ROAD NETWORK MANAGER: Extends village and speed limit.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: There are a number of potential sites identified within Oxton that total 239 units. As above the potential cumulative impact on the A68(T), alongside other potential developments, would require to be determined prior to the publication of the proposed Plan. Information relating to any required mitigation measures and how these will be funded and delivered would require to be identified within the plan.

<b>Right of way</b>	<b>TPOs</b>	<b>Contaminated land</b>	<b>Water supply</b>	<b>Sewerage</b>	<b>Gas Supply</b>	<b>Education provision</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Yes	Limited	No	Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Any additional housing at Oxton should make contribution towards a bus turning circle and bus stop infrastructure at west end of village. Buses currently have to do a 3 point turn at St Cuthbert's View.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: No comments.

EDUCATION: If all sites developed across village, impact on school would be significant.

SCOTTISH WATER (WASTE): Limited capacity - outwith current network but could be accommodated.

SCOTTISH WATER (WATER): Sufficient capacity - a Water Impact Assessment would probably be required.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: These sites (including AOXT0016) appear too large and detached from the village for an appropriate extension to the village. They would also be prominent from the A68. Other, smaller sites seem more appropriate.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Housing on this site would benefit greatly from a pavement to the village.

WASTE MANAGEMENT: No comments.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

PROJECTS MANAGER: No comments.

---

## Overall assessment

<b>PP status</b>	<b>Overall assessment</b>	<b>Site capacity</b>
Excluded	Unacceptable	60

### Conclusions

This site was submitted as part of the Main Issues Report consultation process. The site is a large, prominent greenfield site outwith the Oxton development boundary and is located to the north of the village.

The Roads Planning Team state that the site appears remote from the village and I have concerns over the initial section of public road that serves this site from the village centre due to its generally narrow width, lack of a pedestrian footway and its obvious shortfall of parking provision for the existing properties. I also have concerns on adding traffic onto the minor road to the north. The minor public road leading to the site from the village centre is not capable of accommodating development of this level without third party land and excessive engineering works.

It should also be noted that Scottish Natural Heritage consider that it is a far more prominent site than AOXT0016 and that it would impact on the current gateway/ arrival to Oxton.

Therefore, taking the above into consideration, the site will not be included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b> AOXTO018	<b>Site name</b> South of Justice Hall	<b>Settlement</b> Oxton	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 36	<b>Ha</b> 3.6	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

SEPA: There is a water body within/immediately adjacent to the site. Therefore, SEPA advise that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

A culverted watercourse may run through this site. There may be opportunities to restore the water environment to its natural state by removing the culvert. We therefore recommend that a development requirement is attached to this site requiring a feasibility study including a flood risk assessment to be undertaken prior to development to assess the potential for channel restoration.

We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Clora Burn. Consideration should be given to any culverts/bridges might may exacerbate flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Site may be constrained due to flood risk.

This site is within the Scottish Water foul sewer network and as such foul drainage must connect to the foul sewer. With this and the other proposed sites in Oxton there is likely to be capacity issues at the STW. The Clora burn runs through the site and must be protected as part of any development - SEPA has a policy against culverting for land gain.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site does not lie within the SEPA 1 in 200 year fluvial (river) flood extent. The majority of the site does not lie within the pluvial (surface water) flood extent but a very small part on the East side boundary does. As such, I would have no objections to this site on the grounds of flood risk. However, due to the size of the site, surface water flooding should be considered by the applicant.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> Change of use of land and siting of porta cabin for use as community shop - 18/00530/FUL - Approved subject to conditions.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Limited	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGICAL OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site appears to be improved grassland with hedgerow and small number of trees on the boundary and along Clora burn. Potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC via Clora burn. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats (lighting), badger and breeding birds. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	On site	Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE AND DESIGN: Justicehall is a substantial category B listed villa facing south. The open land to the south is an integral part of the setting of the house; there has only been minor development on the road edge – the memorial hall and more recently shop. The site lies outwith the current development boundary. I am concerned about any development on this site having an adverse impact on the setting of Justicehall.

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: Projected line of Roman road near the site. Likely core of medieval village. Evaluation required.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: No comments.

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable			Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SNH: The site appears to fall within these restrictions of the Settlement Profile for Oxton: "Development to the north and east of the settlement will be resisted where it would have significant effect on the international conservation value of the Leader Water or impact on the countryside setting of the settlement as viewed from the A68 trunk road." This site presents similar issues to those noted in relation to AOXT0017.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

**Near a trunk road?**

ROADS PLANNING TEAM (GENERAL - OXTON): There are 3 road junctions with the A68 Trunk Road which serve Oxton: one just south of Carfraemill Roundabout, one just north of the roundabout, and another a bit further north. The main one (most direct) is the one just north of the roundabout. The suitability of these junctions to serve an increase in development will be a matter for Transport Scotland to comment on as Trunk Road Authority.

The main road junction serving Oxton from the A68 has bus laybys on either side of the A68 and a short length of footway to access the laybys. These laybys are no longer in use as the bus service comes into the village. Passenger Transport has raised a concern that the buses have to do a three point turn at St Cuthberts View and would be keen for potential development sites such as AOXT0013, AOXT0014, AOXT0018 and MOXT0001 to incorporate a bus turning circle if at all possible.

The main road into Oxton, over the Leader Water and via Station Road has its limitations which means that Oxton does not lend itself to any significant extent of development. It is difficult for two vehicles to pass at the pinch point at the property known as Leader Bank and there is no roadside footway between the A68 and the village and no real scope for providing one at parts though this is not too big a concern so long as the bus service continues to come into the village. There are lengths of road in the village absent of footway provision and the absence of off-street parking in the village results in traffic movements being hindered by on-street parking, in particular in The Loan, the road opposite The Loan at the crossroads and to a lesser extent in the main part of Station Road in the heart of the village. Junction visibility is restricted by building presence where The Loan meets Main Street/Station Road in the village centre, but drivers appear to edge out from The Loan and treat the junction with the respect it demands so that road safety seems to not be unduly compromised.

All matters considered, the road infrastructure serving Oxton does not lend itself to serving any significant extent of development.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM (SITE SPECIFIC - AOXT0018): This is by far the best site for a housing development, and possibly part community use, within Oxton.

The site presents an excellent opportunity to integrate fully with the village and create an enhanced main street through the village, widening the existing road to allow for enhanced village centre on-street parking and provision for pedestrians.

A strong building presence with an active frontage onto Station Road with multiple access points including some direct access is desirable and will create a typical main street feel for a village of this size. This could be broken up with a village green and/or village square as part of the placemaking process to protect best vistas.

A further access onto the minor public road to the west is also required along with some improvement to existing pedestrian provision over the initial length of road from the crossroads and some internal parking provision to compensate for the lack of off-street parking which results in on-street parking hampering traffic flow over the initial length of road from the crossroads. Some minor carriageway widening over this length may be required.

A Transport Assessment, or at least a Transport Statement, will be required depending on the scale of development.

ROAD NETWORK MANAGER: Extends village and speed limit.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: There are a number of potential sites identified within Oxton that total 239 units. As above the potential cumulative impact on the A68(T), alongside other potential developments, would require to be determined prior to the publication of the proposed Plan. Information relating to any required mitigation measures and how these will be funded and delivered would require to be identified within the plan.

#### Right of way

Not applicable

#### TPOs

Not applicable

#### Contaminated land

Not applicable

#### Water supply

Yes

#### Sewerage

Limited

#### Gas Supply

No

#### Education provision

Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Any additional housing at Oxton should make contribution towards a bus turning circle and bus stop infrastructure at west end of village. Buses currently have to do a 3 point turn at St Cuthbert's View.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: No comments.

EDUCATION: If all sites developed across village, impact on school would be significant.

SCOTTISH WATER (WASTE): Limited capacity - outwith current network but could be accommodated.

SCOTTISH WATER (WATER): Sufficient capacity - a Water Impact Assessment would probably be required.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: This is a very large site, used for grazing, within the development boundary. Some development on this site would be appropriate (not the whole site?), though the changing levels would have to be considered. The site is very prominent coming into the village so a high quality of design would be required along the Station Road frontage. The trees should be retained and protected.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site has remained largely undeveloped through the map extracts reviewed, however did house a 'works' of unspecified use. The site is brownfield land and its use may present development constraints.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: No comment required.

WASTE MANAGEMENT: No comments.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

PROJECTS MANAGER: No comments.

---

## Overall assessment

#### PP status

Excluded

#### Overall assessment

Doubtful

#### Site capacity

36

## Conclusions

This site was submitted as part of the Main Issues Report consultation process. The site is a large, prominent greenfield site outwith the Oxton development boundary and is located in the centre of the village.

The Roads Planning Team are supportive of development at this location. They state the site presents an excellent opportunity to integrate fully with the village and create an enhanced main street through the village, widening the existing road to allow for enhanced village centre on-street parking and provision for pedestrians.

However, concerns were raised by the Heritage and Design Team in relation to development on this site having an adverse impact on the setting of the Justicehall, the b-listed villa to the north of the site.

It should also be noted that Scottish Natural Heritage consider that it is a far more prominent site than AOXTO016 and that it would impact on the current gateway/ arrival to Oxton. SEPA state the site may be constrained due to flood risk.

Therefore, taking the above into consideration, the site will not be included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b> MOXTO001	<b>Site name</b> Oxton South West	<b>Settlement</b> Oxton	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Mixed Use	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 50	<b>Ha</b> 4.5	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

SEPA: The site is immediately adjacent to the foul sewer network and hence must connect to the public foul sewer. With this and the other proposed sites in Oxton there is likely to be capacity issues at the STW. Depending on the intended future use of the site certain activities/ industrial type processes may require additional permissions from SEPA to operate.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site does not lie within the SEPA 1 in 200 year fluvial (river) or pluvial (surface water) flood extents. As such, I would have no objections to this site on the grounds of flood risk.  
Due to the size of the development, surface water runoff and routing of overland flow should be considered.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b>
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Limited	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No comments received.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Not applicable	<b>Open space</b> Not applicable	<b>Listed buildings</b> Not applicable	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> Not applicable
--------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE AND DESIGN: No specific Heritage and Design issues, this looks however very much a long term site.

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: Finds of prehistoric artefacts found nearby. Projected line of Roman road near the site. Evaluation required.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: No comments.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SNH: Sites AOXTO011, AOXTO012, AOXTO013 and MOXTO001 appear to generally fit with principles set out in the Settlement Profile for Oxton. Given their proximity and relationship to each other we recommend that these sites are considered together and that a Development Framework or Brief is developed.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

ROADS PLANNING TEAM (GENERAL - OXTON): There are 3 road junctions with the A68 Trunk Road which serve Oxton: one just south of Carfraemill Roundabout, one just north of the roundabout, and another a bit further north. The main one (most direct) is the one just north of the roundabout. The suitability of these junctions to serve an increase in development will be a matter for Transport Scotland to comment on as Trunk Road Authority.

The main road junction serving Oxton from the A68 has bus laybys on either side of the A68 and a short length of footway to access the laybys. These laybys are no longer in use as the bus service comes into the village. Passenger Transport has raised a concern that the buses have to do a three point turn at St Cuthberts View and would be keen for potential development sites such as AOXTO013, AOXTO014, AOXTO018 and MOXTO001 to incorporate a bus turning circle if at all possible.

The main road into Oxton, over the Leader Water and via Station Road has its limitations which means that Oxton does not lend itself to any significant extent of development. It is difficult for two vehicles to pass at the pinch point at the property known as Leader Bank and there is no roadside footway between the A68 and the village and no real scope for providing one at parts though this is not too big a concern so long as the bus service continues to come into the village. There are lengths of road in the village absent of footway provision and the absence of off-street parking in the village results in traffic movements being hindered by on-street parking, in particular in The Loan, the road opposite The Loan at the crossroads and to a lesser extent in the main part of Station Road in the heart of the village. Junction visibility is restricted by building presence where The Loan meets Main Street/Station Road in the village centre, but drivers appear to edge out from The Loan and treat the junction with the respect it demands so that road safety seems to not be unduly compromised.

All matters considered, the road infrastructure serving Oxton does not lend itself to serving any significant extent of development.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM (SITE SPECIFIC - MOXTO001): There is a difference in level between this site and the public road (Main Street), but a main access into the site should be achievable at the south westerly end of the road frontage close to the existing track. There is potential for direct access from the existing public road (Main Street) to individual dwellings if the accesses can be dug in at suitable gradients.

The existing carriageway of Main Street would require to be widened adjacent to the site and the 30mph limit, street lighting and footway would have to be extended out from the village.

For good street connectivity, a secondary access will be required onto The Loan and I have concerns over this prospect.

The Loan leading to the site often has extensive lengths of parking on the street which forces single file traffic over significant lengths all the way from the junction with the Main Street/Station Road and round the horizontal curve in the road. This already causes issues with traffic flow. A solution to this would be fundamental to gaining my support for the development of this site. One solution would be to widen the carriageway on the west side of the initial length of The Loan to facilitate on-street parking and two-way traffic flow past the parked cars. This would require a retaining structure, would impact on an embankment and hedging adjacent to the road and would appear to affect third party land.

Furthermore, junction visibility where The Loan joins Main Street/Station Road is restricted due to the close proximity of the corner building on the east side combined with the alignment of the Main

Street/Station Road. There are no obvious solutions to these concerns and additional traffic would exacerbate the situation. That said, the visibility restrictions appear to control traffic speeds to acceptable levels for the situation.

If this site was to be allocated for mixed use development, The Loan would have to be widened beyond the Heriotfield junction and a footway and street lighting be provided to link in with the existing systems. An extension of the 30 mph speed limit is also likely to be required.

All matters considered, I would find it difficult to offer my support for this proposed allocation unless solutions to my concerns can be offered.

A Transport Statement will be required in due course if this site is to be allocated for development.

ROAD NETWORK MANAGER: Extends village and speed limit. Combined effect of all proposals may impact on existing roads infrastructure at centre of village.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: There are a number of potential sites identified within Oxton that total 239 units. As above the potential cumulative impact on the A68(T), alongside other potential developments, would require to be determined prior to the publication of the proposed Plan. Information relating to any required mitigation measures and how these will be funded and delivered would require to be identified within the plan.

<b>Right of way</b>	<b>TPOs</b>	<b>Contaminated land</b>	<b>Water supply</b>	<b>Sewerage</b>	<b>Gas Supply</b>	<b>Education provision</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Yes	Limited	No	Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Any additional housing at Oxton should make contribution towards a bus turning circle and bus stop infrastructure at west end of village. Buses currently have to do a 3 point turn at St Cuthbert's View.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: No comments.

EDUCATION: If all sites developed across village, impact on school would be significant.

SCOTTISH WATER (WASTE): Limited capacity - Outwith current network but could be accommodated.

SCOTTISH WATER (WATER): Sufficient capacity - A Water Impact Assessment would probably be required.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: This seems a large extension to the village and this would not seem necessary given the potential sites available within the village boundary. I am not sure what the position is regarding the school or what the level of demand is for housing in Oxton that would require a size of this site.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: No comment required.

WASTE MANAGEMENT: No comments.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

PROJECTS MANAGER: No comments.

---

## Overall assessment

<b>PP status</b>	<b>Overall assessment</b>	<b>Site capacity</b>
Excluded	Doubtful	50

### Conclusions

This site was submitted as part of the Main Issues Report consultation process. The site is located outwith the Oxton development boundary to the south and west of the village. The surrounding land uses include agricultural, residential and a haulage yard.

This is a large site which is being proposed as a mixed use site to potentially incorporate housing, a school and community facilities. The Roads Planning Team are not supportive of the site unless solutions can be found to overcome the issues they have identified.

There is a hazard pipeline running through the site and a Health and Safety Executive (HSE) PADHI+ assessment has been carried out via the HSE website for the north-western part of the site (also assessed under AOXT0013). The outcome of this stated: HSE's Advice: Advise Against. The assessment indicates that the risk of harm to people at the proposed development site is such that HSE's advice is that there are sufficient reasons on safety grounds, for advising against the granting of planning permission in this case.

In conclusion, due to the reasons mentioned above it is not considered appropriate to include this site within the Proposed Plan.

---

# Peebles

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
SBPEE001	Peebles Development Boundary Amendment	Peebles	Western	Development Boundary	N/A	5.5	Excluded

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable				

### Initial assessment summary

SEPA: We require a FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourses which flow along the northern and southern boundaries. Due to steep topography adjacent/ through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and the proposed development is not affected by surface runoff. SEPA require a flood risk assessment (FRA) to be included as a site specific developer requirement prior to any development occurring on the site, and that the findings are used to inform the scale, layout and form of development. Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. The unnamed tribs which run through and adjacent to the site should be protected and enhanced as part of any development. SEPA request a developer requirement attached to the site to ensure that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: There are small ditches and drains running directly around the whole of this site. I would require that these are investigated. It is likely that a Flood Risk Assessment would be required dependent on the scale and the further information provided on these drains. FRA likely.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Combination	This site has not been considered previously as part of any Local Plan.  13/00444/PPP: Pending planning application for the mixed use proposal, comprising new houses and relocation of the caravan park

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Good	Good	Good	Moderate	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site appears to be improved grassland and site includes static caravans. Mature trees on boundary. Potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC via run off (drain adjacent to site connects to Eddleston water). Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including bats (EPS), badger and breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the north west of Peebles, adjacent to the existing mixed use allocation (MPEEB006) and housing allocation (APEEB044). There is an existing caravan park located within the settlement boundary at present and 1 row of lodges in the northern part of this site.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Adjacent to site

### Listed buildings

On/adjacent to site

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: The projected line of a Roman road runs through the southern part of the site. Some mitigation is likely.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: The potential expansion of the development boundary to include this area will have an adverse impact. Whilst part of the site is currently used as a caravan site, any permanent residential development will change the character of this site and being elevated will be visible.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

On/adjacent to site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: Our advice on this site is based on prior knowledge and desktop assessment using GIS and streetview. We may provide further advice based on a site visit if the potential allocation is carried forward. We have some concerns about potential landscape and visual impacts arising from the further extension of Peebles onto more isolated and elevated land.

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: Extension up the valley slopes beyond the current elevation of development in the Eddleston Valley. Site will be visible from higher ground particularly northern part of site and across the valley from Venlaw.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: Potential future impact on local road network.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comment.

ROADS PLANNING: I have no objection to this settlement boundary alteration.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns.

### Near a trunk road?

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Limited

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTWE): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. Depending what the demand is will determine if further investigation required.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed and currently houses a caravan park. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: No comment.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Question, should we extend the boundary but zone it only for tourism development given the height of the land above the town?

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: There has been much previous discussion to ensure the protection and success of the existing caravan site with improvements and upgrading funded by the new housing approved elsewhere within the Rosetta site. This site has strong tourism benefits for the town and approval of this zoning would probably make the remainder of the site unviable. We also are unclear if this zoning change is linked to proposal APEEB053 which would in effect allow total loss through closure of the caravan site.

EDUCATION OFFICER: N/A.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	N/A

### Conclusions

This proposal was submitted as part of the Call for Sites process. The proposal put forward is to extend the existing settlement boundary of Peebles to include the area directly to the west of the existing mixed use allocation (MPEEB006). It should be noted that the proposal is merely for the extension to the existing settlement boundary and does not include any use or indicative site capacity. Therefore, the consultation responses are based on the settlement boundary expansion and not on any proposed use on the site however, it is noted that Economic Development have expressed concerns.

It is acknowledged that the northern part of this site currently forms part of the Rosetta Caravan Site, alongside the area to the east, within the settlement boundary. Furthermore, there is a pending planning application (13/00444/PPP), covering the housing allocation (APEEB044), mixed use allocation (MPEEB006) and this area in question. The indicative proposals show a mixed use development over the housing and mixed use allocations, with the relocation of the caravan park on the site proposed. However, it should be noted that this application remains pending subject to the conclusion of a Section 75 Legal Agreement.

The applicant's submission states that the indicative masterplan submitted as part of (13/00444/PPP) shows the improved holiday park is proposed to the west of (MPEEB006) allocation. They request that the location of the improved holiday park, is identified within the settlement boundary for leisure purposes.

The Local Development Plan does not allocate sites specifically for leisure uses. It is considered that the most appropriate way to deal with such a proposal adjacent to the settlement boundary is through the planning application process, assessing proposals against the relevant policies within the LDP. At this point in time the application including the improved holiday park remains pending and the majority of the site remains open fields. Therefore, it would not be considered appropriate to extend the settlement boundary of Peebles at this point in time. Therefore, the proposed settlement boundary extension will not be included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

<b>Site reference</b> APEEB038	<b>Site name</b> Langside Farm	<b>Settlement</b> Peebles	<b>SDA</b> Western	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 40	<b>Ha</b> 8.6	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Adjacent to site	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

Small area of flood risk along northern boundary of site and north eastern corner.

SEPA: We require a FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourse which flows along the northern boundary. There may also be a watercourses to the south that requires further investigation. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map and steep topography indicates that there may be flooding issues at this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and the proposed development is not affected by surface runoff. SEPA require a flood risk assessment (FRA) to be included as a site specific developer requirement prior to any development occurring on the site, and that the findings are used to inform the scale, layout and form of development. Foul water must be connected to the existing SW foul network. SW should confirm any capacity/network issues. There is a small trib running along the northern boundary of the site which should be protected and enhanced as part of any development. There may be spring/issue at the southern end of the site running through the site. Any culverts should be de-culverted.

SEPA request a developer requirement attached to the site to ensure that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The site is within SEPA's 1:200 year surface water flood map. I would have no objection to the proposal on the ground of flood risk however due the size is relatively steep so I would request that surface water runoff and drainage are considered for a development of this size.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Combination	<b>Planning history references</b> 00/00321/FUL - Alterations and dormer extension, within the south west of the site. LDP: The same site (APEEB038) was considered for housing.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> South-west
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	----------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: The Officer did not provide any response to the consultation as part of the MIR process. However, the Officer was consulted on the exact same site as part of the LDP and offered the following comments. Minor biodiversity risk. Phase 1 habitat: (aerial interpretation) Improved grassland (B4), line of trees.

Field boundaries: Trees and hedgerow, garden ground. Mitigation: Protect and enhance boundary features. Flood Risk(Fluvial 1 in 200): No.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Site located outwith the extent of the town. Peebles has good access to public transport, employment and services.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On site

### Garden and designed landscape

Adjacent to site

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: No known issues.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific comment.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT: Did not raise any issues.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

On/adjacent to site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No response received.

LANDSCAPE OFFICER: No response received.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site comprises several fields on the east side of the A703 just beyond the northern extent of the Peebles Development Boundary. The fields are steeply sloping (west facing) and as such are visually sensitive to any change of use. There is little in the way of visual containment to the north and west sides of the site and no backdrop into which to settle any development. The topography of the valley and woodland to the southern boundary helps to contain the Peebles settlement.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Somewhat divorced from town centre. Fast section of road may be issues with speeds on A703.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Bus stop infrastructure required.

ROADS PLANNING: Direct access onto the A703 is unacceptable in terms of road safety. I would be able to support a modest scale of development, on the southern portion of the site, served by the existing access to Langside Drive, but this will be reliant on the upgrading of Langside Drive, from the A703 to the site, to an adoptable standard.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

On site

### Water supply

Limited

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

Limited

### Education provision

Average

## Planning & infrastructure summary

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: An area of the site appears to have been previously developed as an agricultural steading. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Site would require non-vehicular access to pavements by the main road to allow safe access to bus stops or non-vehicular access into the town centre.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: This is steeply sloping land and exhibits the same valley sides encroachment which counted against APEEB045. I do not think this is acceptable in setting terms and there may be major access restraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS: Did not raise any concerns.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No Issues.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	40

## Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the 'Call for Sites' process, for consideration as a housing site.

Further to the site assessment, there are a number of constraints regarding the development of this site. The site is located outwith the extent of the town. There is strong, mature landscaping to the south of the site and the site contributes to the setting of the town. The site is constrained within the D&LC Study. The Roads Planning Officer has stated they are unable to support the current extent of the site as it is.

As part of the MIR process, the Central Tweeddale Study was undertaken by LUC to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP and for the future, within the Central Tweeddale area. As part of this study a number of housing and mixed use sites (including longer term) have been put forward. These sites have also been subject to consultation and site assessment. It is considered that the Central Tweeddale Study identified more suitable sites in comparison to this one. Therefore, this site (APEEB038) will not be included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

<b>Site reference</b> APEEB044	<b>Site name</b> Rosetta Road	<b>Settlement</b> Peebles	<b>SDA</b> Western	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 100	<b>Ha</b> 5.7	<b>PP status</b> Retain LDP Site
-----------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------

---

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b>	<b>SAC</b>	<b>SPA</b>	<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
------------------	------------	------------	-------------	---------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site is allocated within the Local Development Plan. It is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the LDP2.

---

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b>	<b>Planning history references</b>
--------------------------	------------	--------------------------------------------	----------------------	------------------------------------

---

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b>	<b>Access to employment</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b>	<b>Site aspect</b>
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
--------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------------------	--------------------	------------------------------------------

### Local impact and integration summary

---

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
------------	------------	--------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	------------------

### Landscape summary

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

Right of way

TPOs

Contaminated land

Water supply

Sewerage

Gas Supply

Education provision

Planning & infrastructure summary

---

## Overall assessment

**PP status**

**Overall assessment**

**Site capacity**

Retain LDP Site

100

### Conclusions

The site is already allocated for the proposed use within the current Local Development Plan and it is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2 for housing, with an indicative site capacity for 100 units.

---

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
<b>APEEB045</b>	Venlaw	Peebles	Western	Housing	26	7.2	<b>Excluded</b>

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable				

### Initial assessment summary

SEPA: Should the application differ from what was previously agreed we would require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourses which flows adjacent to the site. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map and steep topography indicates that there may be flooding issues at this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and the proposed development is not affected by surface runoff. SEPA require a flood risk assessment (FRA) to be included as a site specific developer requirement prior to any development occurring on the site, and that the findings are used to inform the scale, layout and form of development.

Foul water must be connected to the existing SW foul sewer network. SW should confirm any capacity/network issues.  
Petrol station across the road regulated under PPC Pt B. (PVR)

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	Outline planning application - Withdrawn - 08/00436/OUT (Clyde & Forth Homes).  The Sidon Developments have previously submitted a PAN. A new PAN has been submitted for the site.  17/00015/PPP - Residential development with associated supporting infrastructure and public open space - Refused and Appeal lodged and dismissed.  Housing SG: Same site was considered for housing (APEEB045)

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Good	Good	Good	Moderate	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Did not respond to the consultation on this site as part of the MIR process. However, the Officer responded when consulted on the same site, as part of the Housing SG and

offered the following response. Biodiversity Risk: Moderate. Phase 1 habitat (aerial interpretation) Improved pasture (B4). Field boundaries: Parkland trees (notable trees), Venlaw (SBC Designed landscape). Mitigation: Potential need for EPS survey (bats). Protect and enhance notable trees & Parkland trees and boundary features. Flood Risk (Fluvial 1in 200).

GENERAL COMMENTS: Whilst the site is located close to the town centre, the topography of the site would affect the ease of access particularly for walking and cycling.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	On/adjacent to site	On/adjacent to site

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There are known cultivation terraces of likely prehistoric or medieval date in the southern part of the site. These should be avoided and preserved in situ. There is some potential in the rest of the site, and evaluation will be required. It is considered that there would be local impact on the surrounding area and that the site would not integrate well into its surroundings. The Archaeologist confirms that there are medieval (or possibly earlier) cultivation terraces to the south of the site.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: The proposed site lies in a prominent position on the West slopes of the scarp leading up to Venlaw Farm and extends in part below the category B listed Venlaw Castle. The site has no obvious signs of previous development (there are cultivation terraces in part of the area), so it can be regarded as being a green field site. The site formed a parkland for Venlaw Castle and was contained by the carriage drives/ woodland planting to the house and it also has been identified as a designed landscape in the McGowan report to SBC. I have concerns over the impact of development of this site for housing both in terms of an adverse impact on the setting of the category B listed castle and also for the wider impact on the town with distant views to the open countryside being adversely impacted; there is currently no significant development E of the Edinburgh road on the steep slopes (with just a strip of ribbon development right down at road level). I am not in favour of this site for housing development.

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
Not applicable	On/adjacent to site			Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No response received.

LANDSCAPE OFFICER: No response received.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is a wooded area with mature trees and constrained in the Development and Landscape Capacity Study.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

**Near a trunk road?**

NETWORK MANAGER: Need to clarify how access is to be taken off A72.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comment.

ROADS PLANNING: I am unable to support this allocation. This site has been considered previously and a recent outline planning application was refused, in part due to road safety concerns, which are highlighted below:

There is currently a vast proliferation of junctions onto this stretch of the A703 (Edinburgh Road). This is over and above the extent of on-street parking, private accesses to individual dwellinghouses and

nose-in parking associated with the commercial garage. In quick succession on the west side of the road there are junctions serving the garage, the filling station, the Crossburn Farm housing road and Crossburn Caravan Park. There is also a junction for the filling station onto the housing road close to its junction with the A703. On the east side of the A703 there is the junction serving Venlaw Farm and Venlaw Castle Hotel. This whole situation is far from ideal in that junction visibility splays overlap. It is difficult for a driver to pick out a junction, or make a fellow driver aware of which junction they are turning into. Stacking right turn traffic for the junction on the east side of the road interferes with right turn traffic for the junctions on the west side of the road and vice versa. Traffic associated with the proposed site will exacerbate the situation described in the paragraph above. I have previously stated that a complete rationalisation of the junction arrangement in this location, with the co-operation of all interested parties, will be required in order to gain my support for any development on this site. A further concern is the sloping nature of the site making it questionable whether a properly internally connected layout can be achieved whilst still meeting maximum gradient requirements. Furthermore, the site would offer little scope for integration with the existing street network.

<b>Right of way</b>	<b>TPOs</b>	<b>Contaminated land</b>	<b>Water supply</b>	<b>Sewerage</b>	<b>Gas Supply</b>	<b>Education provision</b>
Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	Limited	Limited	Limited	Average

## Planning & infrastructure summary

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

HOUSING STRATEGY: No concerns raised.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Connecting paths to the permissive route to the north of the site and the core path to the south of the site are required for recreation and safe routes to existing pavements.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Well documented refusal – recently on PPP.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No Issues.

NHS: No response received.

## Overall assessment

<b>PP status</b>	<b>Overall assessment</b>	<b>Site capacity</b>
Excluded	Unacceptable	26

## Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the Call for Sites process for housing development. The proposal was recently submitted and considered as part of the Housing SG, however was not taken forward. The site was also considered as part of the LDP Examination and the Reporter did not bring the site forward. The main concern related to landscape fit. The Reporter stated that 'I must pay particular regard to this as the site is located within a Special Landscape Area. I agree with the Council that the existing settlement is well-contained at this point by rising topography to the east. I found that to be a very attractive feature of this important vehicular entrance to the town. Development of the site is likely to lead to the appearance of urban sprawl ascending the higher land to the east. I conclude overall that the potential benefits of increasing the land supply by allocation of this site are outweighed by the likely significant adverse impact on the character and visual amenity of this sensitive settlement edge location'.

Furthermore, there has been a recent planning application (17/00015/PPP) for housing development on this site. The application was refused by a Reporter at appeal. It should be noted that the reason for refusal relating to the principle of housing outwith the settlement boundary and never touched on any other potential constraints with the site.

It is considered that the site contributes greatly to the setting of the settlement. Development at this location would result in a negative impact on the wider settlement and not just to the immediate area. The Category B listed building 'Castle Venlaw' is located to the south east of the site, and the Category C listed 'North Lodge' to the north. The entire site falls within the SBC Designed Landscape 'Venlaw'. The Cultivation Terraces are sited within the site boundary. There is potential for archaeology on the site. The site is also within the SLA and would negatively impact on it.

The site is also constrained by access into the site. The Roads Planning Service are unable to support the development of the site.

Taking all of the above into consideration, it is not considered that the site will be taken forward into the Proposed Local Development Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b> <b>APEEB047</b>	<b>Site name</b> South west of Edderston Road	<b>Settlement</b> Peebles	<b>SDA</b> Western	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 200	<b>Ha</b> 11.0	<b>PP status</b> <b>Excluded</b>
------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

Flood risk along north western and eastern boundaries of the site.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Edderston Burn and tributaries which flow through and adjacent to the site. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site which may exacerbate flood risk. The applicant would need to be mindful of the FPS to ensure there is no increase in risk elsewhere. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map and steep topography indicates that there may be flooding issues at this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and the proposed development is not affected by surface runoff.

SEPA require a flood risk assessment (FRA) to be included as a site specific developer requirement prior to any development occurring on the site, and that the findings are used to inform the scale, layout and form of development.

Foul water must be connected to the existing SW foul network. SW should confirm any capacity issues. The 2 burns running through the site should be protected and enhanced as part of any development. There should be no culverting for land gain.

SEPA request a developer requirement attached to the site to ensure that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The site is within SEPA's 1:200 year surface water flood map, the Edderston Burn and unnamed watercourse run along the east and west boundaries of the site respectively. I would therefore request that a Flood Risk Assessment is undertaken for this site. Due to the size of the development and topography of the size I would also request that surface water runoff, drainage assessment and SUDS are considered.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> The site has been considered as part of a number of previous local plans.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response received.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the west of Peebles, just outwith the settlement boundary. Peebles has a good access to public transport, employment and services. There are moderate

biodiversity issues associated with this site. Peebles is within commuting distance to Edinburgh, where there is a wider range of employment opportunities.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Not applicable	<b>Open space</b> Not applicable	<b>Listed buildings</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> On site	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> Not applicable
--------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There is archaeological potential within the site, and the site includes known archaeological cropmarks. Assessment and evaluation will be required.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific comment.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns.

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b> Adjacent to site	<b>SLA</b> On/adjacent to site	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b> Not applicable
--------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No response received.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No response received.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

**Near a trunk road?**

NETWORK MANAGER: Concern for impact on Tweed Bridge and congestion in High Street.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Possible bus stop infrastructure.

ROADS PLANNING: Any further development on the south side of the River Tweed is reliant on a new river crossing due to issues over capacity and the reliance on a single bridge for the south side of Peebles. Previously I have expressed concern on the possibility of development in this area on the grounds of the traffic capacity of Caledonian Road leading to the site. The problem is parking in the carriageway forcing single file traffic. That said there may be scope for tackling some of the capacity issues. One benefit of this land is its relative close proximity to the town centre. This favours well from a sustainable transport point of view. If this area is to be developed for housing it should be dependent on measures being taken to improve the capacity of the roads leading to the site. The extent of this area suitable for development will be dependent on the extent of off-site improvements and the findings of a Transport Assessment. Access is achievable via Edderston Road and the Sware road. A strong street frontage on both these road with some element of direct access would help have a positive influence on traffic speeds within the area.

The Sware road which dissects the site would have to be upgraded to a suitable standard. Extension of the street lighting and footways would have to be included, as would the relocation of the existing 30mph limits. Similarly, Edderston Road would have to be upgraded, including carriageway widening, beyond its junction with Craigerne Lane and provision for pedestrians, including street lighting enhancement, would be required.

STRATEGIC TRANSPORT: I am supportive of a second vehicular bridge over the River Tweed to help support development south of the river and also to reduce environmental concerns relating to the High Street in terms of the volume of vehicular traffic and capacity issues relating to the existing Tweed Bridge. In terms of the Council's financial planning process, the current Financial Plan does not allocate specific funding for a proposed new Peebles Bridge until 2027 which is therefore out-with the timescale associated with the current Local Development Plan. However, it should be noted that a new bridge for Peebles is still a key longer term consideration for Scottish Borders Council.

**Right of way**

On/adjacent to site

**TPOs**

Adjacent to site

**Contaminated land**

Not applicable

**Water supply**

Limited

**Sewerage**

Limited

**Gas Supply**

Yes

**Education provision**

Average

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Non-vehicular access must be facilitated on the Edderston farm road to allow these users to join existing pavements into Peebles town or to connect to the path network west along the road.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: This area has to be looked at as having potential. Obviously a huge reliance on the second bridge crossing.

EDUCATION OFFICER: Extension or New School may need to be considered. Primary School would be at full/over capacity if this development went ahead.

HOUSING STRATEGY: No concerns.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

PROJECT TEAM: No concerns.

NHS: No response received.

**Overall assessment****PP status**

Excluded

**Overall assessment**

Doubtful

**Site capacity**

200

**Conclusions**

The site was submitted as part of the Call for Sites process, for consideration as housing. The site lies to the west of Peebles. This site (APEEB047) was considered as part of the Housing SG and an initial stage 1 RAG assessment was undertaken.

It is acknowledged that parts of this site/larger sites have been assessed for development in previous Local Plans and the site has not been taken forward. Although the sites/parts of the site have previously been assessed, since these previous assessments, as part of the MIR process a more extensive study of the Central Tweeddale area has been undertaken by LUC, in order to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Central Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP and for the future, within the Central Tweeddale area, in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders. 24 search areas were identified within the study and this site (APEEB047) was part of search area number 12 'Southpark and Edderston Park'. Ultimately, part of the area on the north side of the road was included within a site put forward for consideration as part of the study, however the area to the south of the road was not. The site put forward as part of the Central Tweeddale Study took into consideration the landscape constraints surrounding the area, including the NSA, SLA and Landscape Capacity Study and mitigation proposed.

The site assessment identifies a number of constraints regarding this site, including; potential archaeology, development at this location would become detached from Peebles, the site is constrained within the Landscape Capacity Study and the site is dependent upon a new River crossing. As discussed above, further to previous assessments of this site, the Central Tweeddale Study looked at the wider area and ultimately identified a number of housing and mixed use opportunities for the area, which have taken into consideration constraints.

Overall, there are constraints to developing this site, including the requirement for a new river crossing over the River Tweed, which would require further investigation. However, ultimately it is considered that better sites have been identified. Therefore, this site will not be taken forward for inclusion within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

<b>Site reference</b> APEEB049	<b>Site name</b> South west of Whitehaugh	<b>Settlement</b> Peebles	<b>SDA</b> Western	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 106	<b>Ha</b> 4.1	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	----------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Adjacent to site	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Haystoun Burn and small drain which is identified as flowing adjacent to the site. There is potentially a mill lade to the south of the site. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues adjacent to this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. A holistic approach to development within this area of Peebles is recommended to ensure flood risk is not increased, or developable area reduced, as a result of piecemeal development. SEPA require a flood risk assessment (FRA) to be included as a site specific developer requirement prior to any development occurring on the site, and that the findings are used to inform the scale, layout and form of development.

Foul water should be connected to the SW foul network. SW should confirm any capacity/network issues. There may be a culverted watercourse running through the site however this is not shown or is not clear on the map. If so, the watercourse should preferably be de-culverted.

SEPA request a developer requirement attached to the site to ensure that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> The site is identified as a longer term housing site within the LDP.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response received. However, this site was also considered as part of the Housing SG and the Officer provided the following response. Biodiversity Risk: Minor. Improved pasture with mature tree cover around boundary of site (Lowland mixed deciduous woodland). Protected species may include e.g. badger and breeding birds. Safeguard trees on boundary. No significant biodiversity issues.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Good access to services and facilities. The site is located just on the edge of Peebles settlement boundary. The site is currently identified as a longer term housing site.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Adjacent to site

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Adjacent to site

### Garden and designed landscape

Adjacent to site

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: The site requires archaeological evaluation. Development must also respect the setting of a Scheduled Monument to the south of the proposal.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific comment.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Site adjacent to SBC Haystoun Designed Landscape. An extension at this location would integrate well within the enclosed landscaping.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

On/adjacent to site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

GENERAL COMMENTS: The Landscape Capacity Study considered this area to be appropriate for development. It also suggested areas for landscape enhancement within the site.

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: From our response of 03 August 2016 for allocation reference APEEB050: Given the proximity of this site to SPEEB004, we recommend that the consideration to design of the overall site that is included in site requirements should be undertaken for both sites as part of a site development brief / framework. Both sites lie outwith the existing settlement boundary as shown in the LDP, where there is a recognisable change in character along Glen Road and the paths that continue onwards to Hogbridge and Whitehaugh. The site benefits from mature woodland and trees along all of its boundaries. We strongly support the existing site requirement that the woodland and landscape buffer is enhanced and suggest that this forms part of the detailed design work on the overall site. Existing path links should be retained and integrated into footpaths and cycle routes in the development site.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No response received to the consultation. However the Officer was consulted on this site, as part of the Housing SG and provided the following response. Due to the potential for development to damage the amenity and recreational value of the adjacent Drovers Road, I recommend that any buildings should be positioned well back on the site from the Drovers Road (at least 20-30m) and preferably in the northern half of the plot to maintain some openness of views under the canopy of the mature trees out across the valley. Tree and hedgerow planting on the boundary of the development would assist in linking it to the surrounding landscape. If there is a requirement for vehicle access to link with Glen Road I suggest this is done round the back of the existing house in the western corner of the site and through the tree belt in order to retain the integrity of the Cross Borders Drove Road.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: No comments.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No Comment

ROADS PLANNING: This land is already identified as a site potentially suitable for longer term housing (Site SPEEB003). In general, development in this location is reliant on a new crossing over the Tweed. Development of the site also relies on vehicular linkage between the end of Glen Road and the roundabout at the southern end of Whitehaugh Park. Furthermore the upgrading of Glen Road adjacent to Forest View needs to be considered as part of any submission. Pedestrian/cycle links to the surrounding network to be incorporated into the development.

A Transport Assessment will be required for this site.

STRATEGIC TRANSPORT: I am supportive of a second vehicular bridge over the River Tweed to help support development south of the river and also to reduce environmental concerns relating to the High

Street in terms of the volume of vehicular traffic and capacity issues relating to the existing Tweed Bridge. In terms of the Council's financial planning process, the current Financial Plan does not allocate specific funding for a proposed new Peebles Bridge until 2027 which is therefore out-with the timescale associated with the current Local Development Plan. However, it should be noted that a new bridge for Peebles is still a key longer term consideration for Scottish Borders Council.

<b>Right of way</b>	<b>TPOs</b>	<b>Contaminated land</b>	<b>Water supply</b>	<b>Sewerage</b>	<b>Gas Supply</b>	<b>Education provision</b>
Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	Limited	Limited	Yes	Average

## Planning & infrastructure summary

**GENERAL COMMENTS:** Noted that contrary to the views of the Roads Planning section, the applicant is of the view that vehicular access via Glen Road is not required. The site has been identified as a potential Longer Term Housing Site within the LDP 2016.

**SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW):** Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

**SCOTTISH WATER (WTW):** Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

**CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER:** The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

**OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM:** Path links from to site through the woodland at the north of the site and links from the site on to the two paths running along the south-west edge and the south-east edge are required including an improvement to the path where it meets the Whitehaugh farm track at the east corner of the site.

**EDUCATION OFFICER:** No Issues.

**HOUSING STRATEGY:** No comments.

**ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH:** No response received.

**NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES:** No response received.

**PROJECTS TEAM:** No comments.

**NHS:** No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

<b>PP status</b>	<b>Overall assessment</b>	<b>Site capacity</b>
Excluded	Doubtful	106

## Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the Call for Sites process. This site was recently considered as part of the Housing SG and was not taken forward. The site takes in almost all of the longer term housing site (SPEEB003) identified within the LDP, with exception of the plot of land where a new house has already been constructed.

Whilst the site is an acceptable site for development, SEPA have stated that a flood risk assessment would be required. The site would have a potential minor impact on biodiversity; the site is located on the edge of the settlement and has good access to services and facilities; consideration should be given to the design of the overall site to take account of the Special Landscape Area, the adjacent SBC Garden and Designed Landscape and the setting of the adjacent Scheduled Monument. Additional landscape enhancement would also be required along with buffers to existing and proposed landscaping. Mitigation measures are required to prevent any impact on the River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Further assessment on nature conservation interest will also be required and mitigation put in place. Development should not take place in the required buffer area of the Scheduled Monument but rather that area should be left as open space. Enhancement of the footpath would also be required.

Roads Planning also state that development at this location is reliant on a new crossing over the Tweed, vehicular linkage between the end of Glen Road and the roundabout at the southern end of Whitehaugh Park as well as the upgrading of Glen Road adjacent to Forest View.

As part of the MIR process, LUC have undertaken a study in order to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development options currently identified within the LDP and for the future within the Tweeddale area, in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders. A number of housing and mixed use sites, including additional longer term sites have been identified. It is considered that there are constraints to the development of this site, which require further investigation, for example the river crossing.

Therefore, it is considered that more suitable sites can come forward as part of LDP2. This site will remain as an identified longer term option for housing in the future, and allow time for further investigations regarding a river crossing.

---

<b>Site reference</b> APEEB052	<b>Site name</b> South west of Peebles	<b>Settlement</b> Peebles	<b>SDA</b> Western	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 100	<b>Ha</b> 43.0	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Adjacent to site	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

Extensive site submitted for consideration. A number of areas shown to be at risk of flooding however, majority of site appears to be outwith areas of floodrisk.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Edderston Burn and tributaries as well as any small watercourses which flow through and adjacent to the site. Site would appear to be sufficiently elevated above the River Tweed. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site which may exacerbate flood risk. The applicant would need to be mindful of the FPS to ensure there is no increase in risk elsewhere. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map and steep topography indicates that there may be flooding issues at this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and the proposed development is not affected by surface runoff.

SEPA require a flood risk assessment (FRA) to be included as a site specific developer requirement prior to any development occurring on the site, and that the findings are used to inform the scale, layout and form of development.

Foul water must be connected to the existing SW foul network. SW should confirm any capacity issues. The 2 burns running through the site should be protected and enhanced as part of any development. There should be no culverting for land gain.

SEPA request a developer requirement attached to the site to ensure that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourses and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The site is within SEPA 1:200 year surface water flood map and there a number of drains within the site I would therefore require that a Flood Risk Assessment is undertaken for the site. The site is also relatively steep so I would expect surface water flooding, runoff pathways and SUDS and drainage assessment to be considered also.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> Part of the site is already allocated for housing within the LDP 2016.  Applications: 10/00169/FUL Change of use of agricultural land to form employment land and construction of new access road and services - Withdrawn. 17/00587/PAN - Residential development
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response received.

GENERAL COMMENTS: South Park Wood Local Wildlife and Local Biodiversity site adjacent.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Adjacent to site

### Listed buildings

Adjacent to site

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On/adjacent to site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: Archaeological evaluation will be required.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific comment.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

On/adjacent to site

### SLA

On/adjacent to site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No response received.

LANDSCAPE OFFICER: No response received.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site lies within the Tweed Valley SLA and the north west corner is within the Upper Tweeddale NSA. The site is constrained within the Landscape Capacity Study.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Concern for impact on Tweed Bridge and congestion in High Street.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Possible bus stop infrastructure and contribution toward extension of Peebles town service.

ROADS PLANNING: Any further development on the south side of the River Tweed is reliant on a new river crossing due to issues over capacity and the reliance on a single bridge for the south side of Peebles. Previously I have expressed concern on the possibility of development in this area on the grounds of the traffic capacity of the roads leading to the site i.e. Caledonian Road and South Parks. The problem with Caledonian Road is parking in the carriageway, forcing single file traffic, and the issue with South Parks is the tortuous nature of the initial length of the road off the mini roundabout. That said, there may be scope for tackling some of the capacity issues and one benefit of this land is its relative close proximity to the town centre. This favours well from a sustainable transport point of view. If this area is to be developed for housing it should be dependent on measures being taken to improve the capacity of the roads leading to the site. The extent of this area suitable for development, probably not all of it, will be dependent on the extent of off-site improvements and the findings of a Transport Assessment. The development of the north easterly portion of the land, closest to the existing housing, is preferable. Development will have to integrate and connect with the existing housing land to the east by way of access linkage with South Parks, Edderston Ridge and Edderston Road. This will help with dispersion of traffic. The Sware road which dissects the site would have to be upgraded to a suitable standard. Extension of the street lighting and footways would have to be included, as would the relocation of the existing 30mph limits. Similarly, Edderston Road would have to be upgraded, including carriageway widening, beyond its junction with Craigerne Lane and provision for pedestrians, including street lighting enhancement, would be required.

STRATEGIC TRANSPORT: I am supportive of a second vehicular bridge over the River Tweed to help support development south of the river and also to reduce environmental concerns relating to the High

Street in terms of the volume of vehicular traffic and capacity issues relating to the existing Tweed Bridge.

In terms of the Council's financial planning process, the current Financial Plan does not allocate specific funding for a proposed new Peebles Bridge until 2027 which is therefore out-with the timescale associated with the current Local Development Plan. However, it should be noted that a new bridge for Peebles is still a key longer term consideration for Scottish Borders Council.

#### Right of way

On/adjacent to site

#### TPOs

Adjacent to site

#### Contaminated land

Not applicable

#### Water supply

Limited

#### Sewerage

Limited

#### Gas Supply

Yes

#### Education provision

Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

Part of the site is already allocated for housing within the current LDP (2016).

SCOTTISH WATER - WASTE: Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER - WATER: Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed.

There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: EN – maintenance of the core path going west as non-vehicular and a series of nonvehicular paths through the area and connecting to the existing path network and pavements into town and Hay Lodge Park.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT - CM - This area has to be looked at as having potential. Obviously a huge reliance on the second bridge crossing.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT - Part of this site has been allocated for employment use. We are therefore not supportive of losing this allocation as Peebles already suffers from a shortage of suitable employment land. A previous application for a further employment land allocation was rejected by the Scottish Government reporter on road access grounds. As the road access already supports existing businesses, and a large housing allocation, we cannot see how an extremely large allocation can be approved using the existing access road, without major road improvements, but if a solution was found and implemented it would then benefit the existing businesses.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No Issues.

HOUSING STRATEGY: No comments

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

PROJECTS: No comments.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

#### PP status

Excluded

#### Overall assessment

Doubtful

#### Site capacity

100

### Conclusions

The site was submitted for consideration as part of the Call for Sites process, for housing development.

It is acknowledged that parts of this site have been assessed for development in previous Local Plans and the site has not been taken forward. Although the site/parts of the site have previously been assessed, since these previous assessments, as part of the MIR process a more extensive study of the Central Tweeddale area has been undertaken by LUC, in order to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Central Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP and for the future, within the Central Tweeddale area, in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders. 24 search areas were identified within the study and this site (APEEB052) was part of search area number 12 'Southpark and Edderston Park'. Ultimately, a small part of this site was identified as part of an option within the study for mixed use development. The site put forward as part of the Central Tweeddale Study took into consideration the landscape constraints surrounding the area, including the NSA, SLA and Landscape Capacity Study and mitigation proposed. Therefore, a re-assessment of this site has been undertaken, taking into consideration the information contained within the LUC Study.

The site assessment identifies a number of constraints regarding this site, including; potential archaeology, SLA, NSA, the site is constrained within the Landscape Capacity Study and the site is dependent

upon a new River crossing. As discussed above, further to previous assessments of this site, the Tweeddale Study looked at the wider area and ultimately identified a number of housing and mixed use opportunities for the area, which have taken into consideration constraints.

Overall, there are constraints to developing this site, including the requirement for a new river crossing over the River Tweed, which would require further investigation. Economic Development cannot support loss of Business Land. Ultimately it is considered that better sites have been identified through the LUC Study. This includes the mixed use site (SPEEB008), which forms part of this site, wrapping around Edderston Ridge and Southpark Industrial Estate, which takes into consideration the surrounding landscape constraints. However, there are still outstanding constraints regarding access with (SPEEB008), including the requirement for a new river crossing, therefore that option will be a longer term mixed use opportunity within the Main Issues Report. This will allowed time for further investigations regarding a new bridge. Taking the above into consideration, this site (APEEB052) will not be included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b> APEEB053	<b>Site name</b> Rosetta Road II	<b>Settlement</b> Peebles	<b>SDA</b> Western	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 30	<b>Ha</b> 6.4	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:1000	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
----------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Gill Burn and other small watercourses which flow around and through the site. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site which may exacerbate flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map and steep topography shows that there may be flooding issues at this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and the proposed development is not affected by surface runoff. SEPA require a flood risk assessment (FRA) to be included as a site specific developer requirement prior to any development occurring on the site, and that the findings are used to inform the scale, layout and form of development. There are 2 unnamed tribs running through the site which should be protected as part of any development. There should be no culverting for land gain.

SEPA request a developer requirement attached to the site to ensure that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures. Foul water must be connected to the SW foul network for Peebles stw.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The site is within SEPA's 1:200 year surface water flood map. There are a number of drains/small watercourses running though the site which the applicant will have to consider and mitigate. Drainage and SUDS should also be considered.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Combination	<b>Planning history references</b> 07/00004/FUL - Change of use of land to site 60 static caravans and tent field - Approved with conditions. 96/01158/FUL - Extension to caravan park to erect 32 staticcarava - Approved with conditions 13/00444/PPP - Mixed use development comprising of new housing, relocation of caravan park incorporating static pitches, erection of facilities building and sales office - Minded to approve.  The site was also recently allocated (on recommendation by the LDP Reporter) as a Mixed Use site in line with planning application 13/00444/PPP.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response received as part of the MIR process. However the Ecology Officer was consulted on the mixed use allocation (MPEEB006) as part of the LDP process and offered the following comments. Biodiversity Risk: Moderate. Site contains built structures with known bat roosts and parkland trees/ designed landscape, potential veteran trees, also featured on OS 1st ed. Map. Boundary features include broadleaved trees, hedgerow and riparian woodland along Gill burn, connectivity with Eddleston water (River Tweed SAC). Bat, badger and breeding birds identified re planning application 13/00444/PPP. Mitigation required to ensure no significant adverse effects on River Tweed SAC Retain mature trees. EPS survey (bats) will be required. Site clearance outside breeding bird season.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the north of Peebles and is currently allocated for mixed use development, with an indicative site capacity for 30 units.

## Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area	Open space	Listed buildings	Scheduled Monument	Ancient woodland inventory	Archaeology	Garden and designed landscape
Not applicable	Adjacent to site	On site	Not applicable	Not applicable	On site	Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There is some potential within the site requiring evaluation.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: This is a significant site within the planned landscape of the category B listed Rosetta House. Care is required with any layout to respect the setting of the house, in particular to the east. Development should be considered as “enabling” works in terms of securing a long term future for the listed buildings with a cross subsidy built in.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.

GENERAL COMMENTS: There may be potential for some (minor) development to take place however caution would be required as over-development at this location would result in a negative impact not only on the listed buildings and archaeology onsite but would also detract from the attractive approach into the settlement from the north; as well as the impact that such development would have on the tourism facility onsite. Also, as a site that rises to above 200m, the site can be seen from other parts of the town and although currently well screened due to the mature trees on site as well as those on the neighbouring site APEEB044 - loss of that landscaping would have a negative impact.

## Landscape assessment

NSA	SLA	Over 200 metres?	Over 12 degree slope	Wild Land
Not applicable	Adjacent to site	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: Did not receive a response. However, the Officer was consulted as part of the LDP process for the mixed use allocation and offered the following comments.

This site is included in the LDP. We understand that this allocation is for redevelopment of the existing caravan site for residential development. As the site is subject to a planning application (13/00444/PPP), we have no further comment to make at this stage. Should that consent not be implemented, we would be happy to advise on natural heritage issues for the required planning brief.

(Further Comments at Housing SG stage): As part of the public consultation on the Draft Housing SG, SNH provided the following comments: It is understood that this allocation is for the redevelopment of the existing caravan site for residential development. As the site is subject to a planning application, Scottish Natural Heritage have no further comment to make at this stage. Should that consent not be implemented, Scottish Natural Heritage would be happy to advise on natural heritage issues for the required planning brief.

LANDSCAPE OFFICER: Did not receive a response, however the Officer was consulted as part of the LDP process in respect of the mixed use allocation (MPEEB006) and offered the following comments.

The area on higher ground above the cluster of listed buildings could be sensitively developed for housing subject to suitable access arrangements. Rosetta House, the stable block and the walled garden with garden building require protection with sufficient grounds around them as a setting for these historic buildings. The walled garden and the stable block could be converted for small scale housing or

community purposes. On the adjoining area below Rosetta House, the lower slopes could remain as a camping and caravan park. Any development should respect the historic aspect of both the house and its surroundings as well as its location on the rural edge of the town. Because development in this area is likely to be visible from across the valley and from adjacent path systems the density of housing should be low and the tree and screen planting carefully sited to protect the amenity of the area and link with tree bands and planting within and out with the site.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Potential pressure on existing road network.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Possible extension of town service, turning circle required.

ROADS PLANNING: This site along with Site APEEB044 forms part of the larger planning application site – 13/00444/PPP. These two sites combined would need to proceed in accordance with the requirements agreed by the council with regards to its consideration of that application.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

On site

### Water supply

Limited

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

The site is currently used as for tourism, however the site was recently allocated (on recommendation by the LDP Reporter) as a Mixed Use site in line with planning application 13/00444/PPP to take in tourism and residential. With the 'minded to approve' application, a loss of some of the tourism facility from the site is now expected. However, it is not desirable to see a further loss at this location.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwtW. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: An area of the site appears to have been previously developed as an agricultural steading. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: The paths in this site work as part of the designed landscape here which includes some mature trees and old stone buildings. Such features should be retained.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Minded to approve PPP for housing/tourism – waiting for S75 Agreement. Dependant on conjoined phasing and Dalatho Street bridge.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: We are concerned to see this wholly allocated for housing. There has been much previous discussion to ensure the protection and success of the existing caravan site with improvements and upgrading funded by the new housing approved elsewhere within the Rosetta site. This site has strong tourism benefits for the town and approval of this zoning would probably make the remainder of the site unviable. We also are unclear if this zoning change is linked to proposal SBPEE001 which would in effect allow total loss through closure of the caravan site.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No Issues.

NHS: No response received.

## Overall assessment

### PP status

Excluded

### Overall assessment

Doubtful

### Site capacity

30

### Conclusions

This site is currently allocated for mixed use development within the LDP (MPEEB006), with an indicative site capacity for 30 units. The site was recommended for inclusion within the LDP by the Reporter. The indicative site capacity was added through the Housing Supplementary Guidance. The site was again submitted as part of the Call for Sites process, however for consideration solely as a housing

allocation. The landowner requests that the site allocation is altered to reflect the planning application (13/00444/PPP) indicative masterplan.

This site was recently included within the LDP by the Reporter for a mixed use development, which included no indicative site capacity at that time. The Reporter also included within the LDP the adjacent housing allocation (APEEB044) with an indicative site capacity of 100 units. As part of the Housing SG, an indicative site capacity was added to the existing mixed use allocation (MPEEB006). This reflected the ability of this site to accommodate an element of housing in the future.

The landowner states that the reason for requesting that this site is allocated for housing, rather than mixed use development, is to reflect the masterplan included within planning application (13/00444/PPP). The indicative proposals show a mixed use development covering the housing and mixed use allocations, with the relocation of the caravan park on the site adjacent site to the west. However, it should be noted that this application remains pending subject to the conclusion of a Section 75 Legal Agreement. Therefore, there is nothing to say for definite that the masterplan included within the pending planning application will actually be developed.

Given the recent allocation for the mixed use by the Reporter, it is not considered appropriate to alter this allocation so soon. Furthermore, there is an indicative housing capacity within the mixed use allocation. It would be for the applicant to test an increased housing capacity through the planning application process. Furthermore, the planning application which the applicant refers to remains pending. Once the Section 75 Legal Agreement has been resolved, this issue could perhaps be re-visited further down the line. However taking into consideration the above, it is not considered that the housing proposal will be included within the Proposed Local Development Plan, rather retained as a mixed use allocation with an indicative site capacity of 30 units.

---

<b>Site reference</b> APEEB054	<b>Site name</b> East of Kittlegairy View	<b>Settlement</b> Peebles	<b>SDA</b> Western	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 200	<b>Ha</b> 20.7	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	----------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> On/adjacent to sit	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

It is noted that part of this site is identified within the LDP as a potential Longer Term Mixed Use site. However, since the identification of the site within the Proposed LDP 2013, the 2014 SEPA maps show the site to be substantially at risk of flooding.

SEPA: Due to the site being in an undeveloped area we do not consider that it meets with the requirements of Scottish Planning Policy and our position is unlikely to change. We have a shared duty with Scottish Ministers and other responsible authorities under the Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009 to reduce overall flood risk and promote sustainable flood risk management. The cornerstone of sustainable flood risk management is the avoidance of flood risk in the first instance. Therefore, we require that this site is removed from the Local Development Plan. Site bounded by Glensax/Haystoun burn and a drain on the south side of the site. These watercourses should be protected. Foul water must be connected to the SW foul network. SW should confirm any capacity issues. There should be no culverting for land gain.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is within SEPA's 1:200 year flood map for both fluvial and surface water flooding. I would require that a Flood Risk Assessment is undertaken for the Haytoun Burn . I would note that the Haystoun Burn burst its banks in 2015/2016 winter. For a development of this size I would also require that a drainage assessment is undertaken. FRA Required. Drainage Assessment and SUDS to be undertaken.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> 06/02124/FUL - Engineering works to reduce ground levels - Approved with conditions. 16/00721/PAN - Residential development with associated roads, infrastructure, open space and landscaping. 17/00606/PPP - Residential development with associated roads, access, infrastructure, open space and landscaping including land for drainage/flood mitigation purposes - Pending Consideration.  Part of the site is identified within the LDP 2016 as a potential Longer Term Mixed Use site.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Major	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response received. However, the Ecology Officer was consulted as part of the LDP on a smaller part of this site and offered the following comments. Biodiversity Risk: Major -

All of the site in flood plain of Haystoun burn (River Tweed SAC) and River Tweed SAC/SSSI, (SEPA 1in 200year fluvial flood risk). Potential connectivity with River Tweed SAC through drainage–Mitigation required to ensure no significant adverse effects on integrity of River Tweed SAC.  
Improved pasture, remnant thorn hedge within site. Mature trees and woodland strip on part of boundary.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is just outside Peebles development boundary and has good access to local employment, services and facilities within the settlement. Development at this location would provide opportunity for increased accessibility through a new bridge. The majority of the site is within the flood plain of River Tweed SAC/SSSI including Haystoun burn (SAC).

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area	Open space	Listed buildings	Scheduled Monument	Ancient woodland inventory	Archaeology	Garden and designed landscape
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	On site	On/adjacent to site

### Local impact and integration summary

GENERAL COMMENTS: The south eastern part of the site sits within the SBC Kalzie Designed Landscape.

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: The eastern part of the site requires evaluation.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific comment.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: No concerns raised.

---

## Landscape assessment

NSA	SLA	Over 200 metres?	Over 12 degree slope	Wild Land
Not applicable	On/adjacent to site	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not applicable

### Landscape summary

GENERAL COMMENTS: The Landscape Capacity Study considered this area not to be appropriate for development. It also suggested areas for landscape enhancement within the site. The site is located within the Tweed Valley Special Landscape Area.

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: From our response of 03 August 2016 for allocation reference MPEEB004: While this site is outwith the current settlement boundary as shown in the LDP, it is identified as part of a longer-term safeguard (SPEEB005). If you are minded to support development of this site during the current plan period, further detailed assessment will be required. Given the site's proximity to MPEEB006/APEEB050 and MPEEB007/APEEB051, we suggest that requirements for these sites are detailed in a design framework that should include the open space safeguard to the north of the B7062.

LANDSCAPE OFFICER: No response received.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity	Near a trunk road?
	<input type="checkbox"/>

NETWORK MANAGER: Concern for level of housing proposed and impact it will have on nearby roads infrastructure and town centre as a whole.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Possible bus stop infrastructure and possible turning circle for Peebles town bus service.

ROADS PLANNING: This land is already identified as part of a site potentially suitable for longer term mixed use development (Site SPEEB005). In general, development in this location is reliant on a new crossing over the Tweed, but some development could be brought forward to meet a need for employment land. Upgrading of the B7062 Kingsmeadows Road will be required to support vehicular access to the site and the creation of a street frontage onto the B7062 is recommended. Links into the adjacent housing development, both pedestrian/cycle and vehicular are critical. Flooding is an issue with this area

and will need to be considered as part of any development proposal. A Transport Assessment will be required.

**STRATEGIC TRANSPORT:** I am supportive of a second vehicular bridge over the River Tweed to help support development south of the river and also to reduce environmental concerns relating to the High Street in terms of the volume of vehicular traffic and capacity issues relating to the existing Tweed Bridge. In terms of the Council's financial planning process, the current Financial Plan does not allocate specific funding for a proposed new Peebles Bridge until 2027 which is therefore out-with the timescale associated with the current Local Development Plan. However, it should be noted that a new bridge for Peebles is still a key longer term consideration for Scottish Borders Council.

#### Right of way

Not applicable

#### TPOs

Not applicable

#### Contaminated land

On site

#### Water supply

Limited

#### Sewerage

Limited

#### Gas Supply

Yes

#### Education provision

Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

**HOUSING STRATEGY:** No comments.

**SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW)** Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwtW. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

**SCOTTISH WATER (WTW):** Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

**CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER:** An area of the site appears to have been previously developed as an agricultural steading. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

**OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM:** Create a proper run of non-vehicular route connecting the housing sites and the ability to reach parks, existing paths and existing pavements.

**NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES:** No response received.

**ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH:** No response received.

**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT:** Still insurmountable flooding and road/bridge capacity issues.

**PROJECTS TEAM:** No response received.

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT:** Whilst we support the mixed use allocation in the LDP, a proper determination of the extent of employment use land is needed and a proper development brief prepared.

**EDUCATION OFFICER:** Extension or New School may need to be considered. Primary School would be at full/over capacity if this development went ahead.

**NHS:** No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

#### PP status

Excluded

#### Overall assessment

Unacceptable

#### Site capacity

200

### Conclusions

The western part of the proposed site forms part of a larger site (SPEEB005), identified for potential longer term mixed use development within the LDP. However, the eastern part of the proposed site is not identified for longer term development. The site was put forward as part of the Call for Sites process, for consideration as housing development. Parts of the site have previously been considered for mixed use/housing development in previous Local Plans. Most recently as part of the Housing SG (MPEEB004 and MPEEB008) were considered for mixed use development, however not taken forward.

There are a number of constraints regarding the site. SEPA have raised flood risk issues and request that the site is removed from the LDP. The Ecology Officer advises that there are major biodiversity risks. There is potential archaeology constraints within the site. In respect of landscape, the site is located within the Tweed Valley SLA and is constrained within the Landscape Capacity Study.

The Roads Planning Officer has advised that development in this location is reliant on a new crossing over the River Tweed, but some development could be brought forward to meet a need for employment land in the short term.

It is acknowledged that the site within the LDP is identified for potential mixed use development which could incorporate a mixture of housing and employment uses. The site put forward is solely for housing development and omits a small parcel of land, which the applicant states could be for future employment use. Given the lack of employment land within the Central Tweeddale area it is considered more appropriate to retain this as a mixed use allocation, which would allow the provision of both housing and employment opportunities in the future.

Taking into consideration the above constraints, including the requirement for an additional river crossing, the site will not be included within the Proposed Local Development Plan. However, site SPEEB005 will be retained in the LDP as a potential longer term mixed use site. This will allow time for further investigations to be undertaken regarding the flood risk concerns and new bridge crossing requirement.

---

<b>Site reference</b> APEEB055	<b>Site name</b> Standalane	<b>Settlement</b> Peebles	<b>SDA</b> Western	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 50	<b>Ha</b> 2.6	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

Flood risk on site associated with the Gill Burn.

SEPA: We require a FRA which assesses the risk from the Gill Burn which flows through the site. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site which may exacerbate flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map and steep topography shows that there may be flooding issues at this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and the proposed development is not affected by surface runoff.

SEPA require a flood risk assessment (FRA) to be included as a site specific developer requirement prior to any development occurring on the site, and that the findings are used to inform the scale, layout and form of development.

Foul water must be connected to the existing SW foul network. SW should confirm any capacity/network issues. There is a small trib running through the site which should be protected and enhanced as part of any development. There should be no culverting for land gain.

SEPA request a developer requirement attached to the site to ensure that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The site is within SEPA's 1:200 year surface water flood map, the Gill Burn runs along the southern boundary of the site. I would therefore request that a Flood Risk Assessment is undertaken for this site. Due to the size of the development I would also request that surface water runoff, drainage and SUDS are considered. FRA Required. Drainage Assessment and SUDS to be undertaken.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Combination	<b>Planning history references</b> N/A
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

The site is just outside Peebles development boundary and has good access to local employment, services and facilities within the settlement.

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No comments.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Adjacent to site

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Adjacent to site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: The site will require some evaluation and historic building recording of the existing farmstead.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Potential adverse impacts on the setting of the category B listed Rosetta House and stables.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: No comments.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

On/adjacent to site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comments received.

LANDSCAPE: No comments received.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Distant from town centre. Likely to extend existing 30 mph limit.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Possible bus turning circle.

ROADS PLANNING: I am opposed to this site being allocated for housing due to its detached nature from the town and owing to the topography of the site and proposed access route. The excessive gradient represents a significant problem in terms of achieving a suitable road layout. In addition Rosetta Road would have to be upgraded from the entrance to the Violet Bank development to the access. Links to the allocated housing and mixed use sites site at the caravan park (MPEEB006 and APEEB044) would also have to be incorporated into any layout, which would involve structures to cross Gill Burn. Any development at the north end of Peebles will be reliant upon improved vehicular linkage being provided over the Eddleston Water between Rosetta Road and the A703. This should ideally be provided between Kingsland Square and Dalatho Street, but there may be other acceptable opportunities further north. Third party land ownership will be an issue.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

On site

### Water supply

Limited

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

SCOTTISH WATER - WASTE: Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER - WATER: Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have been developed with an agricultural steading.

The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Retain aesthetic of right of way BT49 and allow space for non-vehicular movement north-west and south-east.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Across a watercourse and wooded fringe, this forming the current boundary to Peebles both at the Rosetta and Violet Bank sites. This breaches that natural boundary and we should resist.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No Issues.

HOUSING STRATEGY: No comments.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No comments.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	50

### Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the Call for Sites process, for housing. The site lies to the north of Peebles, adjacent to the existing housing allocation (APEEB044) and mixed use allocation (MPEEB006).

Further to the site assessment and consultation, the Roads Planning Officer is unable to support the proposed development for housing. The main reasons for this being the topography of the site and proposed access route. The excessive gradient represents a significant problem in terms of achieving a suitable road layout. In addition Rosetta Road would have to be upgraded from the entrance to the Violet Bank development to the access. Links to the allocated housing and mixed use sites site at the caravan park (MPEEB006 and APEEB044) would also have to be incorporated into any layout, which would involve structures to cross Gill Burn. Any development at the north end of Peebles will be reliant upon improved vehicular linkage being provided over the Eddleston Water between Rosetta Road and the A703. This should ideally be provided between Kingsland Square and Dalatho Street, but there may be other acceptable opportunities further north.

It is noted that the site is constrained within the Landscape Capacity Study.

Taking into consideration the above comments from the Roads Planning Officer and the infrastructure constraints, the site will not be included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b> <b>APEEB056</b>	<b>Site name</b> Land South of Chapelhill Farm	<b>Settlement</b> Peebles	<b>SDA</b> Western	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 150	<b>Ha</b> 7.0	<b>PP status</b> <b>Included</b>
------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Adjacent to site	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not lie within any international/national designation constraints. The River Tweed SAC lies to the east of this site.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Eddleston Water and small watercourses which flow along the southern and north eastern boundary. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site which may exacerbate flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within the site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at increased risk of flooding.

There is the potential that the development of this allocation could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard at this site.

There is a water body immediately adjacent to the site. Therefore, SEPA advise that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

Foul drainage from the development should be connected to the existing SW foul sewer network (although the site is just outwith the current sewered catchment). Std comments for SUDS. The watercourse adjacent to the site should be protected and enhanced as part of any development.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial (river) 1 in 200 year flood extents but there is a very small pocket of potential surface water impacts on the South Eastern side of the site at a 1 in 200 year flood event.

I would have no objections on the grounds of flood risk. However, I would ask that due to surface water risk and the capacity of the development that surface water flooding is considered and it is ensured that any water would be routed around the housing.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no planning application history on this site. The southern part of this site was previously considered as part of the Local Development Plan (APEEB036). The southern part of this site, formed part of a much larger site, which was considered as part of the Local Plan 2005/06 (TP12).
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

**Access to public transport**

Good

**Access to employment**

Good

**Access to services**

Good

**Wider biodiversity impacts**

Moderate

**Site aspect**

South

**Accessibility and sustainability summary**

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Moderate biodiversity risk. Site appears to be an improved pasture with treeline on parts of boundary and drystone dyke along road. Adjacent to areas within SEPA 1 in 200 year indicative flood risk area. Potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats (EPS), badger and breeding birds. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC (Eddleston water). SEPA CAR construction site licence required (site >4ha) (7.01ha).

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the north of Peebles, just outwith the Development boundary. Peebles has good access to public transport, employment and services. There are moderate biodiversity issues associated with this site. Peebles is within commuting distance to Edinburgh, where a wider selection of employment opportunities are available.

**Local impact and integration assessment****Conservation area**

Not applicable

**Open space**

Not applicable

**Listed buildings**

Adjacent to site

**Scheduled Monument**

Not applicable

**Ancient woodland inventory**

Not applicable

**Archaeology**

Adjacent to site

**Garden and designed landscape**

Not applicable

**Local impact and integration summary**

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Standalane Cottage at the SW end of the site is category C listed and the proposed development may have an impact on its setting, but this can probably be addressed through mitigation. Careful consideration will be needed about the site layout as the site straddles the road – will there be a “street frontage”?

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Spoke to the Officer who advised that there is potential for archaeology on the site.

**Landscape assessment****NSA**

Not applicable

**SLA**

On/adjacent to site

**Over 200 metres?** **Over 12 degree slope** **Wild Land**

Not applicable

**Landscape summary**

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: APEEB056 lies adjacent to the recent development at Standalane. The outlying and linear nature of the site is likely to result in development that is physically and perceptually detached from the rest of Peebles. The general sense of openness and the rolling nature of the topography could also accentuate these issues. In overall terms we highlight that this site, even with landscape planting and retention of stone walls, could result in a settlement extension which appears incongruous and detracts from the existing well defined and characterful landscape setting of Peebles. The western part of the site is on a slope and would appear likely to require significant cut and fill to achieve development platforms.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: This site lies on both sides of the minor road that links the A703 to Rosetta Road. The site is out with the development boundary and would extend the Peebles settlement .425km further north up the Eddleston Water valley. It would be highly visible from the A703 approaching from the north. It will be essential to achieve containment to the northern edge (by carefully designed structure planting that could extend into the flood plain along the eastern boundary) and additional planting as a backdrop (containment) along the more elevated and exposed west boundary.

**Planning and infrastructure assessment****Physical access/road capacity****Near a trunk road?**

NETWORK MANAGER: No response received.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: Any development at the north end of Peebles will be reliant upon improved vehicular linkage being provided over the Eddleston Water between Rosetta Road and the A703. This should ideally be provided between Kingsland Square and Dalatho Street, but there may be other acceptable opportunities further north. Third party land ownership will be an issue. Existing pedestrian and street lighting infrastructure would need to be extended out from the town to the development site. Fundamental to the development of this site is good pedestrian/cycle connectivity with the provision in Standalane View. There appears to be constraints engineering wise and land ownership wise in achieving this and it will need to be demonstrated that solutions are available before I can offer my support for this site being developed for housing. Some minor road improvement work may be required to Rosetta Road leading to the site from the town to facilitate the flow of traffic and the existing public road through the site will likely need to be modified to accommodate the development. A Transport Assessment would be required to identify and address transport impacts and to demonstrate sustainable travel is achievable.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No response received.

#### Right of way

Adjacent to site

#### TPOs

Not applicable

#### Contaminated land

Not applicable

#### Water supply

Limited

#### Sewerage

Limited

#### Gas Supply

No

#### Education provision

Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No response received.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. A Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network .

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. A Water Impact Assessment (WIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS: requires a pavement into the town precincts and non-vehicular links to the existing path network.

CONTAMINATED LAND: There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.

EDUCATION OFFICER: Kingsland Primary and Halyrude RC Primary would be at full capacity if development went ahead, an extension or new school may need to be considered.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

#### PP status

Included

#### Overall assessment

Acceptable

#### Site capacity

150

### Conclusions

The site lies just outwith the settlement boundary to the north of Peebles. The site was identified as part of the 'Western Rural Growth Area: Development Options Study' which was undertaken by LUC, to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Central Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP for the Central Tweeddale area, in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders. The site being considered, is proposed for a housing development with an indicative site capacity for 150 units.

Peebles has good access to services, employment and public transport. Further to a site assessment, the following constraints/issues were identified, which may require mitigation;

- Flood Risk Assessment required, in respect of potential flood risk and surface water runoff on the site;
- Water body immediately adjacent to the site, therefore a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6m wide must be provided between the watercourse and any built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures. This is required given the watercourse(s) which run through and adjacent to the site;
- Foul sewerage constraints, as the site is located outwith the current sewered catchment;
- Potential connectivity to the River Tweed SAC/SSSI, mitigation required to ensure no likely significant effects;
- Protect and enhance the existing boundary features;
- Potential protected species, including breeding birds within the site, would require mitigation;

- Located within the Tweed Valley SLA;
- Constrained within the Landscape Capacity Study;
- Visible site from the A703;
- In order to provide containment, the north edge would need structure planting and additional planting as a backdrop;
- Would require improved vehicular linkage over the Eddleston Water between Rosetta Road and the A703 (preferred route is between Kingsland Road and Dalatho Street);
- Existing pedestrian and street lighting would be needed from the development to the town;
- Pedestrian infrastructure would need to be extended out from the town to the site. Option could include provision of access via Standalane View. This matter requires further investigation;
- Transport Assessment required;
- Potential for archaeology within the site;
- Potential for a Drainage Impact Assessment, in respect of WWTW; and
- Potential for a Water Impact Assessment, in respect of WTW.

It should be noted that additional discussion was carried out with the Education Officer who has stated that the schools will be able to accommodate the proposals contained within LDP2.

SEPA state that an additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site which may exacerbate flood risk. (it is noted that this is an issue that would be considered as part of a flood risk assessment).

All new developments should manage surface water through the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS). The contributor recommends that this requirement includes the use of SUDS at the construction phase in order that the risk of pollution during construction to the water environment is minimised.

Foul drainage from the development should be connected to the existing SW foul sewer network (although the site is just outwith the current sewered catchment). The watercourse (tributary of the Eddleston Water) adjacent to the site should be protected and enhanced as part of any development.

It is noted that Scottish Natural Heritage state: If allocated, they suggest that the western part of the site should not be included and the rest of the allocation should be subject to the following site requirements:

- Active frontages along the Chapelhill Farm road.
- Pedestrian and cycle access and links to existing networks to the town centre should be established.
- Boundary planting along the eastern boundary should be established to maintain the rural setting of views from the A703.

However, it is noted that the Council's Landscape Section have been involved with the Development Plan Process in and in the considering of this site. It is intended that a Planning Brief will be required to be undertaken in advance of the site coming forward for development.

Overall, taking the above into consideration, it is considered that there are no insurmountable planning issues which cannot be overcome through appropriate mitigation measures although further investigations need to be carried out regarding road/pedestrian infrastructure and school capacity. These will be set out within the site requirements. Overall, the site is proposed for inclusion in the Proposed Local Development Plan for housing with an indicative site capacity of 150 units.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
<b>APEEB057</b>	Rosetta Road Caravan Park	Peebles	Western	Housing	195	19.4	<b>Excluded</b>

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable				

### Initial assessment summary

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site does not lie within the SEPA 1 in 200 year fluvial (river) flood extent however the Gill Burn follows the northern boundary of the site. SEPA's 1 in 200 year pluvial (surface water) flood map shows a number of surface water pathways through the site.

I have no objections to the site however we would require that topographic information is submitted to assess the risk of the Gill Burn to the site. Due to the size of the development and indicated risk of surface water flooding we would require that the applicant consider surface water mitigation which may require undertaking an FRA. Due to the size of the development a SuDS and drainage strategy should be submitted and site designed appropriately to route surface waters away from proposed dwellings.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Gill Burn and other small watercourses which flow through and adjacent to the site. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map and steep topography indicates that there may be flooding issues at this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and the proposed development is not affected by surface runoff.

Peebles experiences regular and extensive flooding but no record of flooding on-site.

We note that there is a watercourse within this site. We therefore recommend that a development requirement is attached to these sites to ensure that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6m wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

A culverted watercourse may run through this site. There may be opportunities to restore the water environment to its natural state by removing the culvert. We therefore recommend that a development requirement is attached to this site requiring a feasibility study including a flood risk assessment to be undertaken prior to development to assess the potential for channel restoration.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Combination	07/00004/FUL - Change of use of land to site 60 static caravans and tent field - Approved with conditions. 96/01158/FUL - Extension to caravan park to erect 32 staticcarava - Approved with conditions 13/00444/PPP - Mixed use development comprising of new housing, relocation of caravan park incorporating static pitches, erection of facilities building and sales office - Minded to approve.
				Parts of the site was also recently allocated (on recommendation by the LDP Reporter) as a Mixed Use site in line with planning application 13/00444/PPP.

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

**Access to public transport**

Good

**Access to employment**

Good

**Access to services**

Good

**Wider biodiversity impacts**

Moderate

**Site aspect**

Not applicable

**Accessibility and sustainability summary**

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the north of Peebles and two parts of the site are currently allocated, site MPEEB006 for mixed use with an indicative site capacity for 30 units; and site APEEB044 for housing with an indicative site capacity of 100 units. It is noted that at present no residential development has taken place on the site, however the Rosetta Road caravan and camping park remains onsite. Development of housing on all of the site would effectively result in the loss of the tourism/business asset.

**Local impact and integration assessment****Conservation area**

Not applicable

**Open space**

Adjacent to site

**Listed buildings**

On/adjacent to site

**Scheduled Monument**

Not applicable

**Ancient woodland inventory**

Not applicable

**Archaeology**

On site

**Garden and designed landscape**

Not applicable

**Local impact and integration summary**

ARCHAEOLOGY: The site has been evaluated with no discoveries of archaeology. More may be needed depending on where it is within the site.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: In general terms the H&D issues identified in the original proposals still stand; impact on the setting of the listed Rosetta House. Careful, considered design is essential and not all the site between the road and the access drive can be considered to be "developable".

**Landscape assessment****NSA**

Not applicable

**SLA**

On/adjacent to site

**Over 200 metres?** **Over 12 degree slope** **Wild Land**

Not applicable

**Landscape summary**

The site is partially located within the Tweed Valley Special Landscape Area.

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: We note that the majority of APEEB057 is allocated in the LDP. The western part (on slopes rising up to Standalane Wood) is not currently allocated but is partly in use as part of the caravan park.

The site appears generally well contained in closer views. When viewed from A703 it is screened by existing planting around and within the site, which should be retained to maintain screening if the site is allocated.

We note that the site is within a Special Landscape Area.

**Planning and infrastructure assessment****Physical access/road capacity****Near a trunk road?** 

NETWORK MANAGER: Need to evaluate impact on existing roads infrastructure which is already congested at times.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Section 75 contribution towards extension of bus service along Rosetta Road. Road layout to incorporate bus turning area and bus stop infrastructure.

ROADS PLANNING: The overall site is the subject of planning application 13/00444/PPP for a mixed use development of new housing and a reconfiguration of the existing caravan park. In principle I have no objections to the whole site being allocated for housing, but the same transport infrastructure improvements identified for 13/00444/PPP would be required, including a new bridge crossing between Kingsland Square and Dalatho Street.

A Transport Assessment would be required for this level of development. Further infrastructure improvements may be required with a shift from mixed use to residential development as residential development will tend to attract more traffic at peak times.

PG/DJI

<b>Right of way</b>	<b>TPOs</b>	<b>Contaminated land</b>	<b>Water supply</b>	<b>Sewerage</b>	<b>Gas Supply</b>	<b>Education provision</b>
Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	Limited	Limited	Limited	Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

**CONTAMINATED LAND:** The site appears to have been developed as an agricultural steading and more recently as a caravan park.

The site is brownfield land and its use may present development constraints.

**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT:** CM - The parkland setting should be preserved free from housing development to reflect consent. This zoning means no holiday proposals which is against terms of consent. Housing development on western fields too high above valley and too detached from body of other houses. Access implications too with increased housing, ie the Dalatho St Bridge. Main concerns are western fields too high and detached for housing – and loss of any holiday development.

**RD - Road network** leading to the site from the south could be an issue. Road to the north is narrow.

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT:** Economic Development would not support the loss of mixed use in the west of the site to housing. There is currently a demand for tourism accommodation within the Tweed Valley and therefore it's vital that we retain accommodation such as this site which can offer choice to meet consumer demands - which in turn improves occupancy levels, in particular, out of main season. Currently the mixed use site proposal offers direct employment in the locality.

**OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM:** EN = The access authority would request non-vehicular on site routes and links to the local path network especially core path 162.

**SCOTTISH WATER - WASTE:** Growth project currently underway but this would require new project.

**SCOTTISH WATER - WATER:** There is a current growth Project for Bonnycraig WTW (Peebles). A Water Impact Assessment would probably be required.

**SEPA:** This site is immediately adjacent to the public foul sewer network and hence must connect to the foul sewer. There are various small drains/issues/sinks/burns running through or around the edge of the site. Any development should be used as an opportunity to enhance these water features. SEPA has a policy against culverting for land gain.

---

## Overall assessment

<b>PP status</b>	<b>Overall assessment</b>	<b>Site capacity</b>
Excluded	Doubtful	195

### Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the MIR public consultation. The site is located within the Peebles Development Boundary and is currently used as a caravan and camping site. The site already contains two allocations, site MPEEB006 for mixed use with an indicative site capacity for 30 units; and site APEEB044 for housing with an indicative site capacity of 100 units. It is noted that at present no residential development has taken place on the site, however the Rosetta Road caravan and camping park remains onsite. Development of housing on all of the site would effectively result in the loss of the tourism/business asset.

Site has good access to public transport, services and access to employment. Housing at this location would lead to the loss of Tourism/Business use.

Potential for archaeology on the site. Caution is required to ensure that the setting of Rosetta House is not adversely affected.

The site is within the Special Landscape Area. Caution required to protect existing heritage assets onsite and landscape.

Economic Development have stated that housing at this location would result in the loss of the tourism asset from the site. There is currently a demand for tourism accommodation within the Tweed Valley and therefore it's vital that we retain accommodation such as this site which can offer choice to meet consumer demands - which in turn improves occupancy levels, in particular, out of main season.

Currently the mixed use site proposal offers direct employment in the locality.

The site is brownfield land and its use may present development constraints.

Taking the above comments on board, it is not intended that the site will be included within the Proposed local Development Plan.

<b>Site reference</b> APEEB058	<b>Site name</b> Lower Venlaw	<b>Settlement</b> Peebles	<b>SDA</b> Western	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 22	<b>Ha</b> 1.6	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site does not lie within the SEPA 1 in 200 year fluvial (river) flood extent. The majority of the site does not lie within the pluvial (surface water) flood extent with the exception of the northern boundary of the site. As such, I would have no objections to this site on the grounds of flood risk. However, due to the size of the site, surface water flooding should be considered by the applicant.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourse and the interaction with the Eddleston Water. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site. Due to steep topography through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff.

We note that there is a watercourse within this site. We therefore recommend that a development requirement is attached to these sites to ensure that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6m wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

A culverted watercourse may run through this site. There may be opportunities to restore the water environment to its natural state by removing the culvert. We therefore recommend that a development requirement is attached to this site requiring a feasibility study including a flood risk assessment to be undertaken prior to development to assess the potential for channel restoration.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> Outline planning application - Withdrawn - 08/00436/OUT (Clyde & Forth Homes).  The Sidon Developments have previously submitted a PAN. A new PAN has been submitted for the site.  17/00015/PPP - Residential development with associated supporting infrastructure and public open space - Refused and Appeal lodged and dismissed.  Housing SG: Same site was considered for housing (APEEB045)
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability summary

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located close to the town centre.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Adjacent to site

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On site

### Garden and designed landscape

On/adjacent to site

## Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY: Prehistoric or medieval cultivation terraces within the site. Excavation will be required.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: The site lies behind the "ribbon" development along Edinburgh Road. The area indicated looks like it might only accommodate an access from the north and its limited width will limit scope for much variation in layout apart from a single road with houses on either one side or just possibly on both sides. Achieving connectivity will be a challenge as will forming an appropriate boundary treatment to the east.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

On/adjacent to site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

The site is located within the Tweed Valley Special Landscape Area.

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: APEEB058 is an elevated site that sits above the A703 and within a Special Landscape Area. It would be seen within the context of existing dwellings along roadside. However, we consider that it would be a challenging site to deliver in terms of access, placemaking opportunities and in landscape and visual terms. If allocated, further expansion eastwards uphill should be resisted.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Significantly increased usage of very minor junction onto A703.

ROADS PLANNING: I am unable to support this allocation.

This site has been considered previously as part of a larger site and a recent outline planning application was refused, in part due to road safety concerns, which are highlighted below:

There is currently a vast proliferation of junctions onto this stretch of the A703 (Edinburgh Road). This is over and above the extent of on-street parking, private accesses to individual dwellinghouses and nose-in parking associated with the commercial garage. In quick succession on the west side of the road there are junctions serving the garage, the filling station, the Crossburn Farm housing road and Crossburn Caravan Park. There is also a junction for the filling station onto the housing road close to its junction with the A703. On the east side of the A703 there is the junction serving Venlaw Farm and the former Venlaw Castle Hotel. This whole situation is far from ideal in that junction visibility splays overlap. It is difficult for a driver to pick out a junction, or make a fellow driver aware of which junction they are turning into. Stacking traffic for right turns into the junction on the east side of the road interferes with traffic waiting to turn right into the junctions on the west side of the road and vice versa.

Traffic associated with this proposed site development would exacerbate the situation described in the paragraph above. I have previously stated that a complete rationalisation of the junction arrangement in this location, with the co-operation of all interested parties, would be required in order to gain my support for any development on this site.

Furthermore, the linear nature of the site now being considered would effectively result in a long cul-de-sac type road which is at odds with current policy such as 'Designing Streets' where well-connected street layouts, both internally and externally, are preferred.

If this site was to be approved for housing then a Transport Statement would be required.

PG/DJI

**Right of way**

Adjacent to site

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

Not applicable

**Water supply**

Limited

**Sewerage**

Limited

**Gas Supply**

Limited

**Education provision**

Average

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

GENERAL COMMENTS: An enlarged site was considered at this location previously and was also considered as part of the LDP Examination and the Reporter did not bring that site forward. The main concern related to landscape fit. The Reporter stated that 'I must pay particular regard to this as the site is located within a Special Landscape Area. I agree with the Council that the existing settlement is well-contained at this point by rising topography to the east. I found that to be a very attractive feature of this important vehicular entrance to the town. Development of the site is likely to lead to the appearance of urban sprawl ascending the higher land to the east. I conclude overall that the potential benefits of increasing the land supply by allocation of this site are outweighed by the likely significant adverse impact on the character and visual amenity of this sensitive settlement edge location'.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed.

There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Totally opposed to this for all previous reasons. If previous idea was to leave a buffer to respect the setting of the Edinburgh Road and houses to the east of it, this is oppressive, will have major amenity impacts and will tower above the houses on the Edinburgh Road because of levels. Rejected on appeal too, on a larger site.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: EN = The access authority will request non-vehicular links to the existing path network and the main road; specifically links to core path 153. These links are important in terms of facilitating access to the existing path network and mitigating against irresponsible access through farmland.

SCOTTISH WATER - WASTE: Growth project currently underway but this would require new project.

SCOTTISH WATER - WATER: There is a current growth Project for Bonnycraig WTW (Peebles). A Water Impact Assessment would probably be required.

SEPA: This site is adjacent to the public foul sewer network and must therefore connect into this network. There is a small trib of the Eddleston water running through the northern end of the site which must be protected as part of any development. SEPA has a policy against culverting for land gain.

**Overall assessment****PP status**

Excluded

**Overall assessment**

Unacceptable

**Site capacity**

22

**Conclusions**

The site was submitted as part of the MIR public consultation for housing development.

An enlarged site at this location was previously considered as part of the LDP Examination and the Reporter did not bring that site forward. The main concern related to landscape fit. The Reporter stated that 'I must pay particular regard to this as the site is located within a Special Landscape Area. I agree with the Council that the existing settlement is well-contained at this point by rising topography to the east. I found that to be a very attractive feature of this important vehicular entrance to the town. Development of the site is likely to lead to the appearance of urban sprawl ascending the higher land to the east. I conclude overall that the potential benefits of increasing the land supply by allocation of this site are outweighed by the likely significant adverse impact on the character and visual amenity of this sensitive settlement edge location'.

It is considered that the site contributes greatly to the setting of the settlement.

Development at this location would result in a negative impact particularly on the adjacent residential properties along the Peebles Road. The site is located within the SBC Venlaw Designed Landscape, and is adjacent to the category 'C' Venlaw Castle North Lodge. There is potential for archaeology on the site. The site is also within the SLA and would negatively impact on it. There is also the potential for negative impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties. The site is also constrained by access into the site. The Roads Planning Service are unable to support the development of the site for a number of reasons namely:

There is currently a vast proliferation of junctions onto this stretch of the A703 (Edinburgh Road). This is over and above the extent of on-street parking, private accesses to individual dwellinghouses and nose-in parking associated with the commercial garage. In quick succession on the west side of the road there are junctions serving the garage, the filling station, the Crossburn Farm housing road and Crossburn Caravan Park. There is also a junction for the filling station onto the housing road close to its junction with the A703. On the east side of the A703 there is the junction serving Venlaw Farm and the former Venlaw Castle Hotel. This whole situation is far from ideal in that junction visibility splays overlap. It is difficult for a driver to pick out a junction, or make a fellow driver aware of which junction they are turning into. Stacking traffic for right turns into the junction on the east side of the road interferes with traffic waiting to turn right into the junctions on the west side of the road and vice versa. Traffic associated with this proposed site development site would exacerbate the situation described in the paragraph above. Furthermore, the linear nature of the site now being considered would effectively result

in a long cul-de-sac type road which is at odds with current policy such as 'Designing Streets' where well-connected street layouts, both internally and externally, are preferred.

Taking all of the above into consideration, it is not proposed to include the site within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

---

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
<b>SPEEB007</b>	Land East of Cademuir Hill	Peebles	Western	Longer Term Housing	N/A	83.4	<b>Excluded</b>

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
1:200	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

The site is not located within any international/national designation.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Haystoun Burn and Crookston Burn and small watercourses which flow through and adjacent to the site. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site which may exacerbate flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at increased risk of flooding.

There are multiple watercourses throughout the site. There is the potential that development at this allocation could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard on the site. SEPA advise that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

This allocation appears to comprise 3 separate sites with no indication of number of units for each. However given the size of the sites the allocation would appear to potentially be quite large. Foul drainage from the development should be connected to the existing SW foul sewer network (although the sites are just outwith the current sewered catchment). Private foul drainage is unlikely to be feasible for this size of development as there are no major watercourses in the vicinity in which to discharge effluent. Std comments for SUDS. The watercourses adjacent/running through the site should be protected and enhanced as part of any development. The most northerly allocation appears to be close to the SW public drinking water supply works.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The Crookston Burn runs between the three sites and has an impact on small areas of all three sites.

In all three of the sites, small parts of the site are shown to be at both fluvial and pluvial flood risk.

It would be dependent on the layout of the development and the proposed access and egress as to whether a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) would be required.

I would, however, definitely require that potential surface water is considered during development due to the large capacity of the site.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	There have been a number of previous planning applications, however they all relate to the poultry use/buildings on the land. Part of the northern most site, has been looked at previously, as part of the Local Plan Amendment (APEEB010). Part of the southern, west most site, has been looked at previously, as part of the Local Plan Amendment (APEEB012). Part of the site was previously considered, as part of the Local Plan Amendment (APEEB013).

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

**Access to public transport**

Good

**Access to employment**

Good

**Access to services**

Good

**Wider biodiversity impacts**

Moderate

**Site aspect**

South

**Accessibility and sustainability summary**

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site appears to be an improved pasture with mature broadleaf treeline and hedgerow on boundary and tree lined field boundary within site, (these feature on 1st Ed OS map). Records of breeding barn owl, oystercatcher and lapwing within site. Red Squirrel recorded in and adjacent to site. Areas within SEPA 1 in 200 year indicative flood risk area. Potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC/SSSI via the Crookston burn to Haystoun burn. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats (EPS), badger, red squirrel, and breeding birds. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC/SSSI. SEPA CAR construction site licence required (site >4ha).

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site lies to the south of Peebles, directly to the south of the settlement boundary. Peebles has good access to public transport, employment and services.

**Local impact and integration assessment****Conservation area**

Not applicable

**Open space**

Adjacent to site

**Listed buildings**

Adjacent to site

**Scheduled Monument**

Not applicable

**Ancient woodland inventory**

Not applicable

**Archaeology**

On/adjacent to site

**Garden and designed landscape**

On/adjacent to site

**Local impact and integration summary**

HERITAGE & DESIGN: There is a cluster of listed buildings at the end of the Bonnington Road, but these are screened by an existing woodland strip so the setting of these building is unlikely to be adversely affected. The sites on the W side of the Crookston Burn are likely to have less impact visually that that on the E side of the burn.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Spoke to the Officer who advised that there is the potential for archaeology within the sites. The two southern sites have HER constraints, however the northern site does not.

**Landscape assessment****NSA**

Not applicable

**SLA**

On/adjacent to site

**Over 200 metres?** **Over 12 degree slope** **Wild Land**

Not applicable

**Landscape summary**

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: SPEEB007 is a significant potential extension to Peebles, in an area of strongly defined landscape character outwith the current settlement boundary. We are concerned that development in the three sections proposed has the potential to promote a sense of piecemeal growth to Peebles with sections physically and perceptually detached from the town. The area of Bonnington Road as it currently skirts around Cademuir Hill also acts as an important and attractive landscape approach to the nearby Upper Tweeddale National Scenic Area. Land to the west of Bonnington Road is rising and will promote a degree of landscape and visual impact both on the approach to Peebles and from wider views. We are not convinced that these three sites represent a co-ordinated or planned approach to expansion of Peebles.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: The site lies on the south side of Peebles and is made up of agricultural fields within the Haystoun Designed landscape which is characterised by tree belts separating fields in the valleys of Haystoun Burn and the neighbouring Crookstoun Burn together with blocks of planting on adjacent hills, all on a modest scale. If additional planting is developed that builds on the existing historic landscape structure, an attractive extension to Peebles could be achieved. The landscape structure must not be compromised to achieve greater number of units. A hierarchy of circulation and access should be a requirement of any layout.

**Planning and infrastructure assessment**

Northern HMA

Peebles

SPEEB007

## Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: No response received.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: Any further development on the south side of the River Tweed is reliant on a new river crossing due to issues over capacity, High Street amenity and the reliance on a single bridge for the south side of Peebles. I am opposed to the larger southerly part of this site being zoned for development in that: Bonnington Road would be the shortest route into town and it is not of a standard suitable for serving this level of development, this land is too divorced from the town, and the gap between this part of the site and the northerly part means that there would be no opportunity for properly integrating the two areas.

The smaller northerly portion of land could be zoned for longer term housing, but a Transport Assessment would be required to justify the extent of housing the road network could support. As well as a new bridge over the Tweed, a road link would be required between this site and Kingsmeadows Road via Sites SPEEB004, SPEEB003 and Whitehaugh Park. A link is then required from this road into Glen Road. This will all help disperse traffic. Some road improvements are likely to be required to Bonnington Road towards Springhill Road to assist with traffic flow.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No response received.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Limited

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No response received.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. A Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. Please note there is a Raw water supply and existing water main running through the middle of site. Additionally the site is in close proximity to our existing Water treatment works. A Water Impact Assessment (WIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: The development of these sites would reduce farther the aesthetics of the environment and require a sensitive design in order to maintain a sense of place for residents and visitors alike which includes the path network and any new links to it.

CONTAMINATED LAND: There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

### PP status

Excluded

### Overall assessment

Unacceptable

### Site capacity

N/A

## Conclusions

The sites lie to the south of Peebles, adjacent to the settlement boundary and to the south of Kings Muir. The sites were identified as part of the 'Western Rural Growth Area: Development Options Study' which was undertaken by LUC, to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Central Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP and for the future, within the Central Tweeddale area, in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders. The sites currently being considered are proposed for longer term housing development.

It is acknowledged that parts of the site(s) have previously been assessed for development and not been taken forward. Although the sites/parts of the site(s) have previously been assessed, since these

previous assessments a more extensive study of the Tweeddale area has been undertaken by LUC, in order to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Tweeddale. Site SPEEB009, was one option put forward for consideration, in respect of a longer term housing site.

The Roads Planning Officer was not supportive of the development of the southern two parts of the site, as Bonnington Road would be the shortest route into town and it is not of a standard suitable for serving this level of development. However they advised that the northern site has potential subject to a new bridge crossing over the River Tweed.

In conclusion, this site will not be taken forward with the inclusion of all 3 parcels of land in to the Proposed Local Development Plan. It is noted a reduced site (SPEEB009) was considered within the Main Issues Report.

---

<b>Site reference</b> SPEEB009	<b>Site name</b> East of Cademuir Hill	<b>Settlement</b> Peebles	<b>SDA</b> Western	<b>Proposed Use</b> Longer Term Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> N/A	<b>Ha</b> 13.2	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international or national designation constraints. The comments from SEPA and the Flood and Coastal Management Team were based on the original consultation for all 3 parcels of land (SPEEB007).

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Haystoun Burn and Crookston Burn and small watercourses which flow through and adjacent to the site. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site which may exacerbate flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at increased risk of flooding.

Development on this site, has the potential to increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard identified within the site.

Multiple watercourses throughout the site. Therefore, SEPA require a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide to be provided between the watercourse and the built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

This allocation appears to comprise 3 separate sites with no indication of number of units for each. However given the size of the sites the allocation would appear to potentially be quite large. Foul drainage from the development should be connected to the existing SW foul sewer network (although the sites are just outwith the current sewered catchment). Private foul drainage is unlikely to be feasible for this size of development as there are no major watercourses in the vicinity in which to discharge effluent. Std comments for SUDS. The watercourses adjacent/running through the site should be protected and enhanced as part of any development. The most northerly allocation appears to be close to the SW public drinking water supply works.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The Crookston Burn runs between the three sites and has an impact on small areas of all three sites. In all three of the sites, small parts of the site are shown to be at both fluvial and pluvial flood risk. It would be dependent on the layout of the development and the proposed access and egress as to whether a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) would be required. I would, however, definitely require that potential surface water is considered during development due to the large capacity of the site.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> Local Plan Amendment: Part of the site considered (APEEB010) and (APEEB013)
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> South
-------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	-----------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability summary

It should be noted that the response from the Ecology Officer was for the 3 parcels of land (SPEEB007), however the comments have still be used.

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site appears to be an improved pasture with mature broadleaf treeline and hedgerow on boundary and tree lined field boundary within site, (these feature on 1st Ed OS map). Records of breeding barn owl, oystercatcher and lapwing within site. Red Squirrel recorded in and adjacent to site. Areas within SEPA 1 in 200 year indicative flood risk area. Potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC/SSSI via the Crookston burn to Haystoun burn. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats (EPS), badger, red squirrel, and breeding birds. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC/SSSI. SEPA CAR construction site licence required (site >4ha).

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site lies to the south of Peebles, directly to the south of the settlement boundary. Peebles has good access to public transport, employment and services.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area	Open space	Listed buildings	Scheduled Monument	Ancient woodland inventory	Archaeology	Garden and designed landscape
Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	On/adjacent to site

## Local impact and integration summary

It should be noted that the responses are for the 3 parcels of land (SPEEB007), however the comments have still be used.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: There is a cluster of listed building at the end of the Bonnington Road, but these are screened by an existing woodland strip so the setting of these building is unlikely to be adversely affected. The sites on the W side of the Crookston Burn are likely to have less impact visually that that on the E side of the burn.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: No issues raised.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Spoke to the Officer who advised that there is potential for archaeology within the site, given the proximity to archaeology to the south of the site.

---

## Landscape assessment

NSA	SLA	Over 200 metres?	Over 12 degree slope	Wild Land
Adjacent to site	On/adjacent to site	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not applicable

## Landscape summary

It should be noted that the responses are for the 3 parcels of land (SPEEB007), however the comments have still be used.

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: (SPEEB007) is a significant potential extension to Peebles, in an area of strongly defined landscape character outwith the current settlement boundary. We are concerned that development in the three sections proposed has the potential to promote a sense of piecemeal growth to Peebles with sections physically and perceptually detached from the town. The area of Bonnington Road as it currently skirts around Cademuir Hill also acts as an important and attractive landscape approach to the nearby Upper Tweeddale National Scenic Area. Land to the west of Bonnington Road is rising and will promote a degree of landscape and visual impact both on the approach to Peebles and from wider views. We are not convinced that these three sites represent a co-ordinated or planned approach to expansion of Peebles.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: The site lies on the south side of Peebles and is made up of agricultural fields within the Haystoun Designed landscape which is characterised by tree belts separating fields in the valleys of Haystoun Burn and the neighbouring Crookstoun Burn together with blocks of planting on adjacent hills, all on a modest scale. If additional planting is developed that builds on the existing historic landscape structure, an attractive extension to Peebles could be achieved. The landscape structure must not be compromised to achieve greater number of units. A hierarchy of circulation and access should be a requirement of any layout.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

It should be noted that the responses are for the 3 parcels of land (SPEEB007), however the comments have still be used.

NETWORK MANAGER: No response received.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No issues raised.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: Any further development on the south side of the River Tweed is reliant on a new river crossing due to issues over capacity, High Street amenity and the reliance on a single bridge for the south side of Peebles. I am opposed to the larger southerly part of this site being zoned for development in that: Bonnington Road would be the shortest route into town and it is not of a standard suitable for serving this level of development, this land is too divorced from the town, and the gap between this part of the site and the northerly part means that there would be no opportunity for properly integrating the two areas. The smaller northerly portion of land could be zoned for longer term housing, but a Transport Assessment would be required to justify the extent of housing the road network could support. As well as a new bridge over the Tweed, a road link would be required between this site and Kingsmeadows Road via Sites SPEEB004, SPEEB003 and Whitehaugh Park. A link is then required from this road into Glen Road. This will all help disperse traffic. Some road improvements are likely to be required to Bonnington Road towards Springhill Road to assist with traffic flow.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No response received.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Limited

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

It should be noted that the responses are for the 3 parcels of land (SPEEB007), however the comments have still be used.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No response received.

HOUSING STRATEGY: No issues raised.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. A Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. Please note there is a Raw water supply and existing water main running through the middle of site. Additionally the site is in close proximity to our existing Water treatment works. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: The development of these sites would reduce further the aesthetics of the environment and require a sensitive design in order to maintain a sense of place for residents and visitors alike which includes the path network and any new links to it.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed until the two southern land parcels were developed for mobile poultry housing units. The northern land parcel appears to have remained undeveloped greenfield land throughout. There is no evidence to indicate that this sites historic uses may present development constraints

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

### PP status

Excluded

### Overall assessment

Acceptable

### Site capacity

N/A

## Conclusions

The site lies to the south of Peebles, adjacent to the Development Boundary and to the south of Kings Muir. The site was identified as part of the 'Western Rural Growth Area: Development Options Study' which was undertaken by LUC, to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Central Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP and for the future, within the Central Tweeddale area, in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders. The site currently being considered is proposed for a longer term housing development site. It should be noted that the site was originally consulted as 3 parcels of land (SPEEB007), however further to the consultation responses, it was decided to only take the north most parcel of land forward, therefore the site was re-coded as (SPEEB009). Therefore, the consultation responses are all based on the previous site code (SPEEB007).

Peebles has good access to services, employment and public transport. Further to a site assessment, the following constraints/issues were identified, which may require mitigation;

- Flood Risk Management to assess the flood risk and surface water runoff within the site;
- There is a waterbody within the site, therefore a maintenance buffer strip will be required;
- Foul drainage should connect to SW foul sewer network;
- Watercourses within and adjacent to the sites must be protected and enhanced as part of any development;
- Potential connectivity to the River Tweed SAC/SSSI;
- Protect and enhance existing boundary features, where possible;
- Potential protected species on site, mitigation required;
- The site is located within the 'Haystoun' Designed Landscape (SBC);
- The site lies to the south of Jubilee Park Greenspace
- There are 2 HER records to the north west of the site and 1 to the south;
- There are a group of listed buildings to the north of the site;
- The site lies within the Tweed Valley SLA;
- The site lies to the east of the Upper Tweeddale NSA;
- SNH raised concerns that the 3 parcels (SPEEB007) has the potential to promote a sense of piecemeal growth to Peebles, with sections physically and perceptually detached from the town. However, it is considered that this has been taken on board and only the 1 north most site is being assessed and considered;
- SNH state that the area of Bonnington Road acts as an important and attractive landscape approach to the nearby Upper Tweeddale NSA;
- The Landscape Officer states that if additional planting is developed that builds on the existing historic landscape structure, an attractive extension to Peebles could be achieved;
- The Roads Planning Officer raised initial concerns with the 2 southern sites being taken forward as part of (SPEEB007), however advised that the north most site could be zoned for longer term housing, but a Transport Assessment would be required to justify the extent of housing the road network could support. Therefore, the site currently under consideration is the north most site of (SPEEB007);
- Any further development on the south side of the River Tweed is dependent on a new river crossing due to issues regarding capacity of road network and the reliance on the existing single bridge;
- Road linkage would be required between this site and Kingsmeadow Road via (SPEEB004, SPEEB003 and Whitehaugh Park), a link is then required from this road into Glen Road;
- Water Impact Assessment required in respect of WTW network; and
- Drainage Impact Assessment required in respect of WWTW network.

As part of the MIR public consultation, SEPA stated that they would require an additional site requirements:

- Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site which may exacerbate flood risk.
- All new developments should manage surface water through the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS). The contributor recommends that this requirement includes the use of SUDS at the construction phase in order that the risk of pollution during construction to the water environment is minimised. Foul water must connect to the existing foul sewer network for Peebles.

Overall, taking the above into consideration, and the fact that it is considered that there other more appropriate sites to take forward into the Proposed Plan, as well as taking account of the consultation responses to the Main Issues Report, it is recommended not to take this site forward into the Proposed Local Development Plan. Furthermore, it is also noted that the Plan already identifies three potential longer term sites within Peebles and it is intended that those sites - SPEEB003, SPEEB004 and SPEEB005 will be retained within the Plan. Nevertheless, it is acknowledged that the site could be considered again for inclusion in a future LDP.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
<b>SPEEB008</b>	Land West of Edderston Ridge	Peebles	Western	Longer Term Mixed Use	N/A	19.5	<b>Excluded</b>

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
1:200	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designations.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Edderston Burn and tributaries which flow through and adjacent to the site. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site. The applicant would need to be mindful of the FPS to ensure there is no increase in risk elsewhere. There have been discussions regarding additional flood prevention works here which may restrict development. Due to steep topography through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further as and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Discussions should also take place with the flood prevention officer regarding the additional flood protection works that are considered in the future to ensure a holistic approach. There is the potential that development of this allocation could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard identified within the site.

There is a watercourse going through the site. There is the potential that development on this site could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard identified within the site. SEPA advise that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

Foul drainage from the development must be connected to the existing SW foul sewer network. Std comments for SUDS. The burns running through/adjacent to the site must be protected and enhanced as part of any development.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial (river) 1 in 200 year flood extents but there is a very small pocket of potential surface water impacts on the South Eastern side of the site at a 1 in 200 year flood event.

I would have no objections on the grounds of flood risk. However, I would ask that due to surface water risk and the potential capacity of the development that surface water flooding is considered and it is ensured that any water would be routed around the housing.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	<p>There is no planning application history within the site.</p> <p>The site or parts of the site, have been looked at as part of a number of previous plans, these are outlined below.</p> <p>Housing SG: A larger site was assessed for housing (APEEB052)</p> <p>Housing SG: The eastern part of the site was assessed for housing (APEEB048)</p> <p>Housing SG: The southern triangle was part of a larger site assessed for housing (APPEB047)</p> <p>Local Plan Amendment: Parts of the site were assessed as part of the LPA, including (APEEB005), (BPEEB002), (APEEB016), (APEEB015), (APEEB022), (BPEEB003) and (MPEEB002).</p> <p>Local Development Plan: Parts of the site were assessed as part of the LDP, including (MPEEB002), (APEEB015), (APEEB035), (BPEEB010), (SPEEB006)</p>

---

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

### Access to public transport

Good

### Access to employment

Good

### Access to services

Good

### Wider biodiversity impacts

Moderate

### Site aspect

South

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk - Moderate impact. Site appears to be an improved pasture with mature broadleaf treeline and woodland on parts of boundary. These feature on (1st Ed OS map). Records of oystercatcher and lapwing within site. Potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC via the Ederstone burn. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats (EPS), badger and breeding birds. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC/SSSI. SEPA CAR construction site licence required (site >4ha).

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the west of Peebles, just outwith the settlement boundary. Peebles has good access to public transport, employment and services. There are moderate biodiversity issues associated with this site. Peebles is within commuting distance to Edinburgh, where there is a wider range of employment opportunities.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Adjacent to site

### Listed buildings

Adjacent to site

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On/adjacent to site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Boundary treatments will be an important element in any development. The colour and hue of any development will also need to be carefully considered as the land rises to the south and will be visible from the N of the Tweed.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Spoke to the Officer who advised that there is potential for archaeology within the site.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

On/adjacent to site

### SLA

On/adjacent to site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: We understand that this site has been considered on a number of occasions and has been refused due to access constraints. If those constraints are now considered likely to be overcome we advise that the proximity of the site to the Upper Tweeddale National Scenic Area should be addressed in site requirements in relation to built form and landscape design to ensure appropriate wider integration of the town within its countryside context. Appropriate recreational access routes, for example to the Manor Sware viewpoint, should also be retained or re-established in appropriate form.

The northern-most boundary of the site is also in close proximity to the River Tweed SAC, which should also be considered further prior to allocating the site.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: This site comprises a number of large sloping fields to the south west of the Peebles settlement boundary. The land and fields slope to the north east and are of a gentle gradient appropriate for development. A scheme of structure planting will be required to create a landscape fit as well as define the limit of settlement expansion in this immediate area – this may be in response to the contours rather than existing field boundaries and should seek to protect the amenity of the existing adjacent housing as well as help to reduce the scale of the site by creating tree belts, green corridors

---

and a hierarchy of circulation built into the landscape structure.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: No response received.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: Any further development on the south side of the River Tweed is reliant on a new river crossing due to issues over capacity, High Street amenity and the reliance on a single bridge for the south side of Peebles. Previously I have expressed concern on the possibility of development in this area on the grounds of the traffic capacity of the roads leading to the site i.e. Caledonian Road and South Parks. The problem with Caledonian Road is parking in the carriageway, forcing single file traffic, and the issue with South Parks is the tortuous nature of the initial length of the road off the mini roundabout. That said, there may be scope for tackling some of the capacity issues and one benefit of this land is its relative close proximity to the town centre. This favours well from a sustainable transport point of view. If this area is to be developed for mixed use development it should be dependent on measures being taken to improve the capacity of the roads leading to the site. The extent of the site suitable for development, possibly not all of it, will be dependent on the extent of off-site improvements and the findings of a Transport Assessment. Development will have to integrate and connect with the existing housing land to the east by way of access linkage with South Parks, Edderston Ridge/Edderston Ridge Park and Edderston Road. This will help with dispersion of traffic. The Sware road which runs along the southern boundary of this proposed allocation will have to be upgraded to a suitable standard. Extension of the street lighting and footways would have to be included, as would the relocation of the existing 30mph limits.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No response received.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Limited

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANGEMENT: No response received.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. A Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. A Water Impact Assessment (WIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: The development of these sites would reduce farther the aesthetics of the environment an require a sensitive design in order to maintain a sense of place for residents and visitors alike which includes the path network and any new links to it.

CONTAMINATED LAND: There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: No objections. An integrated design study is needed to ascertain the most appropriate way to integrate the various elements of the development. It would be preferable if the flattest land within this allocation could be used for any business use on the site as developing on sloping land is problematic and costly for business use

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

## Overall assessment

### PP status

Excluded

### Overall assessment

Acceptable

### Site capacity

N/A

## Conclusions

The site lies to the west of Peebles and wraps around South Park Industrial Estate and Edderston Ridge/Road. The site was identified as part of the 'Western Rural Growth Area: Development Options Study' which was undertaken by LUC, to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Central Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP and for the future, within the Central Tweeddale area, in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders. The site currently being considered is proposed for a longer term mixed use development site.

Peebles has good access to services, employment and public transport. Further to a site assessment, the following constraints/issues were identified, which may require mitigation;

- Flood Risk Assessment required, in respect of flood risk and surface water run off potential;
- There is a watercourse which runs through the site, therefore a maintenance buffer strip is required;
- There is potential connectivity to the River Tweed SAC/SSSI
- Protect and enhance the existing boundary features, where possible
- Potential protected species, including bats and breeding birds;
- Potential archaeology within the site
- The site lies partially within the Tweed Valley SLA
- The small section of the north west corner of the site lies within the Upper Tweeddale NSA
- The south eastern triangle of the site is identified as constrained within the Landscape Capacity Study
- Structure planting and landscaping is required, to create a landscape fit as well as determine the limit of the settlement expansion within this area. This will help integrate the development into the landscape setting of the SLA and NSA
- Any additional development on the south side of the River Tweed is reliant on a new river crossing due to issues over capacity, High Street amenity and the reliance on a single bridge for the south side of Peebles. It is acknowledged that the extent of the site suitable for development, will be dependent on the extent of off-site improvements and the findings of the Transport Assessment;
- Transport Assessment required;
- Potential for archaeology within the site;
- Drainage Impact Assessment required in respect of the WWTW network capacity; and
- Water Impact Assessment required in respect of the WTW network capacity.

It is acknowledged that parts of this site/larger sites have been previously assessed for development in previous Local Plans and the site has not been taken forward. Although the site/parts of the site have previously been assessed, since these previous assessments a more extensive study of the Tweeddale area has been undertaken by LUC, in order to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Tweeddale. This site was one option put forward for consideration, in respect of a longer term mixed use site. The site boundary has taken cognisance of the landscape constraints surrounding the site, including the NSA, SLA and Landscape Capacity Study and mitigation proposed. A re-assessment has therefore been undertaken, in light of the additional information contained within the LUC Study. It should be noted that there are a lack of suitable development opportunities within the Tweeddale area going forward, including for future plans.

Overall, taking the above into consideration, it is considered that there are a number of constraints identified within and adjacent to the site. However, it is not considered that any of these constraints are insurmountable as a long term site and could be mitigated, subject to appropriate site requirements. There are aspects which would require further investigation, most notably a new crossing over the River Tweed. However, given the longer term nature of this allocation, it is considered that this allows time to look further into the constraints and mitigation measures in more detail.

Following the public consultation at the MIR stage, SEPA have recommended that "The burns running through/adjacent to the site must be protected and enhanced as part of any development. All new developments should manage surface water through the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS). SEPA also recommends that this requirement includes the use of SUDS at the construction phase in order that the risk of pollution during construction to the water environment is minimised. Foul drainage from the development must be connected to the existing SW foul sewer network.

Furthermore, as part of the MIR consultation, Historic Environment Scotland have stated that Development of proposals for a new crossing should avoid negative effects on the setting of the category 'A' listed Neidpath Castle. Early consultation with Historic Environment Scotland is advised if impacts on the setting of Neidpath Castle are likely.

In addition, Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) have also responded to the MIR consultation stating that the site is partly within the Upper Tweeddale National Scenic Area (NSA), and while this presents challenges, in this specific context SNH consider that potential impacts could be addressed in site requirements. The western part of the site, which is within the NSA, benefits from existing strong boundaries created by drystone dykes, hedges and individual trees. These features should be retained and form a key part of the structure/layout of development throughout this site, maintaining the quality of place within and adjacent to the NSA. SNH therefore recommend that the site requirements are amended from "Protect existing boundary features, where possible" to "Protect and integrate existing boundary features within the overall placemaking approach". The MIR site requirements state that a masterplan is to be prepared. In addition to the retention of boundary features the contributor

recommends that the masterplan should be directed to include:

- Green networks through the site which integrate SUDS and active travel infrastructure, this should include providing links through the site to the nearby school.
- Recreational links, for example to Manor Sware viewpoint and the River Tweed should be retained or re-established in appropriate form.

In addition, site requirements in the LDP should clearly set out a requirement for Habitats Regulations Appraisal at application stage due to the site's proximity to the River Tweed SAC.

A number of other consultation responses were received in relation to the MIR consultation, these were both in support and in objection to the identification of this site for a potential longer term development.

Following further consideration, it is proposed that this site SPEEB008 will not be taken forward into the Proposed Local Development Plan as a potential longer term mixed use site. It is considered that there are other more appropriate sites that can be allocated within the Proposed Plan. It is also noted that the Plan already identifies three potential longer term sites and it is considered that those sites - SPEEB003, SPEEB004 and SPEEB005 will be retained within the Plan. However, it is acknowledged that the site could be considered again for inclusion in a future LDP.

---

<b>Site reference</b> MPEEB006	<b>Site name</b> Rosetta Road Mixed Use	<b>Settlement</b> Peebles	<b>SDA</b> Western	<b>Proposed Use</b> Mixed Use	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 30	<b>Ha</b> 6.4	<b>PP status</b> Retain LDP Site
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------

## Initial assessment

**Floodrisk**      **SAC**      **SPA**      **SSSI**      **Ramsar**

### Initial assessment summary

The site is already allocated for mixed use development within the LDP, with an indicative site capacity for 30 units. The proposal is now to increase this to 100 units.

## Background information

**Minerals and coal**    **NNR**      **Prime Quality Agricultural Land**    **Current use/s**    **Planning history references**

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

**Access to public transport**      **Access to employment**      **Access to services**      **Wider biodiversity impacts**      **Site aspect**

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

## Local impact and integration assessment

**Conservation area**    **Open space**    **Listed buildings**    **Scheduled Monument**    **Ancient woodland inventory**    **Archaeology**    **Garden and designed landscape**

### Local impact and integration summary

## Landscape assessment

**NSA**      **SLA**      **Over 200 metres?**       **Over 12 degree slope**       **Wild Land**

### Landscape summary

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

Right of way

TPOs

Contaminated land

Water supply

Sewerage

Gas Supply

Education provision

Planning & infrastructure summary

---

## Overall assessment

PP status

Overall assessment

Site capacity

Retain LDP Site

30

### Conclusions

The site is currently allocated within the LDP as a mixed use development, with an indicative site capacity for 30 units. The site was submitted as part of the Call for Sites process by the landowner. They wish the site to be retained for mixed use development, however for an increased site capacity of 100 units. They state that this would tie in with the masterplan, submitted as part of planning application (13/00444/PPP), which shows housing within this site. The landowner also states that as part of the planning application, the Council accepted an overall maximum site capacity of 130 houses. They state that given the change, the LDP designation (APEEB044) would find it difficult to deliver 100 units, as identified. Therefore, they request that (MPEEB006) is increased to 100 units from 30 units.

Both the housing allocation (APEEB044) and the mixed use allocation (MPEEB006) were recently included within the LDP by the Reporter, as part of the LDP Examination. The Reporter at that stage only included an indicative site capacity on the housing allocation (100 units). As part of the Housing SG, 30 indicative units were added to the mixed use allocation. It is also noted that the planning application (13/00444/PPP) remains pending, subject to a Section 75 Legal Agreement, therefore there is no extant planning consent for housing on either of the sites. The combined indicative site capacity between the 2 allocations is 130 units.

As part of the LDP Examination, the Reporter stated that 'Allocation of this site would allow for the relocation and enhancement of the existing holiday accommodation and related facilities. I note in this regard that the proposed plan recognises tourism as one of the main employment sectors in the plan area'. Therefore, given the lack of progress with the planning application or any other proposals being put forward since the LDP Examination, it is not considered appropriate to alter the Reporters decision. Therefore, the site will be retained for mixed use development, with an indicative site capacity for 30 units.

---

# Romanobridge

<b>Site reference</b>	<b>Site name</b>	<b>Settlement</b>	<b>SDA</b>	<b>Proposed Use</b>	<b>Indicative Capacity</b>	<b>Ha</b>	<b>PP status</b>
<b>AROMA004</b>	Halmyre Loan South	Romanobridge	Rest of Borders	Housing	25	2.5	<b>Excluded</b>

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b>	<b>SAC</b>	<b>SPA</b>	<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site does not lie within the SEPA 1 in 200 year fluvial (river) or pluvial (surface water) flood extents. As such, I would have no objections to this site on the grounds of flood risk.

Due to the size of the development, surface water runoff and routing of overland flow should be considered.

SEPA: Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at an increased risk of flooding.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b>	<b>Planning history references</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	N/A

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b>	<b>Access to employment</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b>	<b>Site aspect</b>
Limited	Limited	Limited	Moderate	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

GENERAL COMMENTS: Romannobridge is located 8 minutes drivetime away from West Linton where there are limited services and facilities, whilst Peebles is located 18 minutes drivetime away and benefits from a greater range of services and facilities including employment opportunities.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	On/adjacent to site

## Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY: Nothing known.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No H&D issues.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: Our brief appraisal suggests that this site is well enclosed.

We note that the Cross Borders Drove Road long distance path runs along the western and southern boundaries of this site and recommend that a principle of development should be that it would not adversely affect use of the path.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: No observations.

ROADS PLANNING: I have no objections to housing development on this site. The road serving the site is well designed in terms of traffic calming. Any new road serving this site should follow the 'Designing Streets' ethos.

There may be issues with both surface water and foul drainage. This would need to be investigated as it may impact on the amount of land available for development.

The existing road to the south west of the site serving Romanno House Farm has a sub-standard junction with the A701 in terms of junction visibility and there may be an opportunity here for the road to be re-routed as part of the development of this site. This would involve the closing of the existing access in order to remove its use. Pedestrian connectivity will be a further consideration.

A Transport Statement will be required for this site and it will have to address my points above and address any upgrades required to the existing service road (Halmyre Loan) in light of the additional traffic. PG/DJI

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed.

There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: EN = The access authority would request the integrity of the existing core path round the south and north-west of the site to remain which would include a narrow buffer zone between the paths and the housing.

SCOTTISH WATER - WASTE: SW WWTW only serves part of site other area private, SW asset does not have capacity for increase.

SCOTTISH WATER - WATER: A Water Impact Assessment would probably be required.

SEPA: Water Enviro: This site is on the edge of the sewered catchment so must connect to the public foul sewer. The size of the development is likely to result in capacity issues with the existing STW.

## Overall assessment

### PP status

Excluded

### Overall assessment

Doubtful

### Site capacity

25

## Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the MIR public consultation.

The site has limited access to public transport and services, limited access to employment.

SEPA have stated that due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at an increased risk of flooding.

In relation to Landscape issues, it is noted that the site is located within the SBC Romanno Designed Landscape, and it is considered that development at this location would not significantly impact on the visual character of the area. Roads Planning have no objection to the site coming forward, however, they state that there may be drainage issues.

This is a relatively large site in relation to the existing settlement. The site is within an open field and on the eastern side there is no natural boundary. It is considered that there are more appropriate sites for inclusion in the Proposed LDP but this site could be considered again for a future plan.

In conclusion, the site will not be taken forward for inclusion within the Proposed Local Development Plan for housing.

---

# Skirling

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
SBSKI001	Skirling Development Boundary Amendment	Skirling	Rest of Borders	Development Boundary	N/A	0.1	Included

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable				

### Initial assessment summary

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site does lie within the SEPA 1 in 200 year pluvial (surface water) flood extent but not the fluvial (river) extent. The South side of the site is anticipated to be affected by surface water.

I would require that the applicant considers surface water mitigation and this may require undertaking an FRA.

SEPA: Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at an increased risk of flooding. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.

Main road (A72) through Skirling was flooded in 2014. The source could be surface or fluvial from as the watercourse follows the road.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Other	97/05798/OUT Erection of Dwellinghouse - Refused.

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Limited	Limited	Limited	Moderate	South-west

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

GENERAL COMMENTS: Skirling is located 30 mins drive time to Peebles and approximately 15 mins drive time to Biggar. There are limited services available in Skirling.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

On site

### Open space

Adjacent to site

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On/adjacent to site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY: Nothing Known.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Lies within the conservation boundary, appears to be some scope for a modest "infill" development but would need to be subservient to nearby building sin scale and mass.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: No observations.

ROADS PLANNING: I have no objections to the settlement boundary being amended as shown. PG/DJI

### Near a trunk road?

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

GENERAL COMMENT: The proposal is for an amendment to the Development Boundary. The Local Development Plan does not normally consider minor amendments as part of the Plan Review. The site may only have the potential for a single unit, whilst housing allocations within the Plan are required to accommodate a minimum of 5 units.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed.

There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Would seem a logical extension. Outline permission for a house on the site previously refused in 1997. Inclusion would undoubtedly be followed by an application. Trees on the site are of good amenity value.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: EN = no comments required.

SCOTTISH WATER - WASTE: No capacity – growth project required.

SCOTTISH WATER - WATER: No concerns.

SEPA: Water Enviro: This site is within the sewerage catchment and hence must connect to the public foul sewer.

## Overall assessment

**PP status****Included****Overall assessment**

Doubtful

**Site capacity**

N/A

**Conclusions**

The site was submitted as part of the Main Issues Report public consultation.

The proposal is for an amendment to the Development Boundary. The Local Development Plan does not normally consider minor amendments as part of the Plan Review. The site may only have the potential for a single unit, whilst housing allocations within the Plan are required to accommodate a minimum of 5 units.

There are limited services and facilities available in Skirling and the settlement has limited access to employment opportunities.

The site sits within the Skirling Conservation Area and there is the potential for negative impact on the large mature tree.

It is considered that the inclusion of the triangular piece of land appears a natural inclusion in the Development Boundary and follows the Conservation Area Boundary. However, this does not automatically mean that the site can be developed as a housing plot, as if and when a planning application is submitted, a case must be put forward to ensure the protection of the mature tree on the northern part of the site which is protected under Conservation Area status.

---

<b>Site reference</b> ASKIR002	<b>Site name</b> Parkfoot	<b>Settlement</b> Skirling	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 5	<b>Ha</b> 0.5	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site does not lie within the SEPA 1 in 200 year fluvial (river) or pluvial (surface water) flood extent. The Skirling Burn does run to the West of the site but the site is expected to be significantly higher than the burn and not at flood risk. As such, I would have no objections to this site on the grounds of flood risk.

SEPA: There is sufficient height difference between the site and the adjacent small watercourse. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at an increased risk of flooding.

Main road (A72) through Skirling was flooded in 2014. The source could be surface water or fluvial as the watercourse follows the road.

There is sufficient height difference between the site and the adjacent small watercourse. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at an increased risk of flooding.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> 17/00996/FUL - Erection of Dwellinghouse and detached garage - Withdrawn.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Limited	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Limited	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

GENERAL COMMENTS: Skirling is located 30 mins drive time to Peebles and approximately 15 mins drive time to Biggar. There are limited services available in Skirling.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> On/adjacent to site	<b>Open space</b> Not applicable	<b>Listed buildings</b> Not applicable	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> Not applicable	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

## Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY: Nothing Known.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No H&D issues.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to size and location.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: No observations.

ROADS PLANNING: I have no objections in principle to some form of residential development on this site.

The private access track leading to the site is restrictive in nature over the initial length. Depending on the level of development this may need to be sympathetically upgraded to an adoptable standard with the street lighting infrastructure extended into the site. This would appear to affect third party land outwith the boundary of this site and outwith the boundary of the public road (loop road serving Burnside).

Near a trunk road?

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Average

## Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have previously intersected an area occupied by housing and has more recently been undeveloped agricultural ground.

There is no evidence to currently indicate that the sites historic uses may present development constraints.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: There have previously been proposals for development to the west of Parkfoot, those were resisted. This is possibly a more logical approach, if access is taken between 1 Howe's Brae and Parkfoot.

Slight concern though about the closing up of the open space in the centre of the conservation area and therefore pressure on the other fields in that part of Skirling.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: EN = no comments required.

SCOTTISH WATER - WASTE: No capacity – growth project required.

SCOTTISH WATER - WATER: No concerns.

SEPA: Water Enviro: This site is within the sewered catchment so must connect to the public foul sewer. SW will need to confirm capacity as there has historically been surface water ingress issues within the foul network resulting in surcharging from the septic tank.

## Overall assessment

### PP status

Excluded

### Overall assessment

Doubtful

### Site capacity

5

## Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the Main Issues Report public consultation.

There are limited services available in Skirling and the settlement has limited access to employment opportunities. Development at this location would result in lessening the separation between two parts of the settlement. The site is part of an open field with minimal natural landscape features. Whilst Roads Planning are able to support the site, upgrading of the private access track leading to the site may be required depending on the extent of the proposed development, and this may be affected by third party ownership.

In addition it is considered that there are other more appropriate sites available outwith the Strategic Development Areas and within the Northern Housing.

Taking on board the above comments, the site will not be included within the Proposed Local Development Plan for housing.

---

# Stow

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
ASTOW029	West of Crunzie Burn	Stow	Rest of Borders	Housing	5	1.5	Excluded

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable				

### Initial assessment summary

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Crunzie Burn. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site which may exacerbate flood risk. Due to steep topography through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff.

SEPA require a flood risk assessment (FRA) to be included as a site specific developer requirement prior to any development occurring on the site, and that the findings are used to inform the scale, layout and form of development.

Foul water must connect to existing SW foul network. SW should confirm capacity. It appears that the site access is across the Crunzie burn. Any crossing should be designed in accordance with good practice. There should be no culverting for land gain.

SEPA request a developer requirement attached to the site to ensure that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The site is adjacent to the Crunzie Burn which is not within SEPA's Flood Map. I would expect the applicant to consider this. An FRA may be requested.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	N/A

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Good	Limited	Limited	Moderate	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: No comments received.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The settlement has good access to the strategic public transport network, along the A7. It also has good access to a limited number of services in the settlement and limited access to services in Galashiels. It has limited access to employment in Galashiels. It also has good access to the railway station in the settlement. However, given the position of the site to the settlement, the site would be at the highest point with all other development below it, and would therefore likely discourage active travel within the settlement. North facing site so little potential for solar gain.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Adjacent to site

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

Adjacent to site

### Local impact and integration summary

SBC Designed Garden and Landscape - Muirhouse, adjacent to the site.

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: No known issues.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific comment.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: No comments.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

North facing site that sits at 225m. Development at this location would be higher than all other development within the existing settlement.

Minimum landscaping on site, with none along the southern boundary. Therefore, significant landscaping would be required should the site be brought forward.

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No response received.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No response received.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Existing roads infrastructure is not ideal but small number of houses proposed.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comment.

ROADS PLANNING: For this site I previously observed:

"This site should not be zoned for development as the surrounding road network is too constrained. Earlston Road is narrow with a considerable level of on-street parking so that single file traffic is forced along significant lengths. The footways in Earlston Road are very narrow to the extent that a person with a pram or wheelchair is forced to use the carriageway and the roadside footway is so steep that part of it stepped, so not allowing 'barrier free' access. Furthermore, it is not possible to provide a footway over Townhead Bridge and the public road leading to the site beyond the bridge is narrow and steep with no suitable point of access because of the road gradients".

While adequate sight-lines can be achieved at the proposed road junction location it is on a particularly steep part of the road. The difficult nature of site access is compounded by the need for a bridge/culvert to negotiate the steep ravine/Crunzie Burn so close to the public road.

I do concede that the proposal is for a particularly low density development and there is an opportunity for more direct pedestrian access to the town via a surfaced and lit lane albeit a steep one.

In fairness, the site stacks up well from a sustainable transport point of view in that public transport is available in reasonably close proximity by bus and by rail and local services are within easy walking distance.

In conclusion, I am not opposed to a minimal level of development on this site. I certainly would not support a level of development that would need to be served by a new public road i.e. 5 or more houses at

---

present (6 or more if the number of dwellinghouses permitted off a private access is increased from 4 to 5, in line with the National Roads Development Guide, through the LDP process). My preferred option though, if there is to be housing development on this site, would be for an adjustment of the settlement boundary and for there to be as few houses as possible.

<b>Right of way</b>	<b>TPOs</b>	<b>Contaminated land</b>	<b>Water supply</b>	<b>Sewerage</b>	<b>Gas Supply</b>	<b>Education provision</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Limited	Limited	No	Average

## Planning & infrastructure summary

HOUSING STRATEGY: No comments.

SCOTTISH WATER - WASTE: Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW.

SCOTTISH WATER - WATER: Manse St Galashiels WTW has sufficient capacity. Please note there is a Water main within site boundary.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Non-vehicular access required to existing pavements.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No comments.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: There are evident access issues with this site about which Roads are best able to comment. If those were addressed, I have some concern with the size of this site, comprising a significant extension of the settlement away from its core; the rising hillside and issues resulting from its elevated position and topographical constraints; and its arbitrary south-eastern boundary within the field. It has some containment in the wider landscape from surrounding woodland which helps, though it will present a challenge in terms of being capable of accommodating a development that sympathetically knits into the village.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No Issues.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

<b>PP status</b>	<b>Overall assessment</b>	<b>Site capacity</b>
Excluded	Doubtful	5

## Conclusions

This site was submitted for consideration as part of the Call for Sites process for housing. A larger site was previously assessed as part of the Housing SG, however not included.

Further to a site assessment and consultation, there are a number of constraints regarding the development of this site for housing. The site forms an important part of the setting of the settlement, and is constrained within the Development and Landscape Capacity Study. In addition, development at this location would result in extending higher into the hill than all other development. The Roads Planning section have raised concerns and are only able to support a minimum amount of development. Anything over 4 units will require the road to be brought up to an adoptable standard and it is not envisaged that this could be achieved. This is likely to include the provision of a possible new bridge over the Crunzie Burn and the access route via Earlston Road is narrow with a considerable level of on street parking and is not suitable to serve more houses. It should be noted that developments of less than 5 units will not be allocated within the LDP.

Taking the above into consideration, the site will not be included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

---

# Walkerburn

<b>Site reference</b> SBWAL001	<b>Site name</b> Walkerburn Development Boundary Amendment	<b>Settlement</b> Walkerburn	<b>SDA</b> Western	<b>Proposed Use</b> Development Boundary	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> N/A	<b>Ha</b> 0.3	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site does not lie within the SEPA 1 in 200 year fluvial (river) or pluvial (surface water) flood extents. As such, I would have no objections to this site on the grounds of flood risk.

SEPA: Walkerburn is susceptible to flooding but no records for site. Based on OS map contours, there is sufficient height difference between the site and the River Tweed. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at an increased risk of flooding. This site is on the edge of the sewered catchment so must connect to the public foul sewer.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> 18/00681/FUL refused by officer then overturned at Local Review Body 19/00007/REF - Erection of dwellinghouse with detached double garage and artist studio, associated access and infrastructure
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> South
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	-----------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

The proposed settlement boundary change has a southern aspect. Walkerburn has good access to public services and facilities with employment opportunities nearby.

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Low impact. Site appears to be improved grassland a small number of trees and garden ground on the boundary. No obvious connectivity to River Tweed SAC. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats (lighting), badger and breeding birds.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Adjacent to site

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On/adjacent to site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

The proposed settlement boundary change area was formerly scheduled and archaeology remains on the site. A designated scheduled monument is adjacent to the site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Cultivation terraces within the site will require either avoidance or excavation. Formerly a scheduled monument. The NE corner is adjacent to a Scheduled Monument. Setting issues will need to be considered.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No H&D issues

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: No response received

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

On site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

The proposed settlement boundary change is in the Tweed Valley Special Landscape Area. If the site was to be developed there is potential to continue existing development pattern.

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No response received.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: Existing sub-standard junction onto A72.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No response received

ROADS PLANNING: I have no objections to the settlement boundary being amended as shown to reflect the recent planning approval for a single dwellinghouse (application 18/00681/FUL). However, it should be noted that I would not support further residential development in this area due to the limitations of the public road serving the site.

### Near a trunk road?

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Limited

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed.

There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: CM - If the road capacity issue can be resolved, then the other reason of archaeological setting can be overcome. Good infill site otherwise.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: CC - This site now has approval for one house granted by the LRB (18/00681/FUL), consent to be granted following conclusion of a legal agreement. Subject to roads safety being addressed, and appropriate design etc, it would, however, be better developed for 3 rather than 1, to tie better with the prevailing density here, – the inclusion of this site in the settlement boundary seems appropriate, given the recent appeal decision to grant approval for a single house.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: No response received

EDUCATION: No response received

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received

NHS: No response received

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: EN: I understand that this site has already been given planning permission by appeal.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): A Flow & Pressure test would probably be required. There is a 2" water main located within this site on the Western boundary. Measures must be put in place to protect this main. A site survey must be included to assess the exact location including discussion with Scottish Water.

WASTE MANAGER: No response received

---

## Overall assessment

### PP status

Excluded

### Overall assessment

Unacceptable

### Site capacity

N/A

### Conclusions

The alteration to the Walkerburn Development Boundary was submitted as part of the MIR consultation. It proposes to extend the settlement boundary northwards on the north side of Cabers ton Avenue. The applicant indicates that the site could accommodate 3 houses.

It is not considered appropriate to expand a settlement boundary merely in order to provide infill opportunities within the settlement itself, without a formal allocation. The number of units the site could accommodate would not be large enough for a formal housing allocation.

---

<b>Site reference</b> AWALK009	<b>Site name</b> Caberston Avenue	<b>Settlement</b> Walkerburn	<b>SDA</b> Western	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 3	<b>Ha</b> 0.3	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site does not lie within the SEPA 1 in 200 year fluvial (river) or pluvial (surface water) flood extents. As such, I would have no objections to this site on the grounds of flood risk.

SEPA: Based on OS map contours, there is sufficient height difference between the site and the River Tweed. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at an increased risk of flooding. Walkerburn is susceptible to flooding but no records for site. This site is on the edge of the sewered catchment so must connect to the public foul sewer.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> 18/00681/FUL refused by officer then overturned at Local Review Body 19/00007/REF - Erection of dwellinghouse with detached double garage and artist studio, associated access and infrastructure
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> South
-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	-----------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

The site has a southerly aspect and it has good access to public services and facilities with employment opportunities nearby.

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Low impact. Site appears to be improved grassland a small number of trees and garden ground on the boundary. No obvious connectivity to River Tweed SAC. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats (lighting), badger and breeding birds

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Not applicable	<b>Open space</b> Not applicable	<b>Listed buildings</b> Not applicable	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> On/adjacent to site	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> Not applicable
--------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

## Local impact and integration summary

The site used to be formerly a scheduled monument and archaeology remains on the site. A designated scheduled monument is adjacent to the site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Cultivation terraces within the site will require either avoidance or excavation. Formerly a scheduled monument.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No H&D issues

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

On site

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

The site is in the Tweed Valley Special Landscape Area. If the site was to be developed there is potential to continue existing development pattern.

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to size and location.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Existing sub-standard junction onto A72.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No response received

ROADS PLANNING: I am strongly against this site being allocated for further development over and above that recently approved for a single dwellinghouse (application 18/00681/FUL). The road leading to the site is unsuitable to support any further development due to its restrictive geometry and steep gradient.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Limited

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Average

## Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed.

There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: CM - Single house consented by LRB. Wholly restricted by road capacity and Caberston Avenue, plus the junction with the A72. Massive junction works even needed for the single house.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: CC - This site now has approval for one house granted by the LRB (18/00681/FUL), consent to be granted following conclusion of a legal agreement. Subject to roads safety being addressed, and appropriate design etc, it would, however, be better developed for 3 rather than 1, to tie better with the prevailing density here.

EDUCATION: No response received

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: No response received

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: EN: I understand that this site has already been given planning permission by appeal.

NHS: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Sufficient capacity

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): A Flow & Pressure test would probably be required. There is a 2" water main located within this site on the Western boundary. Measures must be put in place to protect this main. A site survey must be included to assess the exact location including discussion with Scottish Water.  
WASTE MANAGER: No response received

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	3

### Conclusions

The site is located to the north west of the settlement. The site is considered unacceptable for inclusion within the Proposed Plan for housing allocation. There is a strong objection from roads planning.

The following constraints/issues, were raised:

- archaeology officer comments that there are terraces within the site that require avoidance or excavation
- the roads planning officer is strongly against the site because it is unsuitable to support any further development due to its restrictive geometry and steep gradient.
- network manager has said the junction onto the A72 is substandard

The site is proposed for 3 units. The number of units the site could accommodate would not be large enough for a formal housing allocation.

The site already has approval for one unit on the entire site 18/00681/FUL refused by officer then overturned at Local Review Body 19/00007/REF - Erection of dwellinghouse with detached double garage and artist studio, associated access and infrastructure.

In conclusion, the site is not large enough to be allocated for housing and already has approval for 1 house. There is also strong objection from roads planning on the basis of gradient and geometry and the Network Manager considers the junction onto the A72 to already be substandard.

---

# West Linton

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
<b>BWEST003</b>	Deanfoot Road North	West Linton	Rest of Borders	Business and Industrial	N/A	1.6	<b>Excluded</b>

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
1:200	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designation constraints.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourse (potentially called The Dean) which flows through the site. Consideration should be given to bridge and culvert structures which may exacerbate flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map and nearby steep topography indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff. SEPA require a flood risk assessment (FRA) to be included as a site specific developer requirement prior to any development occurring on the site, and that the findings are used to inform the scale, layout and form of development. There is the potential that the development of this allocation could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard identified within the site.

Foul must be connected to SW foul network. SW should confirm any capacity issues. There is a burn running through the site which should be protected and enhanced as part of any development. There should be no culverting for land gain. There may be a requirement for enhanced SUDS for any industrial uses.

There is a water body within, on or adjacent to the site, therefore SEPA request a developer requirement attached to the site to ensure that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents however The Dean Burn flows through the extent of the site which I would expect the applicant to consider. We may request an FRA.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	96/01526/FUL - Formation of new access road, car park and a single toilet - Approved subject to conditions. 96/01503/AGN - Erection of 3 polytunnels and 1 portacabin - Approved.

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Good	Limited	Good	Moderate	South

## Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Moderate biodiversity impacts. Site appears to be improved grassland with mixed amenity woodland, field margin and garden ground on the boundary and burn along western boundary. Records of oystercatcher, lapwing and curlew during the breeding season. Potential connectivity with River Tweed SAC (Lyne water). Protect boundary features and water course and mitigation for protected species including potentially badger breeding birds and mitigation to ensure no adverse impacts on River Tweed SAC.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is outside the development boundary. West Linton has a range of services, facilities and has a potential employment opportunity.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	On/adjacent to site	Not applicable

## Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Outwith the current settlement in a visible location especially from the main Edinburgh Road at a higher level.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There is potential for previously unrecorded archaeology, particularly prehistoric lithic artefacts and associated features. Evaluation will be required.

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable			Not applicable

## Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to size and location.

LANDSCAPE COMMENT: Small scale units suited to rural environment. Well screened with woodland belts as per adjacent site and zEL18.

The Landscape Capacity Study considered this area to be marginal for development. It also suggested areas for landscape enhancement within the site.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

**Near a trunk road?**

NETWORK MANAGER: Access should be restricted to via Robinsland roundabout and A72.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No Comment.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No issues raised.

ROADS PLANNING: Although I have previously confirmed I would be unable to support housing on this site due to road infrastructure constraints, I may be able to support some small scale low key employment use in line with the needs of the village. The road infrastructure would have to extend out to the site. A Transport Statement is likely to be required.

<b>Right of way</b>	<b>TPOs</b>	<b>Contaminated land</b>	<b>Water supply</b>	<b>Sewerage</b>	<b>Gas Supply</b>	<b>Education provision</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Yes	Limited	No	

Northern HMA

West Linton

BWEST003

## Planning & infrastructure summary

The settlement of West Linton already has an allocated Business and Industrial site allocated within the Local Development Plan. However, that site is constrained by ownership. Following a public meeting within the community, it was noted that there is a desire to identify another site in order to assist in meeting local demand until the current allocated site zEL18 can come forward. However, since the publication and consultation of the MIR, the site has been resold and the new owners do not wish to see the site developed.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: There is an employment allocation to the south (zEL18) which is smaller and hasn't been taken up. This is a larger site so would that be likely to be taken up?

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. Depending on the flow demand will determine if further investigation is required.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Roseberry WTW has sufficient capacity. Depending on the flow demand will determine if further investigation is required.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Non-vehicular links required to existing pavements to give safe non-vehicular access in to West Linton.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No issues raised.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: We have no objections to this allocation but would require the input from the roads authority on the acceptability of such a large allocation and its effect on the road network. It may be that access could be taken further up Robinsland Drive to reduce the impact of business traffic on the remaining residential area. The site is relatively flat and there is an unsatisfied demand for sites and premises from businesses in this locale. Additional work may be necessary to investigate the feasibility of this further.

---

## Overall assessment

### PP status

Excluded

### Overall assessment

Acceptable

### Site capacity

N/A

## Conclusions

The site is located to the north east of West Linton. The site was considered to be acceptable for inclusion within the MIR as a preferred option for a business and industrial allocation, and at that time had landowner support. There is a desire to see some Business and Industrial land come forward to assist in meeting local need. West Linton has good access to public transport and services and limited access to employment opportunities.

Since the publication of the MIR, the site has been sold and the new owners do not wish to see development on the site.

Further to a site assessment, the following constraints/issues were identified, which may require mitigation:

- Flood Risk Assessment required, in respect of potential flood risk and surface water runoff;
- There is a water body within, on the boundary or adjacent to the site, therefore a maintenance buffer zone is required;
- Consideration of additional water quality buffer strips depending upon specific water quality pressures.
- There should be no culverting for land gain.
- There is potential for connectivity with the River Tweed SAC/SSSI;
- Protect and enhance the existing boundary features, where possible;
- Potential for protected species, including breeding birds within the site;
- Potential for archaeology within the site, therefore mitigation required;
- The site is within a visible location, especially from the main Edinburgh road. However, the site can integrate well, if planting was established to create a well defined setting and visual containment;
- The Roads Planning Officer can support some small scale low key employment use on the site, in line with the needs of the village;
- Transport Statement required;
- Possible investment required in respect of the WWTW; and
- Non vehicular links required to existing pavements to give safe non vehicular access to West Linton.

Although the site has received a positive assessment, it is not proposed to bring the site forward within the Proposed Local Development Plan, this is due to the change in ownership and the fact that there is still an existing employment site (zEL18) awaiting development.

---

<b>Site reference</b> AWEST019	<b>Site name</b> North East of Robinsland Farm	<b>Settlement</b> West Linton	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 100	<b>Ha</b> 3.2	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourse (potentially called The Dean) which is potentially culverted through the site and other small watercourses which are within or adjacent to the site. We do not support development located over a culvert that is to remain active. Consideration may also have to be given to the interaction of these small watercourses with the Cairn Burn. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues in this area. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.

SEPA require a flood risk assessment (FRA) to be included as a site specific developer requirement prior to any development occurring on the site, and that the findings are used to inform the scale, layout and form of development.

Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. SW should confirm any capacity issues. There appears to be a drain and an issue just to the south of the development area. These should be protected and enhanced as part of any development. There may be some culverts running through the site in which case the opportunity should be taken to de-culvert these.

SEPA request a developer requirement attached to the site to ensure that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> N/A
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> South
-------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	-----------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is mostly outside the development boundary. West Linton has a range of services, facilities and has a potential employment opportunity. The new school is located in a mainly residential area close to the village centre.

ECOLOGY COMMENTS: No response received.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Adjacent to site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

This site could be quite a prominent new site within the settlement. The extent of this site is extremely large in relation to this settlement and would also be a prominent addition.

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There is potential for previously unrecorded archaeology, particularly prehistoric lithic artefacts and associated features. Evaluation will be required.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific comment.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comments.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No comments.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Only concern is for additional traffic numbers on Deanfoot Road / Main Street junction.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Bus infrastructure and possible turning circle.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: The cumulative impact [with AWEST021] on the trunk road would require to be considered.

ROADS PLANNING: I am unable to support this proposal. The road infrastructure in West Linton, and in particular Main Street, is not capable of supporting further development in the village unless some relief can be afforded. As such, any further housing in West Linton should be immediately to the east of Broomlee Crescent and will rely on street connectivity between Deanfoot Road and Station Road. Such linkage would offer some relief for Main Street.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

HOUSING STRATEGY: No comments.

SCOTTISH WATER - WASTE: Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. Surface water sewer running through site. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER - WATER: Roseberry WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. The land appears to form part of a wider steading however there is no evidence to suggest the development extended into the subject site. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Non-vehicular links required to existing pavements to give safe non-vehicular access in to West Linton.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT - RD - Appears a logical extension. Access and landscaping issues.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT - As this site appears to be landlocked, we are concerned that the applicants propose to access through the Deanfoot road employment site which we are still anxious to ensure is developed for this purpose. We would object to this unless an alternative access road location can be demonstrated and is implementable.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No Issues.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No comments.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	100

### Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the Call for Sites process for housing development and resubmitted at MIR stage.

Development of this site would have a moderate impact on the local ecology. West Linton has a range of services and facilities and access to a potential employment site. The majority of the site is flat, exposed and open in character. Potential for archaeology on the site. The site is constrained within the Development and Landscape Capacity Study undertaken for the settlement.

The Roads Planning Officer is unable to support the site, for the following reasons: The road infrastructure in West Linton, and in particular Main Street, is not capable of supporting further development in the village unless some relief can be afforded. As such, any further housing in West Linton should be immediately to the east of Broomlee Crescent and will rely on street connectivity between Deanfoot Road and Station Road. Such linkage would offer some relief for Main Street.

Taking into consideration the above constraints, the site will not be included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b> AWEST020	<b>Site name</b> Deanfoot Road	<b>Settlement</b> West Linton	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 30	<b>Ha</b> 2.6	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

Small area shown to be at risk of flooding on SEPA Maps. The Dean Burn also flows through the site.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourse (potentially called The Dean) which flows through the site. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map and nearby steep topography indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff. SEPA require a flood risk assessment (FRA) to be included as a site specific developer requirement prior to any development occurring on the site, and that the findings are used to inform the scale, layout and form of development.

Foul must be connected to SW foul network. SW should confirm any capacity issues. There is a burn running through the site which should be protected and enhanced as part of any development. There should be no culverting for land gain.

SEPA request a developer requirement attached to the site to ensure that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents however the Dean Burn flows through the extent of the site which I would expect the applicant to consider. We may request an FRA.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> 96/01526/FUL - Formation of new access road, car park and a single toilet - Approved subject to conditions. 96/01503/AGN - Erection of 3 polytunnels and 1 portacabin - Approved.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> South
-------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	-----------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is outside the development boundary. West Linton has a range of services, facilities and has a potential employment opportunity. The school is also located in a mainly residential area close to the village centre.

ECOLOGY: No response received.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Adjacent to site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There is potential for previously unrecorded archaeology, particularly prehistoric lithic artefacts and associated features. Evaluation will be required.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific comment.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Adjacent to site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to size and location.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No comments.

The Landscape Capacity Study considered this area to be marginal for development. It also suggested areas for landscape enhancement within the site.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Only concern is for additional traffic numbers on Deanfoot Road / Main Street junction.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No Comment.

ROADS PLANNING: I am unable to support this proposal. The road infrastructure in West Linton, and in particular Main Street, is not capable of supporting further development in the village unless some relief can be afforded. As such, any further housing in West Linton should be immediately to the east of Broomlee Crescent and will rely on street connectivity between Deanfoot Road and Station Road. Such linkage would offer some relief for Main Street.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

HOUSING STRATEGY: No comments.

SCOTTISH WATER - WASTE: Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW.

SCOTTISH WATER - WATER: Roseberry WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed.

There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Non-vehicular links required to existing pavements to give safe non-vehicular access in to West Linton.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Greenfield, not a logical extension. Would create pressure on adjacent land.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No Issues.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.  
NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.  
PROJECTS TEAM: No comments.  
NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	30

### Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the Call for Sites process, for consideration to housing development. The site has previously been considered for housing as part of the Local Plan Amendment (AWEST008) and the Local Development Plan (AWEST015) and not taken forward. The site is located to the north east of West Linton adjacent to the settlement boundary.

Further to a site assessment and consultation, there are a number of constraints on the site. Development would have a moderate impact upon ecology, therefore mitigation would be required. There is potential for archaeology on the site and mitigation would be required. The Development and Landscape Capacity Study considered this area to be marginal for development. The site is within a visible location from the main Edinburgh Road. However, the site can integrate well, if planting was established to create a well defined setting and visual containment. The Roads Planning Officer is unable to support housing at this site for the following reason. The road infrastructure in West Linton, and in particular Main Street, is not capable of supporting further development in the village unless some relief can be afforded. As such, any further housing in West Linton should be immediately to the east of Broomlee Crescent and will rely on street connectivity between Deanfoot Road and Station Road. Such linkage would offer some relief for Main Street.

Given the above constraints from the Roads Planning Officer it is not considered that housing can be supported on this site. Therefore, the site will not be included within the Proposed Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b> AWEST021	<b>Site name</b> North of West Linton	<b>Settlement</b> West Linton	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 180	<b>Ha</b> 12.3	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	------------------------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Adjacent to site	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

Flood risk on small parts of site.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourse (potentially called The Dean) which flows adjacent to the site. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map and nearby steep topography indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff.

SEPA require a flood risk assessment (FRA) to be included as a site specific developer requirement prior to any development occurring on the site, and that the findings are used to inform the scale, layout and form of development.

Foul must be connected to SW foul network. SW should confirm any capacity issues. There is a pond to the south of the site which should be protected.

SEPA request a developer requirement attached to the site to ensure that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is within SEPA's 1 in 200 year surface water flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. I would, however, ask that due to the size of the development that surface water flooding is considered as well as Drainage Assessment and SUDS.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> N/A
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is outside the development boundary. West Linton has a range of services, facilities and has a potential employment opportunity. The school is located in a mainly residential area close to the village centre. Local Biodiversity site - Lyne Dale Wood adjacent to the site.

ECOLOGY: No comments.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Adjacent to site

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Adjacent to site

### Garden and designed landscape

On/adjacent to site

### Local impact and integration summary

The site sits within the SBC Lynedale / Medwyn Designed Landscape.

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There is potential for previously unrecorded archaeology, particularly prehistoric lithic artefacts and associated features. Evaluation will be required.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: This is a significant scale of potential development which may impact on the settlement. The southern boundary treatment will be important.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

On/adjacent to site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: Site lies within a Special Landscape Area. The western side of the site appears relatively well contained in views from the existing settlement and surrounding roads. The eastern part of the site is more open, including in views from the adjacent A702 trunk road. Developing up to the red line boundary here would represent a significant change in character and the introduction of development into a largely undeveloped landscape. The general character is of a settled and managed landscape with dwellings that are well screened and largely subservient to their surroundings. As currently proposed, the site represents low density development (15 dwellings/hectare), albeit somewhat more dense than parts of the existing village. Landscape impacts and change of character on the A702 could be managed by increasing the density through keeping development back from the eastern boundary, allowing appropriate boundary planting and greenspace to be planned along this edge.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Existing access via Loan is on a single-track road and this would need upgraded for a scheme of this size; as would the junction with the A702. Also new junction with A702 to north of village.

Wider concern for the impact on the constrained infrastructure within the village centre.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Possible bus infrastructure required, layby on A702.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: The cumulative impact [with AWEST019] on the trunk road would require to be considered.

ROADS PLANNING: I am unable to support this proposal. The road infrastructure in West Linton, and in particular Main Street, is not capable of supporting further development in the village unless some relief can be afforded. As such, any further housing in West Linton should be immediately to the east of Broomlee Crescent and will rely on street connectivity between Deanfoot Road and Station Road. Such linkage would offer some relief for Main Street.

Furthermore, this site in particular is somewhat disconnected from the rest of the village. There are too many constraints with the private road known as The Loan so that sole means of vehicular access would likely be from a new roundabout on the A702 Trunk Road outside the village (subject to Transport Scotland approval). The A702 Trunk Road through the village operates to a degree as a bypass and the site sits on the opposite side of it from the village services. A development of this scale would be expected to integrate well with the existing street network and there is very little opportunity for this.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

On site

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Average

Northern HMA

West Linton

AWEST021

## Planning & infrastructure summary

HOUSING STRATEGY: No comments.

SCOTTISH WATER - WASTE: Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER - WATER: Roseberry WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Non-vehicular links required to existing pavements to give safe non-vehicular access in to West Linton.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT - RD - Landscape issues, band of trees running roughly north south through site for example. Access onto trunk road. No defensible boundary at northern edge so likely additional pressure on land to north. Density of development would be different from the existing properties to the north of A702. SLA.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No Issues.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No comments.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	180

### Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the Call for Sites process, for housing development. The site was recently assessed as part of the Housing SG (AWEST016 and AWEST018) and was not taken forward for inclusion.

Further to a site assessment and consultation, a number of constraints were identified with the site. The site is highly visible when approaching the settlement from the north. There is also potential for archaeology onsite. The site is identified as constrained within the Development and Landscape Capacity Study, and is located within the Special Landscape Area.

The Roads Planning Officer is unable to support the allocation of this site and provided the following comments. The road infrastructure in West Linton, and in particular Main Street, is not capable of supporting further development in the village unless some relief can be afforded. As such, any further housing in West Linton should be immediately to the east of Broomlee Crescent and will rely on street connectivity between Deanfoot Road and Station Road. Such linkage would offer some relief for Main Street. Furthermore, this site in particular is somewhat disconnected from the rest of the village. There are too many constraints with the private road known as The Loan so that sole means of vehicular access would likely be from a new roundabout on the A702 Trunk Road outside the village (subject to Transport Scotland approval). The A702 Trunk Road through the village operates to a degree as a bypass and the site sits on the opposite side of it from the village services. A development of this scale would be expected to integrate well with the existing street network and there is very little opportunity for this.

In conclusion, taking the above constraints into consideration, the site will not be included within the Proposed Plan for housing.

---

<b>Site reference</b> AWEST022	<b>Site name</b> The Loan	<b>Settlement</b> West Linton	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 10	<b>Ha</b> 1.0	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Adjacent to site	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

SEPA: There is a pond adjacent to the site but review of historic maps does not show any small watercourses through or adjacent to the site. It may be linked to this area previously being a quarry. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map and nearby steep topography indicates that there may be flooding issues within this area. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff. Foul must be connected to SW foul network. SW should confirm any capacity issues. There is a pond to the north of the site which should be protected.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> N/A
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is outside the development boundary. West Linton has a range of services, facilities and has a potential employment opportunity. The school is located in a mainly residential area close to the village centre. Local Biodiversity site - Lyne Dale Wood adjacent to the site.

ECOLOGY COMMENTS: No comments received.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Not applicable	<b>Open space</b> Not applicable	<b>Listed buildings</b> Not applicable	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> Not applicable	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> On/adjacent to site
--------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------

## Local impact and integration summary

The site sits within the SBC Lynedale / Medwyn Designed Landscape.

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There is potential for previously unrecorded archaeology, particularly prehistoric lithic artefacts and associated features. Evaluation will be required.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Generally the adjacent development appears to be of a lower density than that proposed.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

On/adjacent to site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

The site is located within the Pentland Hills Special Landscape Area. The Landscape Capacity Study considered this area to be appropriate for development. It also suggested areas for landscape enhancement within the site. Despite the site sitting above 200 metres - it is generally flat and would be capable of development.

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: Part of AWEST021. Development here would appear as continuation of existing development along The Loan.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No comments received.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Opportunity to improve access road and junction.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No Comment.

ROADS PLANNING: I am unable to support this land being allocated for housing due to the vertical and horizontal constraints of the Loan. The Loan is currently a private road and any further development which utilises this access would require the road to be upgraded to an adoptable standard. Whilst the running surface could be improved the horizontal constraints and vertical alignment of this road is such that I do not believe the road could be upgraded to a suitable standard for adoption. The access onto the A702 would be a matter for Transport Scotland to comment on.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Adjacent to site

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Average

## Planning & infrastructure summary

HOUSING STRATEGY: No comments.

SCOTTISH WATER - WASTE: Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW.

SCOTTISH WATER - WATER: Roseberry WTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the network.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Non-vehicular links required to existing pavements to give safe non-vehicular access in to West Linton.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT - RD - Has some potential but is it logical? Tight site for 10 units and the density would be radically different from the adjoining. Good line of mature trees to north, would need protection. SLA.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No Issues.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No comments.  
NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	10

### Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the Call for Sites process for housing development.

The site would have a moderate impact on the ecology of the area, and West Linton has a range of services and facilities. The Roads Planning Officer is unable to support the allocation of this site for the following reasons - The vertical and horizontal constraints of the Loan. The Loan is currently a private road and any further development which utilises this access would require the road to be upgraded to an adoptable standard. Whilst the running surface could be improved the horizontal constraints and vertical alignment of this road is such that I do not believe the road could be upgraded to a suitable standard for adoption. The access onto the A702 would be a matter for Transport Scotland to comment.

Taking on board the above comments, the site will not be included within the Proposed Local Development Plan for housing.

---

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	SDA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	PP status
<b>AWEST023</b>	Medwyn Road West	West Linton	Rest of Borders	Housing	8	7.4	<b>Excluded</b>

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site does not lie within the SEPA 1 in 200 year fluvial (river) or pluvial (surface water) flood extents. As such, I would have no objections to this site on the grounds of flood risk.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourse which flows through the golf course and along the boundary of the site. Based on SEPA maps, majority of site appears to be developable.

We note that there is a watercourse within this site. We therefore recommend that a development requirement is attached to these sites to ensure that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6m wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	16/01488/TPO Works to trees - Refused (on part of site along the north-eastern edge). 15/00787/S37 11KV overhead line refurbishment/rebuild - approved with conditions (on part of site). 18/00980/S37 11KV overhead line refurbishment/rebuild - Pending Consideration as at 14/06/2019

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Good	Limited	Good	Moderate	South

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is generally south and south-westerly facing. The site is outside the development boundary. West Linton has a range of services, facilities and has a potential employment opportunity. The school is located in a mainly residential area close to the village centre.

ECOLOGY: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact

Site appears to be improved grassland with mature broad-leaved trees in roundel and trees on the boundary (featured in 1st ed OS maps). No obvious connectivity to River Tweed SAC but 100m from site boundary to Leader water. Protect boundary features and roundel of trees mitigation for protected species potentially including bats (lighting), badger and breeding birds.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Adjacent to site

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Adjacent to site

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY: Roman road adjacent to the site. A number of prehistoric sites in the area. Evaluation required.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific H&D issues.

This is a substantive site within a low indicative capacity outwith the development boundary. I consider the allocation of ALL the site is a challenge.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

On/adjacent to site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

The site is located within the Pentland Hills Special Landscape Area.

The site is considered to be constrained within the Development and Landscape Capacity Study. The study considers that development on the 'Undulating Pasture with Knolls' character area is constrained by the attractive, striking spatial quality of the landscape, which would be lost if development simply filled up the open fields between the many mature small woodlands. In addition, development at this location would extend the settlement away from its association with the rim of the valley of the Lyne Water; which is a distinctive pattern of development on the northern side of the settlement.

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to size and location of site.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: No observations.

ROADS PLANNING: I am unable to support this proposal.

The road infrastructure in West Linton, and in particular Main Street, is not capable of supporting further development in the village unless some relief can be afforded. As such, any further housing in West Linton should be immediately to the east of Broomlee Crescent and will rely on street connectivity between Deanfoot Road and Station Road. Such linkage would offer some relief for Main Street.

As well as serving residential properties, Medwyn Road serves farmland, Baddingsgill Reservoir and a busy golf course, but has no footway or street lighting provision. This combined with the site location being on the opposite side of the A702 Trunk Road from the town services would not be in the interests of sustainable transport as it would discourage walking and cycling and would place a reliance on car trips.

Furthermore, the Medwyn Road and Lyne Park junctions onto the A702 are too close together and Medwyn Road, after its initial length, narrows down to an extent that the roadside verge is being overridden and damaged by passing vehicles.

PG/DJI

### Near a trunk road?

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Adjacent to site

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained largely undeveloped with the exception of an unspecified possible agricultural building.

The site is brownfield land and its use may present development constraints.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: The area looks like it could accommodate far more than 8 houses. No street frontage. Access could be an issue, especially if applications received for more than 8 houses.  
OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: EN = The access authority would request non-vehicular links to the existing path network and the town precincts (pavements).  
SCOTTISH WATER - WASTE: Growth project started, this site is not part of the calculation and would require a new project.  
SCOTTISH WATER - WATER: No concerns for 8 units.  
SEPA: Water Enviro: This site is immediately adjacent to the sewered catchment and so must connect to the public foul sewer. A tributary of the West water runs through the southern part of the site. This must be protected as part of any development - SEPA has a policy against culverting for land gain.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	8

### Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the MIR public consultation.  
The site would have a moderate impact on the ecology of the area. West Linton has a range of services and facilities. Site is a relatively well contained field. Potential for archaeology, evaluation required.  
The site is identified as constrained within the Development and Landscape Capacity Study, and is located within the Special Landscape Area. Roads Planning are unable to support the site. Considerable housing has recently come forward through the Plan.  
Taking into consideration the above constraints, the site will not be included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

---

<b>Site reference</b> AWEST024	<b>Site name</b> Lintonbank	<b>Settlement</b> West Linton	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 230	<b>Ha</b> 17.4	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Adjacent to site	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with the SEPA 1 in 200 year fluvial (river) flood extent and has very small pockets of pluvial (surface water) flooding predicted during a 1 in 200 year flood event.

Due to the capacity of the site, I would require that surface water flooding is assessed by the applicant and flows routed away from property.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourse adjacent to the site on the A702. There is also ponds on-site which will require consideration. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues at this site or immediately adjacent. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at an increased risk of flooding.

We note that there is a watercourse within this site. We therefore recommend that a development requirement is attached to these sites to ensure that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6m wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> N/A
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

GENERAL COMMENTS: Small parts of the site are south facing but the site is predominately not. The site is outside the development boundary. West Linton has a range of services, facilities and has a potential employment opportunity. The school is located in a mainly residential area close to the village centre. Local Biodiversity site - Lyne Dale Wood adjacent to the site.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Adjacent to site

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Adjacent to site

### Garden and designed landscape

On/adjacent to site

### Local impact and integration summary

The site sits within the SBC Lynedale / Medwyn Designed Landscape.

ARCHAEOLOGY: A number of prehistoric objects, sites and features from wider area. Evaluation required.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Whilst no specific heritage issues; the scale of this development and its impact on the centre of West Linton which is a conservation area, will need to be carefully considered.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

On/adjacent to site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

The site is located within the Pentland Hills Special Landscape Area.

The majority site is identified as constrained within the Development and Landscape Capacity study for West Linton. The study states that this location is constrained due to the preference to maintain the strong relationship between the Valley and the Lyne Water which is a distinctive characteristic.

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: Our previous advice on AWEST022 from 15 August 2018:

"Part of AWEST021. Development here would appear as continuation of existing development along The Loan."

We have no further comment to make.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Concern for impact on very constrained infrastructure in centre of village.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Bus stop infrastructure – laybys and bus shelters required on A702. Pedestrian links to West Linton village centre.

ROADS PLANNING: I am unable to support this proposal.

The road infrastructure in West Linton, and in particular Main Street, is not capable of supporting further development in the village unless some relief can be afforded. As such, any further housing in West Linton should be immediately to the east of Broomlee Crescent and will rely on street connectivity between Deanfoot Road and Station Road. Such linkage would offer some relief for Main Street.

Furthermore, this site in particular is somewhat disconnected from the rest of the village. There are too many constraints with the private road known as The Loan so that sole means of vehicular access would likely be from a new roundabout on the A702 Trunk Road outside the village (subject to Transport Scotland approval). The A702 Trunk Road through the village operates to a degree as a bypass and the site sits on the opposite side of it from the village services. A development of this scale would be expected to integrate well with the existing street network and there is very little opportunity for this.

If this site was to be zoned for development a Transport Assessment would be required.

PG/DJI

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: The cumulative impact on the trunk road would require to be considered.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

On site

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Average

## Planning & infrastructure summary

GENERAL COMMENT: A number of TPO trees are located on the site.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed.

There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Long access run into the site. Pressure on fields to the east (around access).

Access difficult otherwise since the road to the south west is private and the junction with the trunk road is poor.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: EN = The access authority would request non-vehicular links to the existing path network and the town precincts (pavements); also non-vehicular links within the settlement would be sought.

SCOTTISH WATER - WASTE: Growth project started, this site is not part of the calculation and would require a new project.

SCOTTISH WATER - WATER: A Water Impact Assessment would be required.

SEPA: Water Enviro: The site is just adjacent to the area served by the public foul sewer and thus the site must connect to the public foul sewer network. This scale of development is likely to result in upgrading being required to the STW. There is a small pond on the site which must be protected as part of any development.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	230

## Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the MIR public consultation.

The site would have a moderate impact on the ecology of the area. West Linton has a range of services and facilities. The site sits within the SBC Lynedale / Medwyn Designed Landscape. Potential for archaeology on site.

The site is identified as constrained within the Development and Landscape Capacity Study, and is located within the Special Landscape Area. Roads Planning are unable to support the site. Considerable housing has recently come forward through the Plan.

Taking into consideration the above constraints, the site will not be included within the Proposed Local Development Plan.

---

# Southern HMA

## Newcastleton

<b>Site reference</b> ANEWC004	<b>Site name</b> North of Station House	<b>Settlement</b> Newcastleton	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 22	<b>Ha</b> 1.0	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

### Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

#### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The site is outwith the SEPA flood maps however SBC is aware of issues with the Coulter Sike and would require a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Assessment to ensure this is fully considered. SBC is currently undertaking a flood study in Newcastleton which would be able to provide some information.

SEPA: Small watercourse/drain flows through allocation and potential flood risk from this source should be taken cognisance of. A basic FRA, consisting of topographic information in the first instance and a detailed layout plan will be required.

### Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> No planning history. The site was considered through the process of the Local Plan Amendment (ANEWC004) but was excluded.
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> South
-------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	-----------------------------

#### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response received.

The site is within walking distance of services in the village centre. There is bus services to Hawick, Carlisle and Langholm. Buses are more frequent during the week than at weekends. Protected species interest have been recorded in the area and further assessment on nature conservation will be required.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Adjacent to site

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed landscape

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: No known issues.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: This site lies to the N of the current Newcastleton Conservation Area; development of the site should take account of the potential impact on the conservation area.

HES: No comments.

The site is located on the edge of the settlement, behind the development at Frank Coultts Court. Consideration is required in terms of layout and design to consider the conservation area in the village and the location on the edge of the settlement not to change the character of the settlement. Since the site is located on the western side of the old railway line it may feel detached from the existing settlement. There are some properties on the western side. There are no major issues regarding local impact and integration with the village. The site is doubtful because it does not follow traditional grid pattern in the village and feels detached from the settlement since it is located on the western side of the former railway.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

Landscape Architect: No comments received.

Scottish Natural Heritage: No comment due to size and location.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: Reasonable existing infrastructure.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: Uncomfortable with this site being zoned for housing on the basis of Council policy protecting the possible reopening of the rail line. This policy forms part of the Local Development Plan and the Local Transport Strategy. The proposed site is on the opposite side of the former railway line from the village and possibly takes in part of the former railway station and is immediately adjacent to the former level crossing. It is difficult to determine the full extent of how this site could be affected by the railway line, possible station (including parking), possible goods yard, possible construction yard and possible road realignments to avoid the need for a level crossing. As such it would appear inappropriate to allocate this land for housing at this time.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No comments.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. A building is present to the south of the site and is assumed to be residential in nature. There is no evidence to indicate the historic use of the site may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Railway corridor for a potential extension of Borders Rail is located on and adjacent to the site and alongside adjacent areas. There is an opportunity to create links through woodland and with footways within the development to upgrade the existing footway and countryside path network.

EDUCATION: No objections.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Newcastleton WTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the network. Newcastleton WwTW has sufficient capacity. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SEPA: Site would need to discharge to public sewerage system as watercourses too small to afford sufficient dilution. SUDs required for surface water.

FORMER ASSESSMENT FROM LPA: Access would be from Langholm Street. The former railway line runs through Newcastleton and land needs to be safeguarded not to prejudice reinstatement of the railway line. Following on from Roads comments the Waverley Team have raised no objections to ANEWC004 or ANEWC005 provided certain safeguardings are carried out. The site includes landscaping buffer to safeguard land for the railway. In the short term this will act as a green link through parts of Newcastleton. The site is included in the policy for Areas for dispersed communities (D2). Suspected contaminated land is on land adjacent to the site that has been developed recently. Notification to MOD is required for development over 15.2 meters in height. A possible problem exists in terms of the availability of raw water to Newcastleton WTW. This issue would be further exacerbated into a potentially major issue depending on whether SW are required to supply a holiday camp. Appropriately designed SUDS required for all new development. At LPI for the adopted Local Plan the Reporter did not recommend inclusion for this site is the plan.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	22

### Conclusions

The Roads Planning Team has objected to the allocation of the site on the grounds of the former railway line which extends along the eastern edge of the site and is safeguarded under Policy IS4 of the Local Development Plan 2016. The site lies adjacent to the Conservation Area of Newcastleton which is characterised by a grid building pattern. The site is detached from the settlement by the former railway line and it is difficult to envisage how it could be developed in keeping with the character of the Conservation Area. For these reasons, it is not considered that this site can be accepted. Any development of the site would require to be the subject of a Flood Risk and Drainage Assessment.

---

<b>Site reference</b> ANEWC012	<b>Site name</b> Land north of Copshaw Place	<b>Settlement</b> Newcastleton	<b>SDA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 19	<b>Ha</b> 1.0	<b>PP status</b> Excluded
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: In terms of information that this Council has concerning flood risk to this site, I would state that The Indicative River, Surface Water & Coastal Hazard Map (Scotland) known as the "third generation flood mapping" prepared by SEPA indicates that the site is at risk from a flood event with a return period of 1 in 200 years. That is the 0.5% annual risk of a flood occurring in any one year. The Indicative River & Coastal Flood Map (Scotland) has primarily been developed to provide a strategic national overview of flood risk in Scotland. Whilst all reasonable effort has been made to ensure that the flood map is accurate for its intended purpose, no warranty is given. Due to copyright restrictions I cannot copy the map to you however, if the applicant wishes to inspect the maps they can contact me to arrange a suitable time to come in and view them. Furthermore, Hydraulic modelling was produced as part of the Newcastleton Flood Study in 2018 which demonstrates that the proposed development lies within the 1 in 200 year (0.5%) flood extent and is anticipated to flood to depths of up to 1m at the site. This study is anticipated to be more accurate than the indicative mapping although no warranty is given. I would note that this is one of the most at-risk sites in Newcastleton and is situated in an area defined as "The Lakes". If a residential or business proposal was to be situated here, I would reject the proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

SEPA: Fully within the 1 in 200 year floodplain of the Liddel Water. New development within this area is therefore viewed as unacceptable.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> No planning application history. The site was excluded from the Local Development Plan 2016 (ANEWC010).
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: No comments received.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Open space</b> Not applicable	<b>Listed buildings</b> Not applicable	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> Not applicable	<b>Garden and designed landscape</b> Not applicable
----------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

## Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: No known issues.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: This site lies to the N of the current Newcastleton Conservation Area; development of the site should take account of the potential impact on the conservation area.

HES: No comments.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: No comments received.

SNH: No comment due to size and location.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: Reasonable existing infrastructure.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: Means of vehicular access is possible via both Scott Street and the short cul-de-sac opposite George Street. Both routes are constrained and are not ideally suited to taking an increase in traffic, but so long as off-street parking is made available for these streets as part of the development of this site then the service will, on balance, be able to accept a limited extent of residential development on this site. A Transport Statement may be required depending on the scale of development.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No comments.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Adjacent to site

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Railway corridor for a potential extension of Borders Rail is located alongside adjacent areas. There is an opportunity to create links with footways within the development to upgrade the existing footway and countryside path network.

EDUCATION: No objections.

NHS: No comments received.

---

SCOTTISH WATER: Newcastleton WTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the network. Newcastleton WwTW has sufficient capacity. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SEPA: Site would need to discharge to public sewerage system as watercourses too small to afford sufficient dilution. SUDs required for surface water.

---

## Overall assessment

PP status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Excluded	Unacceptable	19

### Conclusions

The site is located within the 1 in 200 year floodplain of the Liddel Water, this is one of the most at-risk sites in Newcastleton. New development within this area is therefore viewed as unacceptable.

---