

Response 1

This is an ill considered and poorly thought out project. The farm has the potential to be viable. I know that there are a number of applications to lease the farm; this would not be the case if it was not viable. There is a reason that it is a hill farm; it is simply not suited to the growing of produce as envisaged. This group, Tweedgreen, has received a great deal of funding over the years, I have yet to see any legacy from this funding. Whether they have the ability to deliver such an extensive project is very much to be questioned.

Response 2

Separate pdf

Response 3

I think the concept behind the Jedderfield project offers amazing potential benefits for the people of the Borders: opportunities for all age groups to learn together about nature, sustainable development, rural crafts, ecological issues. It would benefit the natural world by seeking to increase biodiversity.

Response 4

I would like to see Jedderfield Farm managed in a commercial way, with full rent paid to Peebles Common Good Fund, which in turn financially supports many other community activities in Peebles.

Response 5

As a Common Good asset it should be for the common good, for the local community. I think the proposal by Tweedgreen meets that criteria perfectly, Jedderfield Farm could not only be a leading example of how we should be living now and into the future (in the light of the climate crisis) but would also provide so many opportunities for learning, training, well-being and community building for the folk of Peebles and beyond. There would be so much potential for supporting small local business, local organisations, schools, traditional trades, arts & crafts, to mention just a few, as well as preserving and promoting the history of the farm attracting tourism "If it's good for locals it's good for tourists"

Response 6

I think this is an incredible opportunity to develop a sustainable, eco friendly project, accessible to all. It has the potential to educate, enhance wellbeing, develop social cohesion and bring new life to a valuable asset in Peebles. A great way for people to enjoy nature and the volunteering opportunities that have become such an important part of life during the pandemic.

Response 7

The Jedderfield project is brilliantly conceived and planned with highly qualified experts supporting it. It will be a huge educational asset to the community of Peebles, providing ideas and examples of new ways of living for the sustainable future of our planet.

Response 8

I fully support this initiative and feel it would bring a wide range of benefits to the local community.

Response 9

I think this is a great idea to turn it in to a community project, the building and land needs a bit of TLC so this would be a perfect way to transform a rather tired looking plot.

Response 10

I was born and brought up in Peebles and spent many happy hours passing over the golf course then up the track through Jedderfield to the woods beyond and then onto Hamilton Hill. I have read Tweedgreen's proposals for the farm and thoroughly approve. I currently stay in X where I am a volunteer and committee member at a community woodland, I can testify that volunteering at a facility such as is proposed for Jedderfield is very good for both a person's physical and also their mental health.

A facility which supports good environmental practice and educates people in growing their own food is to be encouraged and will be a great benefit to the residents of Peebles. Promoting the history and heritage of the area will benefit both local residents and visitors.

Response 11

In Principal I agree with the proposal and believe that it could in the long term be a proving ground for some aspects of sustainable living. Not only on a small local level but has the potential to benefit a wider community.

The request should be granted.

Response 12

I support this idea. Rather than a grazing farm area that is a 'desert' for wildlife & of no profitable use for the residents of Peebles, it can be turned into a area rich for wildlife, helping the town be more sustainable by introducing fruit & veg production, beekeeping etc. in a sustainable way. It can help educate the townspeople & importantly the towns children in these small scale production & wildlife skills for a more sustainable future we should all be looking towards. Finally we can make what is currently run down, unloved & underutilised buildings & land into a hive of activity and opportunity for the town as a whole. This proposal would be more in keeping with the land as a COMMUNITY ASSET, rather than currently giving nothing to the town apart from very low rent (which it would still get).

Response 13

I think it's a great idea

Response 14

This should not be allowed to go ahead, this will prevent the ground to lie un farmed letting the ground go stale. The access into Jederfield farm is up a steep track which is solid bedrock in places and the Raeburn that runs next to it overflows making it very slippy in places. It is not safe for members of the public to be accessing leading to a huge potential access on the busy A72 below. The site itself is run down and needing a lot of attention, there will be a lot of work required to make this up to current health and safety requirements to satisfy risk assesments.

Response 15

I believe that a transfer of a lease for Jedderfield Farm to Tweedgreen would result in a major new asset for the community and would enhance the future prospects of Peebles for all.

Response 16

I feel that we shouldn't lose yet another small farm.

It is important that small farms remain as they are a vital part of introducing young farmers into the vocation. Something that is needed in Scotland as a whole, with an aging farming demographic, and in Peeblesshire specifically as most farms are part of very large landowners providing no inlets for young farmers.

Other initiatives in the area already cover Tweedgreens ideas so it isn't a necessary asset transfer.

Tweedgreen, I believe, have already been part of a small business initiative, using funding which lasted only four months, which may point to lack of volunteers and experience. So I would be concerned about the longevity of their plan.

Response 17

This farm is an ideal opportunity for a young aspiring farmer to take up the challenge of in what is an area full of large well established farming organisations.

I am concerned about the level of funding to get Tweedgreens venture off the ground and the fact it would also take extremely large sums of investment to keep the site in a stable financial position.

Response 18

I am fully supportive of this asset transfer request.

Peebles has show itself to be an inclusive,vibrant community and this asset would be used to provide outdoor education, a space to grow and a chance to decrease the towns carbon footprint by promoting green issues.

The opportunities for learning during the refurbishment and regeneration affords may inspire and train young people in the community in many different areas.

The community spirit developed when working on a project like this spreads out to the whole community in many ways.

I ask the Scottish Borders council to look favourably on this application

Response 19

Whilst I applaud the principles that this project will aim to achieve and don't have any issues with proposed usage of the site I am concerned about the access and increase in traffic to the site.

The current access is via a track which winds its way through Peebles golf course. This will make a hazardous path for visitors on foot who may not be familiar with the curtesy of waiting and looking for golfers who may be playing over the track. The track is also unsuitable for an increased number and flow of vehicles. In my opinion an alternative access would need to be created which avoids cutting through the golf course.

I am also concerned about increased noise from users of the Jedderfield site at the point where it lies next to the golf course, and whilst I appreciate golfers don't necessarily have

priority over the space nonetheless members and visitors pay to use the course and any extra noise is detrimental to the game.

Finally some thought need to be given to preserving the footpaths (both 'mapped' and informal) that run round the area to ensure these do not deteriorate in condition and continue to be safe for walkers. For example, cycling or other similar activities should not be encouraged on these.

Response 20

I would like to know the projected daily number of pedestrians and vehicles that will be visiting the project. I am a member of Peebles Golf Club and my major concern is the level of traffic both pedestrian and vehicle accessing the project through the golf course.

Response 21

In response to the consultation, I believe the best use of the land is continued use as a farm. I understand there are a number of expressions of interest from locals wanting to get into farming!

The site is part of the Peebles Common Good Fund.

The lease provides an income for the community benefit of the whole town in perpetuity! This land already a community asset and there is no reason to sell the land or to rent it at a peppercorn rate!

Response 22

I fully support this plan to allow Tweedgreen to manage the farm at Jedderfield. In doing so, the farm will become a well managed asset to the people of Peebles, and set a great example for community growing in Scotland.

Response 23

As a member of Peebles Golf Club, I am concerned that the current access track across the golf course will be expanded either physically or by increased usage for both pedestrians and vehicles. Unless this is very carefully managed at the planning stage and then legally enforced, there is considerable scope for the enjoyment of the golf course to be severely affected by an increase in access over current levels. I hope that sufficient safeguards are put in place to ensure that this potentially detrimental effect is mitigated, minimised and if possible eliminated.

Response 24

Whilst I very much like and support the aims and vision of this project I have some concerns.

1. Access: the current access runs directly through the golf course. This has been fine when Jedderfield was run as a farm as traffic to and from was very low however with these proposals I think the access will need to be reviewed, possibly needing to be accessed via the logging road on the neighbouring land if the neighbouring land owner was amenable? The golf course is an important community asset and any impact on this needs to be considered carefully. They have had a tough year financially and have worked hard to maintain their future especially with their youth development and coaching.

2. Increased traffic. Involving school and community groups will involve transport and the impact of this such as turning areas and parking. I am not sure that this lovely space a much loved walking and cycling area is suitable for this and would like to see how transport and access will be addressed.

3. This project will potentially bring a huge increase of footfall to a space that is currently a lovely quiet and wild space so I think there needs to be some thought as to how this will be managed and the current walking access maintained.

4. I would be keen to see some grazing retained as there is not a lot of accessible grazing on this side of the town. As a horse owner most of the grazing is on the other side of the town involving the need to drive to access it. Peebles is an agricultural country town and it is important to retain access to grazing that is accessible to residents on this side of the town not just for horses but for all animals.

5. I have some concerns as to whether Tweed green as an organisation have the capability and experience to take on a project of this size with a site that is so important to the town. I love their vision and feel passionate about many of their aims but looking at their previous projects this is on a much larger scale and I am unsure if they will be able to realise it on their own? I would be keen to see it perhaps done in stages on a smaller scale and allowing some of the land to be leased as grazing as the project develops? My fear would be that the project starts and creates a big impact sine perhaps negative such as tarmac road or parking and then the project fails and we are left with an eyesore rather than the rather lovely space it is now.

Despite these concerns I do think there is potential in their plans and would ask that there is more detail in the plans and a stronger business plan and also safeguards put in place to ensure this wonderful space continues to be an asset for the community for many generations to come.

Containment of users of the Jedderfield project within their designated area will be a problem, its simply not going to happen , we all know that.

To summarise , Jedderfield Farm should preferably be retained for agriculture/grazings as was the original intentions of Common Good land. Hopefully common sense will prevail and a level playing field will exist for all applicants.

Response 29

This is a great idea, a good use of a site which is currently in need of improvement. What better way to use it if not for the community and also for highlighting environmental issues.

Response 30

I want to be supportive of this venture but I'm afraid I feel quite cynical about it. Having grown up on a farm, I know the work that is involved in maintaining land and I question Tweedgreen's ability to deliver. Whilst the intentions maybe honourable, do the proposed plans benefit the majority of the community or just a select few? This proposal is set to receive a lot of funding, over £250k. Will a viable sustainable business model be created from that huge cash injection or is Tweedgreen going to be propped up by constant funding? Do the plans impact on other locals who don't have the good fortune of receiving funding to action their business goals?

Tweedgreen's accessible wholefoods venture at the Courthouse in 2016, whilst well meaning, failed to understand what it is actually like for families living on the lowest end of the income spectrum. Living hand to mouth, from one meal to the next, constantly stressed and worried about money, hindering the ability to forward meal plan most of the time. The courthouse project folded after 4 months. Who will actually benefit from the Jedderfield project? With businesses closing or laying staff off as a result of Covid, people need jobs to put food on the table.

From a farming perspective, it is nigh on impossible for young farmers to get a foot on the farming ladder these days. These are the next generation of food producers. We need to give them an opportunity to start out somewhere. There's also the environmental role that farm animals play in the ecosystem and biodiversity of the land and my understanding is no farm animals are detailed in the proposition.

I am not against the Tweedgreen plans per se but question their benefit to the town on a, a farm so desperately sought by young farmers, and b, on land donated to the Peebles Community Good Fund.

Response 31

I think Jedderfield Farm should remain in the common good fund. There may be other means by which Tweedgreen can promote its work.

Response 32

While this proposal is for a lease rather than a transfer of ownership, the rent offered would result in a substantial reduction of funding for the Peebles Common Good fund, which contributes greatly to local causes.

The asset transfer proposal has many merits but I believe the benefits they offered do not our way teh loss to the Common Good fund and do not support the transfer on the proposed terms.

I also raise concern regarding the potential increase in traffic flow form a poor junction on a busy section of the A72.

Response 33

Great project, I really hope you will succeed, great educational value

Response 34

I am wholeheartedly in favour of this. It will be such an asset to the people of Peebles and generations to come.

Response 35

I am against this application. I would rather the land be used for farming and be. Leased from the Common Good with a suitable rent.

Response 36

What a great sounding project. I first heard of it only today via a Facebook post encouraging people to respond to the consultation to they object. Having read the application documents, my response is completely the opposite. I fully support the objectives of the project and it is something that I can absolutely imagine being involved in myself. That aside, it would be a great asset to the community if it achieves only a fraction of what has been proposed.

Response 37

I do not want this transferred away from the common good fund. Thank you.

Response 38

I personally think that Jedderfield should be kept as a working farm, the access is a massive issue for people if they don't have a suitable 4x4 to get to it, so how this is going to benefit elderly people and people who don't have one ,as a fit young 26 year old woman, I struggle to walk up to Jedderfield, there for how are the elderly/buggies suppose to gain access to this land to! On a personal opinion I feel that you are taken away any opportunity for a young person to take over Jedderfield and start from scratch! The land has been used for years for farming why change now? Is the golf club going to have suitable risks assessment put to in place for people walking up to the location? Is the golf club ok with the potential of hazards that may arise?

Response 39

I believe this is a would be great community asset that would benefit the people of peebles. There is nothing similar to this in the local area and with the interest form school I see this as a real positive.

The community asset transfer would make this a more viable project and keep it within the community.

Response 40

The transfer of this property is deeply disturbing for Peebles.

Firstly tweed green have already failed in a far smaller project with far smaller sums of money needed. What's to stop this happening again? What if the inevitable happens and they fail yet the transfer has still many years to run?

Will it be an endless grant after grant that so often happens.

The loss of revenue from the land plus the constant funding needed to keep this project going is just not a wise decision.

Furthermore, the town is surrounded by well maintained forestry by the forestry commission and many sustainability projects are all ready running with ample advice available so is this really needed in a field that's already well addressed?

Whereas farming is a notoriously difficult avenue for young farmers even with family connections and this land provides the opportunity for the area to be used and maintained with minimum funding whilst helping young locals. Not only would this be helping future generations it would be financially sensible as well.

Lastly, the area itself is accessible by a steep dirt track beside a golf course. At the moment the traffic on the road is at a maximum bikes and a the occasion farm machinery causing no problems to golfers and locals. With the plans put forward by tweed green the traffic would be far too much for the infrastructure in place and cause problems for the area.

In summary, the planned project and asset transfer does not make any sense financially or for the local area and there must be other better options that this project that is being advertised so vigorously.

Response 41

Until we know what the other applicants propose to do it's impossible
To give this the go ahead- no information on access, affect on golf club , volume of people using it.surely every applicant deserves to be treated as equal rather than this one trumping them all so for that reason it's a no

Response 42

No transfer

Lease it to some young farmer who wants to start farming
Plus the common good fund will loose a valuable asset

Response 43

I object to the proposal on the grounds of loss of income for the Common Good Fund not only for a year but many years to come which could amount to tens of thousands of pounds and because of the Health and Safety aspect related to access to the project crossing 3 holes and running parallel to another 2 with all the problems associated with this.

My thoughts also include a suggestion that you may want to look at allowing such a project to proceed but be based on the land between the new Kingsland School and the existing farm access track thus taking away the H&S aspect of my objection and reducing the financial loss to the fund.

Response 44

I think that this should remain as it is and should not be transferred

Response 45

I am against this , I'm very concerned regarding traffic on the golf course.

The public are putting their selves in danger from being serious injured from being hit by a ball

The golfers are paying substantial fees to enjoy a game in a peaceful setting, not to put up with constant traffic trudging throughout!

Why not allow a farming family the opportunity

Response 46

This project could potentially educate many young minds, help restore nature, provide joy for locals and visitors alike, and yield a worthwhile harvest.

Response 47

[REDACTED] Peebles March Riding & Beltane Queen Festival Committee. I note that several local organisations have been engaged with, although not ourselves. While we do not have any objection in principal to what is proposed we would wish to ensure the festival's annual use of land at Jedderfield is continued.

Firstly, the annual Rising of the Marches uses the old Drive Road that runs along the south western boundary of the property.

Secondly, the annual horse races use the north east most field. As you will see on site there is a removable barrier on this east boundary which was installed many years ago by the committee, which is removed every year to allow the racetrack to be extended into the field. As you will expect, having had annual use of these routes/areas for as long as anyone can remember, we would wish this to continue.

Response 48

I think the plan to develop Jedderfield Farm as a community asset involving low carbon living and as a place of outdoor teaching to school children is an excellent one. School children need to experience the outdoors as well as low-carbon living. The farm developed in this way could be a demonstration project of which there should be many more around the country. I like to think Peebles could be in the forefront of such projects. Tweed Green are the right people to undertake such a project. They look to the future of a sustainable planet as we all need to do.

Response 49

I am fundamentally opposed to this request.

My rationale is as follows -

Removal of a working farm asset that should be worked by a local farmer.

Removal of significant annual income that would have been generated by the farm - the figures quoted are a loss from 6/8k per year to only 1k. This is money removed from the local economy that has always been used for the benefit of the community.

Access to the site and the numbers of people so doing (educational site for local school children) thus generating residual impact on the road and the need to effect access through the integral golf course.

The potential for the land and building to become a base to drive forward the specific narrative of a political party or associated groups and policies.

Response 50

Should stay with common good fund for the town

Response 51

The links to the relevant documents for this proposal are all broken. Not much of a consultation, so all that is clear is that there will be a significant loss of income to the Common Good fund. On that basis I oppose the proposed transfer.

Response 52

The plan put forward appears thoroughly researched and offers the community a great opportunity to work together on environmental issues.

Response 53

I am firmly in favour of this application being granted. I believe the climate crisis we are in needs addressed immediately and a grassroots approach is essential to effecting change at higher levels.

The introduction of renewable energy projects is especially lacking in this area and education around ecologically centred living would benefit not only the inhabitants of Peebles but the council also. Better recycling methods and reuse/composting will be a fantastic asset.

Response 54

I think this project will be a great asset to the local community. The plans for useage of the land are excellent and I would support its development as outlined by Tweedgreen.

Response 55

I strongly support the plans for this very exciting sounding project at Jedderfield. I think a lot of people in Peebles would welcome such a space for forward thinking.

In times of environmental degradation we need to get smarter with our resources. A centre for cleaner farming, educational workshops for all ages, history and heritage projects etc. – what is not to like? In this environment youngsters could spend a day experiencing growing and harvesting different crops, crafting or learning about their home town. It could be a vital link between people, nature and history!

I have worked as a project officer for a similar project abroad. Jedderfield seems to me like the perfect spot for these kind of activities. On the outskirts of the town but not too far away from the town centre. Some clever thinking regarding the access needs to be done, but when that issue has been solved I can not see any place better.

Response 56

This project offers the Community an accessible reference for sustainable, low carbon living.

Schools, occasional workshops and presentations can't provide ongoing support to this extent. This initiative acts as a practical, 'on the doorstep' consultation hub providing reinforcement and consolidation of knowledge and skills as well as developing a site to its full potential for the common good.

Response 57

I supported this project in principle before I realised that it was an asset transfer and that other applicants were also interested in the site. Now I believe that to transfer this out of the common good fund may be shortsighted. It is a very big asset to go to a local group which has not managed projects of this scale before, and I would be concerned that the first thing on the business plan is to establish accommodation for the on-site managers - this could be construed as self interest as someone is going to get a new house from a common good asset. I am also concerned that there seems to be no representative with actual business experience, which would make me nervous about the project's expected success. The application seems heavy on funding applications but light on the nuts and bolts of how practically this might work. If I'm being brutally honest it sounds like a hobby group wanting to harness a common good asset to create their own playground. I don't support this plan.

Response 58

A good idea, but the access to this particular area surely makes the project not viable. Unless a new access road can be built. School kids having to cross the golf course in class sized groups is dangerous. The current access road is not in good condition and will not be able to support a higher level of transport either!

Response 59

I strongly support this application by Tweedgreen to bring Jedderfield Farm back to life and into full community use. The farm is uniquely well located to allow ready public access - a gentle 30-minute walk from the centre of the town - and is an ideal place to engage with and actively learn about climate change issues and how they are inevitably going to impact on all of us over the coming decades. Climate change awareness is a key Scottish Government priority and the Glasgow summit later this year will focus worldwide attention on Scotland and Scottish Borders Council's support of this Jedderfield project will sit well with these wider agendas and bring appropriate cross-part political recognition.

As a Peebles resident for the past 35 years, I have enjoyed and welcomed the many positive changes our town has seen (I am not one of the 'Aye Thus' old guard!) and I am very aware of the strong sense of community support, real and latent, for a whole variety of new community-based ventures (for example, look at the runaway success of the new 'Keep Peebles Clean' social media environmental campaign). We need to adapt to change with determination and enthusiasm and this exciting and innovative Jedderfield project, in these post-Covid times, offers us the chance to get together safely, to engage and make our own contributions to battling the climate change crisis while improving our own health, fitness and well-being as well as having fun!

Response 60

I do not agree with this asset transfer request.
I have specific reasons which I will share if requested.

Response 61

I wholeheartedly support this asset transfer request to TweedGreen. Land and other assets that are part of the Peebles Common Good should be managed for the benefit of the people of Peebles.

In this time of climate crisis, I can think of a better use of the land that a community resource that provides a model for sustainable living and that offers the townsfolk a chance to practically engage in a project that will be of benefit of the whole community. This is doubly important on the back of the past 12 months and the impact of the pandemic, which has shown us how important building community is.

Response 62

I am strongly in favour of the Tweedgreen application to manage Jedderfield Farm. This site is ideally located to provide a huge range of benefits to the people of Peebles, and Tweedgreen are well equipped to create the level of community involvement that will be required.

Response 63

Peebles has a population of 8-10,000 people whereas Tweedgreen seems to have an active membership in single figures. I don't believe that Tweedgreen can be considered as a community organisation when it has such a low level of active participation. It seems that the asset transfer route is just being used to place Tweedgreen ahead of commercial offers.

There is no complete business plan and no way to assess whether Tweedgreen has sufficient financial resources to pay the rent under the lease. As a company limited by guarantee Tweedgreen has minimal capital.

As the members of the company have no personal liability for the companies debts will personal guarantees be sought from the officers? It is difficult to see any rationale for the need for a 25 year lease in any event as the individuals behind the proposal are unlikely to be able to commit to a project for that length of time. Given the implied level of activity it is also difficult to see why 58 acres are needed in any event.

If a lease is granted to Tweedgreen commercial rental income will be lost to the Common Good Fund and this would disadvantage the wider community for the benefit of a minority.

Response 64

I support the application from Tweed Green for the community ownership of Jedderfield Farm. At a time of international climate emergency, a need to change consumer behaviour to conserve dwindling natural resources and the need for sustainable recovery post-pandemic, I believe this project offers an opportunity for the local community to demonstrate that economic growth and responsible land management can go hand in hand. The project offers valuable opportunities for education, food production, habitat restoration and wildlife improvement and can be a case study for community cohesion and sustainability to other towns across the UK.

Response 65

I believe this will be a very exciting venture for Peebles and the surrounding Tweed Valley area, in terms of education and active involvement in a green project highlighting the benefits of growing your own food in a responsible and sustainable way. I imagine that this will be a project that many people will be able to involve themselves in to the greater benefit of the local community.

Response 66

I wish to comment on the proposed re-use of Jedderfield farm in Peebles.

The application by Tweedgreen to take over the farm raises a number of questions concerning the impact of this proposal.

The only access to the farm is via a very rutted single track road which passes through the golf course. Tweedgreen have advertised that if they are successful in their application they would be looking for people to rent space for workshops etc. This would inevitably lead to a substantial increase in the traffic to and from the farm which would necessitate the creation of a number of passing places on the access track. This would be quite an undertaking in such a confined space with the increased traffic usage impacting on the current users of the golf course. Who would fund this requirement.

Another consideration would be the likely need for additional irrigation capability to sustain the proposed agriculture plans. Currently the golf course water supply is from private tanks located on the farm which during summer is barely enough for the golf course needs. Presumably Tweedgreen would need additional capacity to support their plans and if so who would fund this requirement.

Whilst some aspects of their application have merit with the current social emphasis on sustainable existence it does bring some quite substantial obstacles along with the benefits.

I believe the vacant farm presents a superb opportunity for a young farmer to get his or her first chance to get started in the farming business.

Not many vacant farms become available each year and the size of Jedderfield presents an ideal start in this respect.

Hopefully there are other applicants for the chance to use Jedderfield including some who wish to continue farming on this site.

Response 67

Jedderfield farm should be used as a farm, this proposed use Tweedgreen have will cause a range of problems, from access, increased traffic through golf course which can/likely be dangerous, should be postponed until a full review of problems are discussed in full, as the impact will be catastrophic to local as well as visitors to play golf

Response 68

I have read with interest the ideas put forward by Tweedgreen.

I know that they have thought carefully about how the community could benefit by the Jedderfield Farm Project.

I am concerned myself about climate change and biodiversity but I would object to the project being taken further because of two reasons.

1. The damage that would be done to the golf course, which is held in such high regard, by many golfers throughout Scotland would be immense, by having a busy road passing through the course and affecting at least five holes

2. The safety factor would be of great concern. Cars and people passing along the road would involve a colossal insurance concern.

I wish the Tweedgreen group all the best but please do not spoil such a valuable asset as Peebles Golf Club.

Response 69

I believe that this is an important venture that will be a growing asset to the Community. Particularly at this time when there is an acknowledged Climate Emergency and a recognition of the importance of growing more of our food locally. This is a project that has the potential to have a big influence and impact on the lives of our community and will be of benefit to for generations to come.

Response 70

I believe that this is an important venture that will be a growing asset to the Community. Particularly at this time when there is an acknowledged Climate Emergency and a recognition of the importance of growing more of our food locally. This is a project that has the potential to have a big influence and impact on the lives of our community and will be of benefit for generations to come.

Response 71

I support this plan and the benefits it aims to bring to the local community.

Response 72

I think the plans for Jedderfield are very ambitious and forward-thinking and I believe that the proposed asset transfer will offer many educational, environmental, and economic opportunities for the community of Peebles and beyond. Peebles and the Tweed Valley is unique, distinct, and special and it would be beneficial to harness the traditional and emerging skills and ideas of its local people. It will provide an important venue for training, education, local produce, the arts, etc, and support a vast number of people in need, providing a safe, inspirational and diverse space. The land has not been managed to its potential in previous years and I believe that by accepting the offer to take Jedderfield Farm on will enhance its biodiversity, scope, and use for community good.

Response 73

An excellent idea, and I find it hard to imagine that anyone should think otherwise.

Response 74

I object strongly to this proposal.

While generally supportive of the initiatives in this proposal, the proposed site is completely unsuitable. I note very little mention is made of the vehicle access to Jedderfield. This former farm track crosses the golf course at several points and a huge increase in traffic which would inevitably result from these proposals would cause great disruption to golfers and severely destroy the ambience of the best golf course in the Borders. In addition cars and their occupants would be in danger from stray golf balls

Response 75

I have major concerns with the asset transfer request and how the project would be run. What happens if the volunteers dry up along with all the grant money that it would require to get the project off the ground never mind maintain it for 25 years. What happens to the land if planted with trees after. It would take an exceptional amount t of work to put it back to agricultural or land of any use bar for more trees.

I would argue the fact that the land is not of a viable size to sustain a farm. To many small starter farms like these are swallowed up by larger landowners with money and there are less and less farms for younger farmers to start out on.

The proposed rent of the farm is about half of what was being payed by the previous occupier and is a considerable amount less than what could be gotten for such a place. Despite the benefits that this project may provide to the community, the difference in revenue that this property could provide if it realised its potential could be upwards of £100000 compared to the £25000 on offer. The difference that that amount of money could do in the community would far outlay the benefits of this project that relies on volunteers and grants.

Response 76

I'd like to see a comprehensive business plan with salaries and volunteer aspect . I think the land should remain farming and this project should be re located with a lesser lump sum being offered to this group . I think previous tweed green projects should be looked at and the use of funding and completion of projects should be considered ! We in Peebles offer 300 girls a safe space for upto two hours a week with no funding I would never interested to know how many children will be using this project how and why . Pls seriously consider all the options before making a decision

Response 77

The proposal is essentially for a tourist attraction with a very poor business plan. The vision and sustainability lack little foresight beyond the first few years into the 25 year plan. Expecations on volunteers, no thought on proper access and the request to lease for a minimal fee per annum is a disservice to the town.

The Common Good Fund provides vital funds to many of the smaller groups in the town, to lose this sort of income may be at the detriment of small clubs and orngaisations in the town. If the business plan were to be improved and financial backer confirmed not speculated as some of them are, then an annual lease of at least £8,000 per annum rising by inflation annually would make much more sense.

However, the business plan needs to be solid. In this case it is very loose and there are too many assumptions for it to be viable

The preferred use would be to return this land to a working farm and help those paying the annual rent, to the CGF obtain grants etc to return it to its best potential.

Response 78

I feel after reading Tweed Greens proposed plan of action - which has many holes and unanswered questions throughout it - that Jedderfield would be better served as a farm rather than a business entity within the community.

Their business plan requires masses of grants (of which they are not guaranteed to get), in order to get it off the ground - never mind continue to run in the future (then there is the point that if they run out of funding and be unable to continue, what will the succeeding business or farmer have to put right in order to bring the land back to a workable state?) . They have a history of gathering vast grants but to my knowledge have nothing to show for them (their courthouse 'whole food' venture left a peebles business supplying similar products and run by a local who was self-funded, in serious worry when they were selling their products at trade value from Greencity - who thankfully put a stop to tweed greens pricing error as quickly as possible. This venture of tweed greens was opened via lottery funding i believe, of considerable value). I also feel that a lot of the grants they are applying for is to support a business that are already catered for by other members of the community

who rely on these sales for income, (eg. Christmas tree sales, and log sales to name but a few) therefore are not allowed to be contested with public money. By applying for so many grants it leaves the opportunity for others in the community short, as it soaks up all the funding for the area. I'm sure you are aware that there are many great wee projects in Peebles that rely on such grants, and most of them cover areas that Tweed Green also wish to cover, such as community growing and education. Our local schools already (as pointed out by some local teachers) have in place access on site and within the area to poly tunnels and outdoor growing areas.

Since starting this comment request, i have read on Tweed Greens own facebook page that they are not standing by their business plan and have indeed ripped it up fairly substantially, so I am not sure it is fair for you to base a decision on it , how can the community trust them not to revoke all their promises in the future if they are setting this trend now.

* A farm of this size IS feasible (despite their comments saying quite the opposite) with many different farming styles and is a tremendous opportunity to get a young person(s) into agriculture without it taking mass capital. It is not the experience that young farmers are requiring, as many young farmers will have far more experience than any of Tweed Green members i can assure you, it is more the opportunity in which to find and afford to lease a small farm in which to begin their own venture, as many such properties are quickly bought up by those with more capitol to invest and unfortunately not necessarily for agricultural purpose.

* I also feel that more people in the community will benefit far more from using the revenue the rent brings in through the common good fund, than from what Tweed Green propose. Many of their ideas proposed, most farmers adopt anyway in order to give and return from the land.

*The access to the farm is a shared access with other businesses, so is not for them to say as a whole what happens to it. As access for the community it can only be granted by foot, as the track is only suited to 4 x 4 type vehicles due to its steep and rough nature. Too much traffic is a concern to the golf club as it could potentially put people off playing there, leading to the loss of business. The track also enters straight onto a main road, which is very busy and could be the cause of accidents with people using the track that are not used to such terrain.

*I feel the process of the community asset transfer is an incredibly unfair way of getting anyone to decide on such a big project, as there is only one side given. The public are not all ignorant, nor aware and need reference to what others may be offering, seeing as 13 other people have applied outside of Tweed Green to rent Jedderfield farm, and the public should be given the chance to hear from them alongside Tweed Greens proposals.

*Lastly, i would like to bring up the question of how Tweed Greens aims are any different to that of Whitmuir The Organic Place (roughly 15 miles from Peebles - a distance for those without transport, but still considered local to Peebles). They had many wonderful ideas, unfortunately many of these were also started or sustained via the use of community grants. What has happened to Whitmuir and would it not be better suited for Tweed Green to 'team up' with ██████████ for such a venture, in order to continue an already established project/business and therefore reduce the need for such a high volume of community grants?

Response 79

The request from Tweedgreen is well intentioned but it is a "wish list" of ideas with little evidence of land or farm management to back it up. Their Business Plan, that is available at

7/4/21, is incomplete and it lacks the financial and material data needed to satisfy a thorough due diligence review.

The rent proposed of £1,000 pa is under the current market rent for a hill farm of 56 acres. If the full rental were received by the Common Good Fund, that would provide finance for many other worthwhile community projects.

While Tweedgreen are well intentioned, I do not support this proposal as it currently stands.

Response 80

I support this application. The aims and objectives of the project are very relevant in these times and the project's application has been thoughtfully and competently completed. It would be good to see this land and buildings developed in the way proposed, harnessing the skills and energies of local people and providing a model for sustainable horticulture/agriculture and associated activities that have the need to care for the environment at its heart.

Response 81

I think this is a fantastic project which will help our local community to be ahead of the game in exploring new ways to tackle the Climate Emergency through sustainable approaches to farming and agriculture

Response 82

To date, I have seen little evidence of any measurable benefit to the wider community resulting from Tweedgreen's various projects, despite some £250,000 having already been awarded to them over the years.

I note from the draft 'business' plan that whilst extensive work has been carried out identifying potential funding sources (totalling £500,000), nothing is provided in respect of executive summary, operation & management, key players, staffing or record keeping. It's not so much a business plan as an eco wish-list, littered with keywords and stock phrases although strangely, no mention of commitment or transparency. Where are the start-up cost and profit & loss forecasts, cash flow projections, SWOT analysis etc.? There is a very heavy reliance upon the need for volunteers with eleven references to volunteers in the plan. One winter season will likely curb initial enthusiasm. Then what?

Published details of rent generated from Jedderfield Farm & Farmhouse show an historic rent achieved of £2,100 per annum, yet Tweedgreen are offering only £1,000 as their annual peppercorn rent contribution to the Common Good Fund, with any profits retained for the project. I would advise that a personal guarantee is sought from the directors, so that the 25 year lease will be paid in full, when the project collapses due to inevitable loss of volunteer labour upon which the proposal relies upon so heavily. I note that Tweedgreen's exposure to financial risk, as a company limited by guarantee, amounts to just £3. That could leave The Common Good Fund exposed to substantial costs for making good the asset at a later date.

I would draw your attention to the failure of a recent, relatively simple project to create a map of safe cycle routes, where it was reported by Cycling Scotland that: "A main barrier Tweedgreen faced when carrying out their project was limited staffing resource due to funding restrictions causing a delay in the project delivery. Due to this, there was a lag in the delivery of the project which in turn resulted in the funding not being spent in line with the original timescales".

A cynical person could be forgiven for thinking that Tweedgreen's raison d'être is devising spurious on-trend projects to meet the specific criteria required to secure grant funding, for

which they appear to have a voracious appetite. I fear that to Tweedgreen, Jedderfield farm is merely a device, a grant magnet if you will. The asset transfer if approved, will simply provide a myriad of grant funding application opportunities based on a raft of false promises, platitudes and intangible future benefits. The Common Good Fund (and by extension, the wider community) will doubtless be left the poorer for it.

Response 83

What financial consideration if any is being given to the Peebles Common Good fund? If the project fails in the future, does the land revert to the Common Good fund? Or can Tweedgreen sell the land to a property developer years down the line without any benefit to the Common Good fund?

Response 84

Generally impressed by the positive outcomes proposed here - for the local environment and local young (and old) people. Particularly so in a post-Covid world. I guess main concerns would be to make sure Common Good fund does not lose financially, and that it does not attract vandalism. Also that neighbours, notably Golf Club, are not disadvantaged/annoyed. I will certainly be prepared to be a volunteer in whatever capacity I could be useful in.

Response 85

I support the application by Tweedgreen for community projects to address environmental issues using Jedderfield farm

I am an agricultural consultant, specialist in animal husbandry with 45 yrs experience
In my opinion the farm is much too small and with poor access to be a commercial concern
The previous tenant probably had it right economically by keeping Highland cattle, mainly outwintered, that suited the difficult terrain and long winters but this was not good for the grassland that got damaged particularly around ring feeders, causing environmental pollution
Cattle were fed silage in big bales, made by a contractor and fed out by tractor and spike
Environmentally I would not support this farming method in future

Much of such land locally has now been put to non native conifers with poor biodiversity interest, this could be the fate of the farm if not taken in hand by the community
I would support planting Broadland tree species to create a wild life corridor bringing nature closer to the new primary school

Making play access for preschool children in woods is very advantageous for the next generation

Using the farm buildings to support outreach to people without access to the countryside is a good idea

I think the soils are generally too poor, wet and the altitude too high to support crops, A wild flower meadow may work possibly providing vintage tractor enthusiasts with a hay making opportunity

I hope these opinions and ideas help in your future plans that should bring benefits to the people of Peebles

Response 86

I object to any asset transfer.

Response 87

There should be no consideration of any asset transfer from the Common Good Fund.

Response 88

What a fantastic idea. Tweed green is thinking global and acting local. What a positive approach to our future of food production. Let the transfer go ahead. Thankyou

Response 89

As a local Peebles resident I am very much in favour of the asset transfer of Jedderfield Farm to Tweedgreen.

Response 90

This is an excellent project and should be supported.

Response 91

I think this will be a fantastic & viable opportunity for the people of Peebles, and a very positive step towards becoming a greener, more environmentally friendly community. It is already community land and this long term project holds so many opportunities for community collaboration. It will also create opportunities to ensure traditional skills are shared with future generations. Importantly it will promote health & wellbeing. More than all this we have a moral responsibility to look ahead and to both preserve and promote sustainable use of natural resources for future generations. I have no doubt it will be a difficult journey for those at the forefront to bring this project to fruition however it is sustainable, very worthwhile and important for our children.

Response 92

If they only want to lease for 25 years why does there have to be an asset transfer, why can't Tweed Green just pay rent to the Common Good. I am not in favour of their proposal

Response 93

I think this sounds like a great idea. It is really important to start low carbon projects at a local level and this could be really beneficial as an example and as a practical tool.

Response 94

I am strongly in favour of the proposal. Opportunities to learn practical skills and engage with the land appear to have decline during my lifetime and I feel that the educational and social aspects of this proposal - for all ages - are particular strength.

Response 95

I write to object to the proposal to support the asset transfer from Peebles Common Good Fund to Tweedgreen for Jedderfield Farm, Peebles.

The scheme would have a huge drain on Peebles Common Good Fund and possibly render the fund unable to support other local worthwhile appeals in the near future.

The location of Jedderfield Farm, close to Peebles Golf Course, means that many people, young and old would be in danger of being struck by golf balls as they travel along the lengths of road leading to and from the farm. In my opinion the members of Peebles Golf Club would have priority in the use of the area.

The scheme, as outlined by Tweedgreen is over ambitious and may well overstretch the abilities of the people involved leading to the Peebles Common Good Fund's contribution, if awarded, being wasted.

Tweedgreen's ethos and principles are commendable but can be achieved in many other ways than this current project of using Jedderfield Farm.

Response 96

I support this request. Until the end of last year I lived in Peebles for 25 years and know the area well. I feel strongly that the proposed use for Jedderfield will be of great and lasting benefit to the town, will bring credit to the town and to the Scottish Borders, and will inspire others.

Response 97

I am fully in support of this transfer.

Response 98

My main concern about this request is that I'm not sure it is in the best interest of the local community. My reasons are:

- * I fear it may have a financial and physical impact on the Golf Club in terms of infrastructure and extra footfall over the course.
- * I believe the farm would be best kept as a farm.
- * It is very hard for young farmers to get a start in farming here and maybe this would be a better use of the resource.
- * keeping it as a farm with the right tenants could still provide positive environmental impact & give some community involvement.

Response 99

I have read the proposals regarding Jedderfield and it appears to be a nice dream which I feel would rapidly turn in to a nightmare for all concerned. Without going into great detail about all the aspects of the application, I have great doubts if the people involved have any hands on experience of running and maintaining more than 50 acres and associated buildings, I have no doubt whatsoever that the team are very experienced in how to do things and how to source funding, that is a very different proposition to actually doing the hands on work. For example in the middle of winter when all the pipes are frozen or burst who is going to spend all day thawing or sorting the situation. They may of course have funding to get a plumber, try getting one up to Jedderfield, don't think so therefore back to the organisers. This may seem like a silly or petty example but it is the reality of running a small farm.

The access is another very serious issue, they seem to want the world to be involved or at least visit but not use cars, probably most people who would be interested in the project would not be youngsters, just try walking from the town to Jedderfield. The current road is almost unfit for purpose, it is certainly unfit for lots of traffic. No doubt this could be rectified to some degree but the cost would be huge and that is dependent on buying ground as the

farm does not hold title to the road. I believe there may be a suggestion that access could be gained through the forest from near the toll house, no doubt it is possible with the correct permissions and a bottomless pot of money. This road would bring you out in the field above the farm and while it is not impossible I share a dubious connection with the previous tenant in as much we have both slid sideways down the hill while driving a Land Rover through that field because the track down to the farm gets so wet the field is the only option to get to the farm, the reason I add this is to highlight that this is not an allotment in the middle of the town.

I am very concerned that if this bid is successful and unless they are going to pay the going rate for rent it will rob the common good fund of much needed funds. This would in effect mean that all other organisations in the town would be starved of financial support and in effect all other groups would be subsidising this vanity project whether they like it or not.

Finally while I am not privy to other applicants I am aware of one young man who applied to take over Jedderfield to run as a farm. He received a letter from the Council asking him how much he would be prepared to pay for rent without qualifying what the terms would be. IE the proposed length of the tenancy, was he renting a farm with a habitable house and usable sheds, were the fences going to be made stock proof etc, etc. The young man is in a good position to upgrade the road, house, sheds and fences but he has to know the terms before suggesting a rent. The letter also asked whether he would be prepared to purchase the farm, I was not under the impression it was for sale. While he did not voice this opinion I am very much of the opinion that this was a deliberate attempt to utterly sicken him so he withdraws. Young man or not he was left, rightly or wrongly that he was engaging with a bunch of amateurs at the council and he was left disappointed and wondering how he could proceed under such vague terms.

Response 100

Jedderfield Farm – Asset Transfer Request Consultation

This response is submitted by Bonnie Peebles, a community interest group.

We have a number of questions and comments regarding this application for asset transfer.

1. Was the tenancy vacancy at Jedderfield Farm advertised? – Bonnie Peebles acknowledges that the farm at 58 acres of mainly rough grazing will not suffice as a farm in itself but could be leased as a small holding to a young person wishing to set up in business on his/her own. The availability of such an opportunity is rare in the Scottish Borders forcing most young people without recourse to a family farm to leave the area.

2. Tweedgreen are offering an annual rent of £1000.00, which is well below market price. Even if the buildings are not taken into account the annual rent on 58 acres of poor grazing should be at the very least £1500 and more like £6000. Is it not the duty of the Common Good Fund managers to obtain the best rent possible for such inalienable properties that cannot be sold or transferred? No evidence is provided to back the claims that loss of revenue will be offset by 'social, health and environmental benefit'.

Furthermore it could be argued that greater benefit to the people of Peebles and to the environment would be derived from turning the whole farm into a solar farm. 58 acres of photovoltaic panels, even here in the Scottish Borders, at a very conservative estimate, would generate 6000Mwh per annum. Assuming that one house uses about 6000Kwh per annum in electricity (that is for everything except heating, which is generally gas) and if Peebles has 6000 homes you can see that Peebles would be self-sufficient in electricity for the life time of the solar farm or 20 years.

3. The requested lease duration is 25 years – Bonnie Peebles suggests that this is too long a period for an organisation that is not financially sustainable in itself and requires charitable funding and the input of volunteers to be viable. Most third sector organisations run hand to mouth. What will happen to the farm if Tweedgreen can no longer maintain it? Would a 5 year lease not be better with a review at the end of that period and a chance to renew the lease if outcomes are being met?

4. Bonnie Peebles notes that under section 3C of their request, Tweedgreen expects certain rights (for which they do not intend to pay):

- To plant trees
- To permit use by third parties
- To make improvements including 'renewable installations'
- To investigate relevant change of use

All of these seem to imply a dramatic change from the small, mixed livestock farm that exists today and that something more than this ill advertised and short timescale consultation is required. Will the Common Good Fund Committee hold a much more comprehensive and accessible consultation and make sure that every household in Peebles is aware of it?

5. Eventually, the proposal is to have 'affordable accommodation' on the site, with 'nature experiences' and 'garden based food production' – If we ignore for the present the change of use that this implies and just concentrate on practicalities:

a. How will the site be accessed by all these users? – the current lane, from the A72, is not suitable even if it were to be resurfaced (and that would be a shame because of its history). It is very narrow and used by pedestrians, with and without children and dogs, and cyclists, and it runs through the golf course. A new access route has not been identified and it is difficult to see where that would run: through the plantation or through Rosetta Caravan site?

b. How will water be accessed and waste water and sewage be managed? – Presumably all these proposed volunteers, visitors, third party tenants and overnight guests will require more facilities than are currently on site.

c. With all the proposed building and renovation work there is bound to be a need for heavy vehicle traffic and presumably the bin lorry will have to visit occasionally even if most waste is recycled.

6. Finally, Bonnie Peebles would like to note that the farm is in a very run down state and that renovation of the buildings is necessary. The previous tenant has not maintained the site and the Common Good Committee or council officers have for whatever reasons allowed this. Bonnie Peebles asserts that It is not in the interest of the residents of Peebles that the farm be allowed to continue in this state of dilapidation. We would like assurances that the incoming tenant be required to bring the premises to an appropriate condition and that they be maintained in this state for the duration of the tenancy.

Response 101

I have read around this request for Asset Transfer and also documents published by Tweedgreen. My concerns comprise

- the loss of income to Peebles Community. Tweedgreen is a limited Company so it would be reasonable to expect them to pay the going rate for a farm of this size.

- on reading minutes of their meetings, I am a concerned by the lack of numbers and apparent relevant experience of those involved and the request to remove mention of Extinction Rebellion from them.

- those involved obviously have knowledge of working the law to suit as they have effectively precluded any farmer, traditional or otherwise, from applying to rent this Peebles community farm.

- their aspirational aims could be effected as easily from an office in Cavalry Park and sending out fieldworkers to schools, renting an allotment in March Street, having bee skeps in an area that children could easily walk to.

Having read their well meaning intentions, I am not convinced of their knowledge and ability to run a farm of this size effectively. They seem skilled at applying for grant funding..... and to be honest, fields of wildflowers won't put food on the table!

Response 102

The Asset Transfer request should be declined.

This land should be used for Farming.

The Golf Course is used all day and this would compromise not only the golfers but any individual accessing Jedderfield.

A nightmare for all concerned. Safety first.

Response 103

To: The Communities and Partnerships Team, Scottish Borders Council

Public Consultation related to Land Asset Transfer Request by Tweedgreen –
Lease of Jedderfield Farm, Peebles

Comments on the Tweedgreen Asset Transfer Request – submitted by [REDACTED],
ScotWays Local Representative for Tweeddale

A public right of way exists over the Common Good land currently known as Jedderfield Farm. The route of this right of way is logged by the Scottish Rights of Way Society [ScotWays) under the number BT102 in the Catalogue of Rights of Way [CROW]. The route also has a more recent dual designation, as a Core Path, registered in Scottish Borders Council's Adopted Core Path Plan with the Number CP147. The existence and designations of this important access route is not mentioned in either Tweedgreen's Asset Transfer Request Form application, or their Jedderfield Business Plan Draft.

The Right of Way, No. BT102, traverses the land concerned, from the A72 Peebles-Glasgow road, a short distance west of the town, up to and beyond the site boundary of Jedderfield Farm, and forms part of the 'Cross-Borders Drove Road'.

The Core Path, No. CP147 follows the linear route of BT102 traversing the land concerned, before diverging from the BT route to form a link via BT103 and BT49 creating the final section of a popular circular route to and from Peebles along BT49 with the dual designation as Core Path No. CP162.

In Tweedgreen's Business Plan, under 'Issues', at 'Access', (page 12) the statement states, "SBC officers have advised that the access track is not identified as part of the property title but the tenant does have access rights". There is no reference to the 'status' of the access track.

Although there are some brief references to encouraging outdoor recreation and public access to land, eco-tourism and providing some "potential low-cost, low-impact accommodation: for volunteers or eco-tourists, e.g. horseriders or hikers on the Old Drove Road, etc.," - it does appear that they may have overlooked the specific issue of public access rights, as there is no mention of Part 1 of the Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003 or public rights of way. There is no reference to, or recognition of, a landowner's duties under

Section 3 of the 2003 Act, - though there is nothing to suggest they are necessarily proposing anything contrary to that.

It is noted there is a reference to 'access' in the 'Asset Transfer Request Form', (page 18), under Funding – There are a number of capital expenses we are currently working on.

1. We will shortly meet on site with a local road contractor to give us their opinion and cost on upgrading the current track to the farm via the golf club. As highlighted in Edwin Thompson's survey: "The condition of the track is such that a 4x4 vehicle with sufficient clearance is needed to access the farm."

Since the 'formal' access road to and from Jedderfield Farm is via the farm track, next to the Rae Burn, and the junction with the A72 road, plus the Site Plan accompanying the application does not feature any "track to the farm via the Golf Club", the intention for upgrading access over the property is unclear. If the proposal is for upgrading the farm's access track from the A72, next to the Rae Burn, running along the same line as the BT102 / CP147 route, the proposed Land Managers will need to consider the impact on the general public while any works take place.

Response 104

1) Major concerns over access up to farm.

The farm drive is steep, uneven and rutted, in wet weather this streams with water running down it whilst in winter the drive becomes hazardous to navigate due to snow filling in the drive. There are no passing places on this single-track road for multi vehicle use. Having read Tweed Greens business plan, I would anticipate a great deal of cars daily trying to access the farm. I question how feasible this will be bearing in mind the above restrictions and feel the average car would struggle to manage up. At the foot of the drive there is no space to leave parked cars. This also poses questions over the suitability for pedestrians. This drive is not suitable for buggies or wheelchairs, elderly would find it extremely arduous and equally so families. I read that Tweed Green suggested that access then would be gained though the Golf club by walking up the course or in buggies and find this deeply concerning. Having read through Golf Course Guidelines I cannot imagine this would be allowed as it would simply be too dangerous. It would also have big impact on the Golfers game as they would be required to stop until all public and passed up the course to reach the farm. Looking at the Peebles Golf Club car park I very much doubt they can accommodate both Tweed Greens needs and their own.

2) I would challenge Tweed Greens opinion that Jedderfield is no longer a viable farm, it has to date run as an independent farm without grants and can continue to do so. The fact there are 12 or 13 other applicants to lease the farm would strongly contradict this claim. They either do not have the knowledge required to make that judgement or are trying to deliberately mislead the public. I found it ridiculous that they suggested this only to follow with the idea that they would take on 3 to 4 youngsters and teach them to farm at Jedderfield. I would doubt very much that they can better either the Borders College education programme for agriculture, or Oatridge Agricultural college, to name but two. To date what experience do they have of educating anyone in Agriculture?? It is also hugely presumptuous of them that they think anyone else interested in Leasing Jedderfield as a farm has either no experience or are very young.

3) Local businesses will be directly affected by some of the Tweed Green proposed businesses should they proceed. Many individuals around and in Peebles have built up businesses to host visitors to the area. We have pods, caravans, Air bnb's, hotels and Wig Wams, all built up from scratch without public funding or grants, it would be extremely unfair to ask them to compete with a public funded business and against all grant regulations. This would also apply to tree growing and selling.

4) Tree growing at the farm would render the land useless for farming. We live in an area surrounded by vast, well maintained forests. The need to waste good farm ground for such small long-term gain is questionable. Have this group been advised as to what can grow at the height of Jedderfield and its soil type? I have doubts at the ability to grow fruit bushes that high up successfully.

5) Should this venture fail who is responsible for putting back the farm to good?? Should this go ahead but fail it will undoubtedly cost the council to return this to its natural state. I spotted that Tweed Greens own liability should things fail is £1 each per Director, quite astounding! What then happens to the assets and how long would it take to regain them, repair, and then have another income for the common good fund at this stage?

6) My biggest concern would be the past history of Tweed Green and their ability to lead this project of multi-faceted business ideas. Having investigated what funding, they have received in years passed I have been shocked at the scale of previous grants. Around £500,000 has been obtained by Tweed Green for various projects and yet there is absolutely no evidence anywhere in Peeblesshire of this money having been used and of being useful long term to the community. Time and again they have started ventures for them to fall to the wayside and nothing to show for it. At one time a £147,000 was obtained and yet 6 months later they only had under £4000 in the bank?? Even a relatively simple project to create a cycle path brochure was not done in time and all granting lost. So, based on all the historic evidence, do the council really think that Tweed Green should be given such a valuable asset such as Jedderfield to squander more money away and this time instead of nothing to show are left with repairs to land and such like?? The strength of organisation like Tweed Green is their volunteer base and it is very clear this has been a large part of their previous failed ventures. They seem to not be able to sustain enough volunteers to keep their projects going. If they could not get enough help to either keep a shop open for 4 months or complete a cycle brochure, I have deep misgivings about their ability to run a farm, grow fruit and veg, a hostel, run sustainable living units, solar panels etc. It must be remembered that their huge set up funding costs are just that, start up costs. Over the 25 years the level of new and constant funding is likely to be vast. Can they guarantee they can achieve that??

7) Tweed Green made their first presentation to the council in November 2019. plenty of time to prepare and finalise a business plan and yet there are repeated sections of their plans that are left blank to be completed "in due course ". This does not inspire confidence that they know what they are doing. So far along this process in applying for the asset transfer should the plan not be absolutely solid and well researched?? Far from being fully structures it appears they are changing their mind about how they may run Jedderfield weekly, this shows a distinct lack of purpose and confidence in their own plans. Very concerning. At the stage of canvassing for opinion and comment it is unfair to present an incomplete view to the public.

8) I object to the fact while Tweed Green has had all this time to prepare and present their case to the public that there are 12 or 13 other applicants that the public do not know about. It cannot be fair that only one side is heard, and you cannot have a balanced opinion when only half a case is known. I understand the process on Asset Transfer but to allow the public to think there is only one option is totally misleading. The fact that Tweed Green, on public forum ,have used this to their advantage is also unfair and discredits them further in my opinion.

9) Issues – costing of renovating the farm cottage at £100,000? I suggest this would not be the cost and has been exaggerated to favour their business plan.

10) We have many growing spaces in communal gardens in Peebles and locally, projects that cover a lot of what Tweed Green would like to cover. We already have a similar model in

Whitmuir Farm at Lamancha , while the ideas have been good they have requires years and years of constant funding and still have not been greatly successful, you wonder whether ideas and funding should be pulled together to achieve aims rather than try ,without enough experience and knowledge, a new venture?

11) I feel that overall, the community will miss out on the income from Jedderfield Farm if Tweed Green take it over, They only intend on paying £1000 a year and yet confusingly are considered a commercial let.

Response 105

Dear councilors/members of the committee,

I write to confirm my objections to the asset transfer request by tweed green for Jedderfield farm.

1. Their business plan is now non existent after changing it beyond repair after it being open for public reading, the asset transfer as I understand is all based on a business plan that works. This is now not the case, so how else are you able to judge their ability to run such a project?

2. They plan to run this project on grants alone by the looks of it, and this is off the back of literally squandering masses of grants in the past that have no impact or legacy to show for them within the community. Can we trust them not to change their minds again?

3. If you let them change it from a farm, 1- any money the farm generated from the government (ie. single farm payment for example) over the last 5 years will be claimed back from you. 2- what are you going to do with non-farm land once it is declassified and planted in trees once their grant money runs out, or the 25 year lease is up?

4. They seem to be bombarding the peebles businesses with wild ideas of renting space in a cattle shed!! Would they not require the roads to be upgraded and planning for change of use to be sought to rent out commercial spaces? They are speculating wildly about what they can do in order to get support.

5. I think the access problems have been down played, i have walked that road to see for myself, the road cannot be upgraded easily or cheaply and would require more than their say so to do the upgrades, as it is shared access. Speculation of a new entrance to entice people to use the farm, is them simply grabbing at straws seeing it would require them crossing other people's land and could take years to obtain before it would be beneficial to the community. It also enters on to a busy road and those not experienced driving on such terrain could cause accidents entering on to a busy main road.

6. Their monetary offer of £1000 a year in rent is less than half of what was previously paid by the last tenant, a farm of such nature could see the rent 3 times that come in a year at far greater good to the community good fund. I am not sure how this can be rented out as a commercial asset, but the good fund supports a lot of good causes within the community and any money taken away from this fund will be hard felt.

7. If they thought they had any chance of getting this project to work with support, they would not need to go through an asset transfer request but would simply tender for the rent of the farm like everyone else. It feels like this is just a steam rolling exercise so that they take any opposition out before the decision is made. If this was a fair process anyone else interested would be able to present to the committee or indeed the public alongside Tweed Green. There is an intense feeling that the whole application is being rushed and indeed railroaded before all of Peebles inhabitants have had a chance with which to fully gain access to all options available and especially all information regarding Tweed Greens full intentions AND

their previous endeavours with regards to grants they have received. Their latest grant application (during the pandemic no less, when many local businesses were struggling for income of any kind) for just over £2000 to purchase a bench and some hanging baskets along with signs to socially distance for their EXISTING community garden - would this be classed as money well spent when if they are as resourceful as they say they are, surely they could summon up the knowledge via community volunteers to source and build a bench from recycled materials and i almost certain if they had asked that a local business would gladly gift them a hanging basket if the community could see the benefit of Tweed Greens constant funding? In short, nothing about Tweed Green sits well with me, this application of theirs included, and i feel that if they are granted this tenure it will be a waste of a great and scarce opportunity for a young person(s) of our community with which to start farming life while still ensuring the common good ground as a usable asset. We are a rural area of which agriculture is of huge importance, and we would be incredibly sad to see this lost.

Response 106

What plans are in place for access, as the current road runs through the middle of the golf course?

Response 107

People need to be informed about the effects of our lifestyle on our planet and any project which raises awareness of the dangers to our environment should be supported. We can live comfortably in a much more sustainable way and this model will demonstrate practical changes we can all make to enable us to do this.

Response 108

The vision is laudable and desirable. But I am very concerned that it is much too big a step. Establishing what Tweed Green propose is extremely difficult even under the best circumstances. Peebles is not ideally located. Nor is it large enough to support something on this scale. The sub-text of not encouraging (car-driving) tourist participation is very attractive as an idea but in my opinion seriously impractical in a place the size of Peebles. Most similar attempts in more suitable parts of the UK really struggle and most fail. Locally Whitmuir has made it with a massive, and very personal, effort. The Tweedsmuir Community buy-out of the old Crook Inn has not. This is a massive commitment, which currently falls far short of sufficient committed funds. The lack of risked funding potential is worrying as is the lack of a risk register. While not privately owned in the normal sense this endeavor really badly needs all the normal assessment of a business. They may of course have been made available to SBC. I would prefer that Jedderfield continues to operate as a farm and that Tweed Green looks for smaller opportunities. Peebles cannot support a failed enterprise on this scale. Start small and build....

Response 109

In my opinion this would be an excellent use of the Common Good land, for the true common good of the people of Peebles, and beyond. It has the potential to offer many excellent opportunities and benefits for people of all ages and abilities.

here are a few examples:

- * the improvement in mental and physical wellbeing that is known to be associated with spending time outdoors in nature
- * we are now hearing of a considerable increase in the numbers of young people requiring support with mental health difficulties, and that they have to wait a long time for any support. Tragically, more suicides among young people have been reported during this pandemic. The opportunities offered by this project could help these young people and potentially reduce suffering and tragedy.
- * the social benefits to people (in every age group) who have faced isolation and loneliness, not only in this last year but before that
- * the opportunities for people to share their skills, and learn from each other

* the potential for social enterprises of various kinds

* the opportunities that would arise for local school pupils to learn in a practical way about our beautiful local environment and how they can enjoy it and play an active part in protecting and caring for it, and learn together how to work towards a greener future.

The aspect that struck me first and very strongly however, is the potential this project offers for inclusion in education, volunteering, and employment, particularly - but not exclusively - for children and young people who have learning difficulties or physical disabilities, or who require additional support for any reason. In such an environment, there would be many practical tasks they could learn to do, alongside their peers, and thus gain a sense of achievement and success.

For young people who struggle with core skills in the classroom, the opportunity to learn and succeed at practical skills in a different environment could lead to a sense of achievement and increased confidence that could significantly improve their quality of life and future prospects.

I quote from a BBC report about a young man who, formerly involved in petty crime, was persuaded to work for his Duke of Edinburgh Award: "There's potential that you don't know you've got until you actually try it. "

And to quote the Duke of Edinburgh: "if you can get a young person to succeed in any one activity, then that feeling of success will spread over into many others."

Response 110

I think there is a rationale for entertainment of this Asset Transfer, but I am not convinced that the Business Plan as presented is sufficiently credible in its current form. My concerns are threefold:

- (i) allocation and use of Common Good Land (irrespective of Asset Transfer);
- (ii) maintenance / enhancement of the asset value of land (irrespective of Asset Transfer); and
- (iii) the clarity of focus of the proposed use of the land if leased to Tweedgreen.

Point 1: My primary concern is that the Peebles Common Good Fund should continue to benefit financially at the same sort of level as it has done historically from lease of the Jedderfield Farm on a commercial tenancy, on the basis that this income is used towards support of a wide range of community projects that benefit the community. There are arguments that the lease value could be discounted taking into consideration potential benefits to the community arising from management under Tweedgreen, but I am of the view that this confuses the purpose of the Common Good Fund, and that the two concepts – a market rent versus a subsidised rent – should not be confused or conflated. Any interest taking on the use and management of this land should pay a fair market rate.

Point 2: My second point is that whilst no detailed information is provided on the condition of the land and buildings that make up Jedderfield Farm, passing familiarisation with the site suggests that the building cluster is in poor condition and has been subject to little investment in recent decades, and that drainage of at least parts of the farm (notably close to the farm building) is not at its best. I am firmly of the view that assets put into the care of the Common Good should be looked after in such a way as to maintain or enhance their market, historic and cultural values. It is not clear what obligations have been placed on a tenant farmer to maintain and invest in the site in the past, or how the Common Good has exercised its responsibility to maintain the value of the site and farm in recent times.

From what I can see the Common Good has not adequately addressed these obligations, and the value of this asset is reduced – though I recognise that the issue may be something of a Catch22 for Common Good administrators. I think this issue needs to be urgently addressed by the Common Good, but am also of the view that the Common Good is in something of a quandary – that the Fund is not sufficiently flush to commit the levels of

investment that are required to bring this farm (and most particularly the farm house) up to modern standards, nor is it necessarily the most appropriate use of Common Good funds. I would not advocate selling this site to a private investor (and think it may, in its current state, be a poor offer to make this available as a live on-site tenancy, though it may suit a live-away tenancy), but sale to a community group (with appropriate asset lock) might be a practical and pragmatic option. Likewise leasing the site to a community group, with the onus on the group to make the necessary refurbishment and improvements, might serve a similar purpose – leaving in the longer term a substantially upgraded and more valuable asset within the Common Good asset portfolio.

Point 3: The (draft) Business Plan presented by Tweedgreen advocates operation of the site to offer the people of Peebles and Peeblesshire examples of good ecological and sustainable practice through activities in the realms of volunteer-led agriculture, leisure, and low impact commercial activities whilst delivering social benefits. My view is that this is laudable in ambition but is undermined by a lack of focus and a distinct lack of detail as to how the facility and its many activities will be organised and managed, and community benefits delivered. My view is that the proposals need to be based on real world and rather conventional organisational and management structures – which should not, and do not need to, detract from the delivery and demonstration of what some might judge less-conventional but Tweedgreen advocates as approaches, skills and techniques necessary to responding and adapting to the climate emergency. This seems – quite reasonably – to lie at the core of the proposals. It is difficult to have the confidence in the proposals as they stand to support an Asset Transfer. That said I do believe there is a viable project here and that more time and energy needs to be invested in developing the idea before a decision on the CAT request is finalised.

I believe the central focus of any community management of this substantial site should be its operation as a working farm. All other activities should be secondary and subsidiary to this. This does not and should not undermine the stated core intent of its operation under community management to advocate and demonstrate sustainable practices and fulfil an educational role. Development / re-development of the core building complex as a farm centre and dual purpose residential / exhibition and meeting space (developments that are likely to be the expensive and most demanding of the proposals) should, again, be clearly secondary to doing what is essential / necessary to a working farm. And operation as a farm does not mean that part of the farm area cannot also be developed for more community-oriented use.

By developing clarity of focus it becomes much easier for Tweedgreen to communicate its intentions, not only to the people of Peebles and Peeblesshire, but to decision-makers on the Peebles Common Good Fund Sub-Committee and at Scottish Borders Council. I think Tweedgreen has struggled to clearly communicate its intentions for the site, and as a consequence this has rather muddied the waters as to what is and is not intended, which has led to mis-understandings. I believe Tweedgreen should be given an extended opportunity to tighten up its Business Plan and develop its proposals.

Response 111

I am not in support of this request for an Asset Transfer Lease Agreement by Tweedgreen, for the following reasons.

1. Loss of income

Jedderfield Farm is an income producing asset owned by Peebles Common Good Fund, and administered by Scottish Borders Council on their behalf

By entering into an Agreement with this group to Lease the farm for 25 years at a rent of just £1,000 pa, the Common Good Fund would be deprived of a substantially greater income for the next 25 years.

As I understand that a commercial rent for this property would be in excess of £6,000pa, this proposal will deprive the Common Good Fund of an income of at least £125,000 over the period being considered of 25 years – this would be a major financial loss to the Common Good Fund.

2. Loss of Agricultural Ground

As a small holding, this is an ideal property for those seeking an entry into Agriculture. Whilst this is not prime agricultural land, it is typical of much of the agricultural land in Peeblesshire

I understand that there are a substantial number of other interested parties in leasing the property for Agricultural purposes which both indicates a huge demand, also indicating the total lack of other available properties within the wider area for that purpose.

3. Proposed tree planting

Surrounding areas have substantial forestry plantations, which have continued to expand over the last few years taking existing land out of Agriculture use.

By planting substantially more trees on this area, this would permanently remove this land from Agriculture and reduce the options for the future.

4. Site Access

The current access to this property is extremely poor. It is extremely difficult to see how this can be improved to make this access route suitable for all those being targeted to make use of the property in future.

It is also evitable that the substantial increase in traffic accessing Jedderfield in future would not detrimentally affect the golf club. As the access route treks across the fairways of the golf course, it is inevitable that this would detrimentally affect all those playing golf.

As the golf course is also owned by the Common Good Fund, on a long-term lease to the Golf Club this proposal adversely affects another income producing asset of the Common Good Fund.

5. Financial

Over the past 10 years, Tweedgreen have obtained very substantial funds from the public purse, however to date there is very little evidence of any real lasting benefit to show, for these investments made from public funds granted to this group.

I am extremely sceptical re the lack of firm detail within their business plan as to how viable this project is. In many respects this appears to be more of a wish list of what might be possible, if any of the potential funding noted can actually be obtained.

In summary I feel that all the interested applicants for this property should be considered equally on their merits in managing this Common Good Fund asset, both as a Capital Asset and an income producing asset for the ultimate benefit of the Common Good Fund, both now and in the future

Response 112

I have lived in Peebles since Feb.1999. Currently, I have a young family living in Peebles.

Peebles is a town that needs this sort of community facility. Land and space is so short in Scotland and especially around Peebles so normal people in society cannot access it if they have an idea to take forward. The normal community and government organisations do not supply such things.

I have lived in Scandanavia for a couple of years. There they have similar initiatives run both privately and by the community. They as successful.

I think that this would also be a bit of a hit for the tourists, especially the walker types. If it can be developed in with a structured path network around Peebles then folk can take in the glorious views around the farm - or even take part in the activities.

I hope the golfers and 'aye been' types don't get too carried away with objections.

And the rumours that it will be for sale are terrible. That will be dragging Peebles back to the 19th century.

Response 113

Peebles Common Good Fund

Asset transfer request of Jedderfield to Tweedgreen

Members of the Peebles Common Good Fund Committee are specifically asked to note that Tweedgreen used a statement on their Facebook page on Tuesday, 6 April 2021, as an ad hoc update to their business plan, which makes a mockery of the process to upload files to SBC's website for public consideration. Furthermore, their business plan is, to say the least, lacking in detail in some of the most pertinent details – it is simply not acceptable to write “Section is intentionally blank and will be completed in due course” – when is due course? How are councillors supposed to make an informed decision when so much vital detail is missing?

Objections

1. Loss of a Common Good Asset / loss of potential income £6k - £10k per annum
Once Jedderfield is lost as a working farm over the course of a 25 year lease to Tweedgreen, there will be no returning it to a working farm, given Tweedgreen's ambitious intentions. Tweedgreen's offer to pay a peppercorn rent of £1k will result in a loss to the Common Good Fund over the period of 25 years of between £125k - £225k. Given that many local organisations (indeed Tweedgreen being one of them) rely on this fund, this is a significant loss.

2. Access to Jedderfield

The main access to Jedderfield is the drove road at the top of Neidpath Road. This single track, with no passing places is in poor condition, with rutting, erosion and depending on the weather, a stream of water running down it. The track then goes right through the middle of a busy golf course before arriving at Jedderfield. I am aware that Tweedgreen are adamant that their supporters will be encouraged to cycle and walk to Jedderfield and to this end, I note that Tweedgreen are seeking an alternative route to Jedderfield. Recently, one of their supporters noted on social media, that Tweedgreen were looking at a track through a field between Neidpath Castle and the quarry. Having researched this and identified a potential access track, it is absolutely vital that Councillors are made aware that the majority of that route between Neidpath Castle and the quarry, does not have a pavement nor a safe verge and there is a sheer drop right down the hill towards the River Tweed. This is a health and safety issue and I question whether a risk assessment has been carried out into the dangers presented by this potential route.

Having noted in Tweedgreen's business plan that many organisations have shown an interest in joining them at Jedderfield, the assertion in their Facebook statement that there would not be an increase in traffic, is questionable to say the least.

3. Assertion by Tweedgreen Jedderfield is “too small to make it economically viable”
Jedderfield has been run as a working farm for many years and I find it astonishing that Tweedgreen should now try to persuade the Councillors that Jedderfield is “too small to make it economically viable”.

As has been made public in various forums, there has been at least another 12 applicants interested in Jedderfield and it is assumed that the majority would wish to run it as a working farm, so Tweedgreen's assertion that it is not economically viable, does not stand up to scrutiny. Jedderfield would make an ideal starter farm, for someone who would otherwise be unable to get onto the farm ladder.

Furthermore, it is patronising and contradictory of Tweedgreen to suggest that on one hand Jedderfield is not economically viable as a farm and then on the other hand offering to train 3 or 4 young people in farming. I would advise that there are other more competent organisations who already do this, namely Scotland's Rural College (SRUC) and Borders College in Galashiels.

4. Assertion by Tweedgreen that only they can upgrade Jedderfield

Having recently visited Jedderfield, (whilst not a qualified surveyor, I do have professional property market experience), I took a look around the exterior of the cottage and observed that the roof appeared to be in good condition and that it has had uPVC windows and door fitted in the recent past. I challenge Tweedgreen's description of the "dilapidated condition of buildings" and in their Facebook statement, Tweedgreen are now suggesting that "in order to make it usable and habitable once again, there would have to be substantial capital investment to bring the property up to standard. We propose to share some of these costs" The Common Good Fund should make sure that they are not the ones doing the sharing given the sizeable ongoing grant applications by Tweedgreen. By inference, Tweedgreen are again trying to sway the councillors in their implication that they are doing the Common Good Fund a favour by taking Jedderfield and the cost of upgrading it off their hands.

Whilst the interior is certainly looking tired and dated, I dispute the figure of £100k that is being suggested by Tweedgreen to upgrade the cottage and barns. Farmers by their very nature and necessity are competent at taking on projects like this and working through them over a period of time. I also dispute the assertion that all other applicants would expect the Common Good Fund to upgrade the cottage and barns, before signing a lease. This is merely speculation on their part.

5. Tweedgreen's consultation on Jedderfield was too narrow

Tweedgreen's survey on the Community Asset Transfer of Jedderfield had a total of 161 responses with 146 for the project and 15 against. Given that Peebles has a population of around 9000, 146 people is not representative of the wider community. Allowing an asset transfer based on the support of such a small group is difficult to justify.

I note from Tweedgreen's own AGM on 26 November 2020, that they were already having doubts about taking on Jedderfield, worrying that it was too big and the fear it could turn into another Crook Inn. This does not instil confidence in the commitment of Tweedgreen's committee to the project.

6. Inability to deliver Community Asset Transfer leaflets to all homes in Peebles

As noted in the business plan, all homes in Peebles were to receive an explanatory leaflet, which has not been done, allegedly due to COVID. I would respectfully point out that the Royal Mail, newspapers, parcels, Peebles Life and now political leaflets have all been delivered over the past year and would suggest that this may be an excuse to cover the fact they could not find enough volunteers. Given that the CCF Development Fund awarded a grant of £449 for this purpose, it would have been appropriate to try harder to distribute the leaflets for which grant funding was awarded.

7. Tweedgreen advertising in Peebles Life to attract potential interest

It was with astonishment that I read Tweedgreen's advert in the April 2021 edition of Peebles

Life. By their own admission in their business plan, Jedderfield is supposed to be “dilapidated” so why would they already be inviting interested parties to rent barn space? I suggest that this is to boost their list of interested parties implying greater support for the project. Their business plan has a long list of groups that have been contacted to gauge interest in renting space. One particular note of interest is from a local children’s clothing charity and I cannot imagine where Tweedgreen expect to accommodate such a fine charity in a “dilapidated” farm cottage and barns. I would suggest that the majority of these groups would lose interest once they fully consider the journey to Jedderfield in the cold, wind, rain, snow and ice. (The track to Jedderfield, I can only imagine, will not be adopted by the council and will therefore not be gritted).

8. Tweedgreen’s Application Form and business plan for Community Asset Transfer
The application form is full of the “buzz” words, which Tweedgreen employ on grant applications – employment, jobs, education, disability, climate change, sustainability. But in reality, if Tweedgreen were so keen on education, they could have been doing this for the past 10 years and most certainly do not need Jedderfield to start doing it now. The so called business plan is missing so much information, it would never even reach a bank manager’s desk. A business plan is not about finding grants and making projects to fit. The amount of “Section is intentionally blank and will be completed in due course” clearly shows their inexperience and lack of knowledge and to put this forward as a business plan for something as important to the people of Peebles, is frankly insulting.

9. Funding

The success of the project will not be realised without an ongoing supply of grants. You will note from Tweedgreen’s business plan that they already have promises or are seeking funding in the region of £500k, which is a colossal amount of money to throw at a project, which has not been costed properly due to their inexperience.

I have spent many hours over the past three weeks, drilling down into their previous grants and balance sheets submitted to Companies House since their first submission on 11 May 2012 for accounts made up to 31 August 2011 and I would question their business acumen.

I would ask how confident the Committee are that Tweedgreen have the experience to manage these huge amounts of money, given that on 22 March 2011, Tweedgreen were given £147k by the Scottish Government and yet by 31 August 2011, they only had £3296 on their balance sheet as cash at bank.

Whilst Councillors may consider that funding is not an issue that they need to consider, given the £500k worth of grants that Tweedgreen have applied for, it is absolutely vital that Councillors are made fully aware of past grant awards and question how able Tweedgreen are to manage money, given the omission of something as simple as record keeping in their business plan.

10. Business Plan Headings – detail left blank (or requiring expansion)

It is absolutely incredible that Tweedgreen should decide to leave the content of the following headings blank and frankly shows a complete disrespect for the Community Asset Transfer process. If Tweedgreen intend to update the content of the headings AFTER the end of the consultation period on 11 April 2021, then I would suggest that this may have been done in order to disarm consultation responders.

Executive Summary

Section is intentionally blank and will be completed in due course”

Operation and Management

Section is intentionally blank and will be completed in due course”

Key Players

Section is intentionally blank and will be completed in due course”

Staffing

Section is intentionally blank and will be completed in due course”

Governance

To be expanded

Record keeping

Section is intentionally blank and will be completed in due course”

11. Summary

I object to the Community Asset Transfer of Jedderfield to Tweedgreen in the strongest terms and ask that you take every one of my previous 10 points as an objection.

Tweedgreen cannot proceed without grant funding. They can enjoy running their projects with none of the financial responsibility of a normal business. Over the past 10 years, Tweedgreen has secured in the region of £250k of grants and I suggest that Councillors ask to see the profit and loss accounts for each of the last 10 years as well as the simple balance sheet, of which only the latter is lodged at Companies House. This is in order that you are fully au fait with all the financial information that you will need to see that Tweedgreen lack the business and financial acumen to be able to successfully run a project of this magnitude.

As I am sure you are aware, Tweedgreen is limited by guarantee so their liability runs to just £1 per director / member.

Tweedgreen functions for Tweedgreen members and for their members alone. Ask yourselves, Councillors, what tangible evidence is there of the benefit to the majority, of the £250k of grants over the past 10 years and I suspect you will come up with the same answer, which is negligible. They rarely if ever have a beneficial impact on the vast majority of the 9000 people living in Peebles.

Whilst I appreciate *at this point*, the Common Good Fund Committee, are not being asked for any financial support by Tweedgreen, it is vital that the Councillors consider what will happen to Jedderfield when this project runs out of money and what liability the Common Good Fund will be left with, in order to make the farm good for a lease holder with genuine / realistic intent.

There is a very big difference between being environmentalists and taking on a project such as Jedderfield and from my extensive research and all that I have read in Tweedgreen’s submissions, it is clear to me that Tweedgreen are not qualified or capable of a project this size and it would be an utter travesty for this Community Asset Transfer to go ahead and Jedderfield be lost as a Common Good Fund Asset along with the potential income it could otherwise bring for the benefit of the people of Peebles.

Tweedgreen has shown a lack of regard and respect for the Community Asset Transfer process. After their submission of documents to SBC, who are facilitating the process, Tweedgreen made use of their Facebook page to announce ad hoc amendments to their business plan, which is completely unacceptable. Tweedgreen’s business plan, which has many headings left “intentionally blank”, should in itself render the whole business plan inadmissible in the process.

I would appeal to Councillors to **decline** this Community Asset Transfer of Jedderfield to Tweedgreen.

References:

1. Community Asset Transfer application form

2. Tweedgreen's business plan dated 4 March 2021
3. Tweedgreen's statement on their Facebook page dated 6 April 2021
4. Tweedgreen's website
5. Various financial records from Companies House

Response 114

Jedderfield Farm public Consultation

I have just attempted to complete the online consultation document without success as I could not locate the questions!

I have lived in Peebleshire for more than 40 years; I have extensive experience in the agricultural world and, in fact, was brought up on a farm. I have walked the Jedderfield farm.

As such, I have a number of observations. I would agree with Tweed Green that the site would not be viable as a dedicated 'small farm' business.

This is because of the small size and poor quality of the land. In places, the soil depth is a matter of inches. To make it viable, It would require massive investment and intensification which would detract from the nature of the area. Furthermore, I witnessed the closest I've ever seen to an alpine meadow in the UK. The nature of the previous landuse has preserved the biodiversity long since lost in much of our farm land. This cannot be sacrificed and, I believe, must be preserved. Tweed Greed are the ideal group to be the custodians of this role in my opinion.

I commend their business plan and see the potential for Jedderfield to enable young people from Peebles and the surrounding area to develop skills and nurture interests in a range of rural activities from woodland management to small scale production. I note it's potential as both an educational and a community resource and support Tweed Green's Jedderfield Group's application.

Response 115

I am against this asset transfer for the following reasons:-

1. The documents submitted with the application are incomplete and some parts are in draft. It is unreasonable to expect decisions to be made on the basis of incomplete information.
2. The access road is a rough track in a poor state of repair and therefore unsuitable for traffic other than tractors and similar agricultural vehicles. I am not convinced that people accessing the Farm will all walk or cycle, as claimed by Tweedgreen..
3. Tweedgreen are proposing to pay a rent much less than market value, thereby depriving the Common Good Fund of money that could be used to support other deserving local causes.
4. I am not convinced that the people behind Tweedgreen Ltd have the expertise to make the project successful. To give them a 25 year lease is potentially risky.

Response 116

We feel that this will be an excellent showcase for the community of Peebles and those visiting.

We know Peebles very well. We were the last custodians of [REDACTED] Castle and have often walked onto and through Jedderfield farm. We maintain many friendships with the folk of Peebles and are often in the town.

We have seen similar projects when living in New Zealand. They are a great benefit to all. We have also ran our own businesses - so we know that setting these things up can be difficult but it can be done.

We are aware and concerned that Jedderfield farm is being considered to be sold by the Peebles common good. Who would gain from this ! This would be very wrong. It must be used by the community for the community. With it's relatively small size for commercial farming and it's proximity to schools, it would appear obvious that it should be run by a community group , to educate and inspire all.

I sincerely hope our comments bear some influence on this matter.

Response 117

I lived for nearly 20 years in Edinburgh and visited Peebles often. I have friends there and will be back again this year.

This project is an excellent idea.

I have heard rumours that this publicly owned land is being sold to private interests. This is wrong - and goes in the face of modern thinking. Why give more publicly owned assets for private greed?

Tweedgreen's ideas have some real solid ideas. With a good team then this can be a reality that will be excellent for Peebles and visitors alike.

The golf course may be an issue - getting through it. But people playing golf should not be a bar to the growth of a good community idea. Anything can be worked out. Compromise.

Response 118

Peebles Civic Society recognises and applauds the social and environmental aspirations of Tweedgreen as expressed in their proposals for a Sustainable Living Project at Jedderfield Farm.

Many members of Peebles Civic Society and the wider community are broadly supportive of the idea that Common Good assets can deliver more than income and have the capability to deliver other benefits. The Civic Society also believes that the wider community would be supportive of environmentally focussed activities at Jedderfield Farm.

However, Peebles Civic Society has to express concern about the Asset Transfer Request submitted by Tweedgreen for a 25 year lease of Jedderfield Farm.

Our reservations are as follows:

The ATR application is incomplete, and does not demonstrate that Tweedgreen qualifies as a properly constituted Community Transfer Body, nor how it is controlled by members of the community the project aims to benefit.

Tweedgreen is listed at Companies House as a £1 guarantee limited company consisting of three directors. We understand that membership consists of two email contact lists. An indication of the company's administrative diligence is that the register inspection address was only changed from that of a director who resigned in September 2017 more than three years later, in December 2020. We have serious doubts about Tweedgreen's ability and capacity to carry out its ambitious proposals.

The SBC website: Community transfer policy and guidance notes for applicants notes the need for a strong track record of money management and a business plan. The first requirement is questionable, considering the content of the ATR. A Climate Challenge Fund grant of £250,000 grant for a two-year project in 2010 employed three people, but this was a one-off project with no continuing self-sustained community benefit. The submitted business plan is seriously deficient, having no cost plan, no cash flow analysis and no identified future income streams, while sources of grant aid are merely aspirational.

There is no clear argument that the benefits and outcomes of the project would outweigh the loss of Common Good income and the long-term loss of a farming asset. A lease of £1k a year is well below the market value and would result in a significant loss of income to the Common Good Fund, and by extension a blow to local community groups that depend on the Common Good Fund as a source of grant aid.

Far from being a “Common Good liability” as claimed in the application, this is a valuable asset and an ideal starter farm for a young person to get a foot in the farming community. There is a desperate shortage of opportunities for young people wishing to enter the agricultural industry. If properly marketed there would be significant formal interest made to the Common Good. We understand that around a dozen people or groups have already come forward to express an interest.

There are also issues with the private access track and with increased traffic through the Golf Club due to the proposed change of use, which is likely to require planning permission and substantial access upgrading for public use, including health and safety assessment in relation to the inevitably increased use of the lane by vehicles, bikes and pedestrians, and the impact on the operation of the Golf Club.

Finally, we question the use of Community Asset Transfer legislation for an asset that is already owned in trust for the whole community. In our opinion, the effect of this ATR, if granted, would be to decrease the value to the community of this Common Good asset, which we believe would be contrary to the spirit of the legislation.

Reponse 119

I consider that this application is not in the best interests of Peebles Common Good Fund and fear that the fund could end up losing ownership of the land and property at Jedderfield.

I believe that the Fund would benefit more by continuing to rent out Jedderfield for farming purposes, thus providing a steady stream of income into the Fund, with no danger of losing ownership of this valuable asset.