
**Please find attached additional Information in respect of
Item No. 6 and Item No. 7 on the agenda for the above
meeting**

6(e)	<p>Consider request for review of refusal of application in Principle for residential dwellings with associated amenity, parking , Infrastructure and Access on Land South of Cruzion Cottage, Earlston Road, Stow 20/01620/PPP and 21/00018/RREF</p> <p>Additional Information (Pages 3 - 16)</p>
7(e)	<p>Consider request for review of refusal of application for the erection of a dwellinghouse on Land Adjacent to Carnlea, Main Street, Heiton - 20/01327/FUL and 21/00019/RREF</p> <p>Other Information referred to in Papers (Pages 17 - 26)</p>

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 6e

From: Armstrong, Deborah
Sent: 06 October 2021 16:19
To: Henderson, Fiona
Cc: Miller, Craig; Johnston, Charles; Connolly, Trish; Clarke, Carlos
Subject: RE: Land South of Crunzion Cottage, Earlston Road, Stow -
20/01620/PPP and
21/00018/RREF
Attachments: Additional response for LRB (6.10.21).docx

Hi Fiona,

Further to the email from Carlos, please find attached a response from the Forward Planning Team.

If there is anything else, just let me know.

Thanks

Debbie

From: Clarke, Carlos <CGClarke@scotborders.gov.uk>
Sent: 06 October 2021 13:44
To: Henderson, Fiona <FHenderson@scotborders.gov.uk>
Cc: Miller, Craig <CMiller@scotborders.gov.uk>; Johnston, Charles <CJohnston@scotborders.gov.uk>;
Armstrong, Deborah <Deborah.Armstrong@scotborders.gov.uk>; Connolly, Trish <TConnolly@scotborders.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Land South of Crunzion Cottage, Earlston Road, Stow -
20/01620/PPP and 21/00018/RREF

Fiona,

Further to your email to Forward Planning, I would provide the following brief comment on behalf of the appointed officer as regards sustainability. I will otherwise not comment on the housing figures matter, as I would rest our view entirely on any commentary provided by the Forward Planning team in that regard

* I recognise the amendment to Scottish Planning Policy such that the policy allows for a presumption in favour of development that contributes to sustainable development to be considered a significant material consideration when a development plan is more than five years old. The principles of Paragraph 29 in that regard should be accounted for. In my interpretation of the principles in Paragraph 29, however, the contribution that four large detached houses and long private access road will make to sustainable development will be outweighed by the conflict arising from what would be a low density development on a relatively large greenfield site beyond the established limitation of the settlement boundary that would not relate well to

the sense of place of the village at this location. Any contribution made, therefore, to sustainable development is limited and is not, in my view, a material consideration that should override conflict with the current, adopted Local Development Plan which, it is worth noting, is only just over five years old.

I hope this response is helpful to the Review Body's considerations.

Regards,

Carlos Clarke
Team Leader
Development Management
Regulatory Services
Scottish Borders Council
Tel: 01835 826735
Email: cgclarke@scotborders.gov.uk

From: localreview <localreview@scotborders.gov.uk>
Sent: 06 October 2021 10:22
To: Johnston, Charles <CJohnston@scotborders.gov.uk>
Subject: Land South of Crunzion Cottage, Earlston Road, Stow - 20/01620/PPP and 21/00018/RREF

Good Morning

Further to our telephone conversation with regard to the above .

At its meeting on 13 September 2021 the LRB agreed to request that the Forward Planning section be requested to re-appraise their decision on the above application in light of the squashing of PAN 1/2020 and retraction of paragraphs in the SPP - regarding sustainability.

I would appreciate a response as soon as possible.

Regards Fiona

Fiona Henderson
Democratic Services Officer
Democratic Services
Resources
Council Headquarters
NEWTOWN ST BOSWELLS TD6 0SA
? DDI : 01835 826502
? fhenderson@scotborders.gov.uk

Additional response for LRB

Planning application: 20/01620/PPP

Two previous responses were provided in respect of the above planning application in February and June 2021. This response provides an update in respect of the policy position since the previous responses earlier in the year.

It should be noted that since the previous responses, PAN 1/2020 has been quashed and the updated paragraphs within Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) made in December 2020, regarding sustainability, have now been retracted. As a result the previous comments no longer reflect the up to date policy position regarding how the 5 year effective housing land supply is calculated. As such, all previous references to PAN 1/2020 are no longer relevant.

This does not alter the previous recommendation and it should be noted that the original comments regarding the housing land audit process remain valid. In that, it is not considered appropriate to re-assess the effectiveness/programming for each individual housing site, or to state which sites are not likely to be progressed, as part of the planning application process. This is undertaken as part of the Housing Land Audit process.

As a result of PAN 1/2020 being quashed, the Council revert back to the methodology for monitoring the 5 year effective housing land supply, set out within Appendix 2 of the adopted Local Development Plan (LDP) (2016). Appendix 2 was subject to Examination and the Reporter agreed with the contents and did not make any modifications to this methodology. The Council has finalised the Housing Land Audit (2019) which concludes that the Scottish Borders has a 5 year effective housing land supply. It is considered that the programming in the HLA are fair.

In conclusion, further to the updated policy position, it is not considered that this proposal meets the criteria within Policy PMD4 nor the amended SPP and there are no material considerations which would allow the site to be supported. As the proposal is contrary to planning policy, it cannot be supported by the Forward Planning team.

This page is intentionally left blank



Your ref: 20/01620/PPP

Ms Louise McGeoch
Clerk to the Local Review Body
Scottish Borders Council

13th October 2021

BY EMAIL ONLY

Dear Ms McGeoch,

NOTICE OF REVIEW 21/00018/RREF: APPELLANT'S RESPONSE TO SUBSEQUENT COMMENTS OF FORWARD PLANNING TEAM

Thank you for your correspondence of 7th October and passing on the comments of the Forward Planning team (dated 6th October) who provided consultee advice. We are grateful for the opportunity to respond to those comments.

It is important to note that although PAN 1/2020 and Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) 2020 have been quashed; SPP 2014 remains extant and is no longer superseded. Paragraph 110 of SPP makes clear that "a generous supply of land for each housing market area within the plan area" should be identified in order to "support the achievement of the housing land requirement across all tenures, maintaining at least a 5-year supply of effective housing land at all times".

This provision was also included in SPP 2020.

Therefore, it is correct to assess whether a five year Supply of Housing Land is existent in the determination of a planning application.

SESPlan1 establishes the Housing Land Requirement for the Borders as 12,930 no. in the period 2009-24. This equates to an annual requirement of 862 no. per annum. The Scottish Borders Local Development Plan 2016 sits in this context – not as an exception to it. The legal context herein was confirmed by the Government's Reporter in Appeal Decision PPA-140-2088 (Venlaw, Peebles).

Completed units in the Borders have not exceeded 345 no. units since 2015. Annual completions are detailed in Table 1 below, replicated from the Council Housing Land Audit 2019 (most recent edition).



Table 1

Year	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total	Target	Shortfall
Units completed	272	373	250	222	345	1,462	4,310	2,848

Appeal Decision PPA-14-2088 established firmly that the Borders is not served with a five year Supply of Housing Land. Indeed, the Reporter concluded that a “significant five-year effective land shortfall” was existent. The Reporters of the DPEA (Directorate of Planning and Environmental Appeals) are the ultimate independent adjudicators of planning disputes in Scotland. It is not credible to argue that a Reporter is mistaken in his/her assessment of the fundamental issue determining the outcome of an appeal.

The Appellant’s position remains that the below table accurately sets out Housing Land Supply in the Borders.

Table 2

Description		Figure	Calculation
Scottish Borders Housing Land Requirement (2009-2024) ¹	(a)	12,930	
Length of period (years)	(b)	15	
Annual housing requirement	(c)	862	(a)/(b)
Annual housing requirement (2009-2019) ²	(d)	965	9,650/10
All tenure completion 2009-2019 ³	(e)	3,959	
Completed years	(f)	10	
Remaining residential requirement	(g)	8,971	(a)-(e)
Years remaining ⁴	(h)	5	
Revised Annual housing requirement	(i)	1,794	(g)/(h)
5 year requirement	(j)	8,971	(i) x 5
SBC-claimed effective supply	(k)	3,679	
Audited effective supply ⁵	(l)	2,351	
SBC-claimed number of years supply	(m)	2.05	(k)/(i)
Audited number of years supply	(n)	1.31	(l)/(i)
Audited housing shortfall	(o)	6,620	(j)-(l)

a) Please see Appendix 1 for footnotes to table.



However, even if it were to be accepted that annual Housing Land Requirement (HLR) for the Borders was 492 no. units per annum (per Table 4 of Appendix 2 of the LDP 2016) a Housing Land Requirement of 2,460 no. units would still be accrued in each five year period. On these figures, a **delivery shortfall of 998 no. units** has been recorded over the most recent five year period – 2,460 homes required, 1,462 homes delivered.

As a shortfall in the Housing Land Supply has been proven, the proposal is considered to accord with Policy PMD4 as principal criterion c) is satisfied. The proposal is also considered to represent discrete development which would form a logical and contained extension to Stow's existing built environment without prejudicing local character, the local landscape quality, or residential development of further land. As the appeal proposal accords with Policy PMD4 it is considered that the principle of development is acceptable and to represent sustainable development.

Moreover, the fact remains that development of 2 no. of the 4 no. allocated sites in Stow remain constrained. While development of the other allocated site (ESO22) is accepted to be deliverable; development of the fourth and final site – while not identified as constrained – remains some distance off. The main review of the Housing Land position in the Borders was conducted by Ferguson Planning in January 2021, as of the time of writing (October 2021) the final allocated site in Stow (ESO38) remains unconsented with the Application for Planning Permission still undetermined. While deliverable, the potential of this site is for delivery of new homes in the later stages of the Proposed Local Development Plan currently under review by the DPEA.

The Appellant is grateful for this opportunity to address the comments of the Forward Planning team and thank the Local Review Officer, the Clerk to the Local Review Body, and her staff accordingly.

It is our hope that members of the LRB find these comments to be clear and helpful in completing their determination of the matter at hand.

Yours Sincerely

Ferguson Planning



APPENDIX 1

Footnotes from Housing Land Supply table

Ferguson Planning Ltd

Main Office:

Shiel House | 54 Island Street | Galashiels | TD1 1NU

NI Office:

61 Moyle Road | Ballycastle | Co. Antrim | BT54 6LG

T 01896 668 744

M 07960 003 358

E tim@fergusonplanning.co.uk

W www.fergusonplanning.co.uk

Page 10



Company Registration Number: 614302 (Registered in Scotland)



Footnotes

1. Figure from Table 3.1 of SESPlan: Housing Land Supplementary Guidance November 2014.
2. Figure from Table 3.1 of SESPlan: Housing Land Supplementary Guidance November 2014.
3. Completion figures sourced as follows:
 - 2016-19 copied from SBC's Housing Land Audit 2019.
 - 2010-15 copied from Table 7.1 (second column) SESPlan2: Housing Background Paper October 2019.
 - 2009 extrapolated from Table 7.1 (third column) SESPlan2: Housing Background Paper October 2019.
4. Years remaining as per PLDP under examination (to 2026) as opposed to adopted SESPlan date (to 2024).
5. Large sites included within the Effective Supply by the Planning Authority have been assessed for deliverability; analysis supplied in Excel Spreadsheet. SBC figure for small sites has been accepted and is not included in analysis (Excel Spreadsheet).



APPENDIX 2

Response from the Appellant of 11/10/2021



From: Bruce Weir <Bruce@cwproperties.co.uk>
Sent: 01 October 2021 14:22
To: localreview@scotborders.gov.uk
Cc: Lucy Moroney <lucy@fergusonplanning.co.uk>; Tim Ferguson <tim@fergusonplanning.co.uk>
Subject: Land South of Crunzion Cottage, Earlston - FW: 20/01620/PPP and 21/00018/RREF

Good afternoon Fiona,

Thank you for your email dated the 17th of September 2021 to Lucy Moroney at Ferguson Planning, with comments from Mrs Hartswood. I hope you don't mind that I have responded, rather than Ferguson Planning, as I thought the responses would be better from me as the applicant, given the comments made.

I would be grateful if this response can be circulated to the Members of the Local Review Body.

In response to Mrs Hartswood's email I would comment as follows:

- 1 The site has been put forward in the past, as part of the local development plan process, but no planning permission in principle application or detailed planning application has ever been submitted. It is important to note that the local development plan process precludes sites being considered that are less than 5 houses, so even if it was considered acceptable it couldn't be allocated through the local development process.

The reason that the planning application has been submitted now is for one principal reason. I believe that the sites that have been put forward in the local development plan for Stow have not and are not going to deliver the housing numbers required for the village and the general principle objectives of the Borders Railway Blueprint. Of the 4 housing sites in Stow that are allocated, one of them, the former Royal Hotel site, has been allocated for 11 units since 2008 and has never been developed despite various interested parties making offers for the site, including me. The owner is making no effort to sell or develop the site so no housing is likely on that site any time soon. One of the other sites, on Lauder Road, has been consented for 6 units and has recently been sold at auction. We believe that the topography of this site will result in the originally planned 6 units being reduced to 1 or 2, as we understand it was an individual that has purchased it rather than a house builder. The site at Craigend Road has delivered 10 units out of 18 allocated, however no further applications have been made and thus a further shortfall of some 8 units. The remaining site at Stagehall seems to be the only one that is progressing, with interest in the site from Hudson homes and a current planning application being progressed.

As such, out of the 4 sites allocated, none have been developed in the 2016-2021 plan period and only one shows any signs of being developed. This provides clear evidence in the lack of housing delivery in Stow and when one considers the opening of the new



railway station we believe more should be done to bring forward deliverable and logical sites to meet the ever increasing demand to live in Stow.

In addition to the lack of sites coming forward in Stow we have also looked at the housing land supply across the Borders. In the past 5 years there has been a shortfall of approximately 100 houses per annum being built throughout the Borders in terms of targeted numbers for between 2016 to 2021. Of those actually built, approximately 43% are from small windfall sites similar to my site, and surely this needs to be recognised when it comes to housing delivery in the Borders. Further information can be found within our planning consultants appeal statement.

There has been no update from the council as to what numbers are still required to meet targets, however if you read the recent appeal decision on the Venlaw site in Peebles it should be noted the Scottish Government's Planning Reporter goes into print saying the council are 631 houses short of their housing numbers in the Scottish Borders in terms of land supply upto 2021.

It is for these reasons that I decided to make a planning application on this field, as I felt the site fits in with similar housing that neighbours it and is on a small scale that can be easily accommodated within Stow, while at the same time meeting the housing shortfall at a local level in the near future. It will bring knock on economic benefits during the construction stage and in supporting local services.

2 i) I do not believe that the overall community have objected in a relatively high number. The majority of objections have come from local residents on Earlston Road and are a small percentage of the village.

ii) The site does currently sit out with the development boundary but that is an arbitrary line drawn to show the boundary of the village. If you look at 3 out of the 4 sites that are currently allocated in the local development plan they are all extensions to the village boundary with a new access created from roads leading out of the village.

Craigend – a new access was created from Craigend road into a culdesac called Burnside way, thus extending the village boundary in a similar way as I propose.

Stagehall – the Wedale View development was created from Station road into a culdesac when it was developed in 2007/08. The current application will extend that road, again extending the village boundary in a similar way as I propose.

Lauder Road – this again is an extension of the village boundary with a new access into a culdesac, again in a similar way as I propose.

If villages like Stow are going to expand, they have to expand up the side of the valley, due to flood risk in the base of the valley. As such it is inevitable that the village



boundaries have to expand over time and the boundary line will move further out. We have sought professional landscape consultants to review our proposals and they have concluded that there would be no significant landscape impacts created by what is proposed given the contained nature of the site.

iii) Traffic safety has been considered in detail and there is **NO objection** to this from the council's transport officer. Speed surveys have been conducted, the access fully designed and all elements of the new bridge considered. In addition to this there have been **NO other statutory objections** to the development proceeding with the exception of the forward planning team.

iv) Amenity of local residents has been considered in detail to ensure that there will be limited impact on the neighbouring properties. A number of layouts have been considered and I am quite happy to consider further landscaping and buffering to ensure there is no overlooking or impact on local residents and therefore no amenity issues.

Finally, although not detailed in Mrs Hartswood's email, one of the other main reasons for objection to the application from some of the neighbouring residents, was loss of a field and the fact that the houses seemed to be family houses and have car ports. Again, I would be happy to look at keeping open space at the bottom of the site, neighbouring these residents, as well as looking at the design of the new housing so it has minimal impact. It would be my intention to build one or two houses for sale, however I am also considering building one or two houses , which may be available to rent.

I hope this response is helpful.

Yours sincerely

Bruce Weir
Torsonce Mains
Stow

This page is intentionally left blank

SCOTTISH BORDERS COUNCIL

CHEVIOT AREA COMMITTEE

15 DECEMBER 2004

APPLICATION FOR PLANNING PERMISSION

ITEM:	REFERENCE NUMBER: 04/01984/OUT
OFFICER:	Frank Bennett
LOCAL MEMBER:	Councillor A Nicol
PROPOSAL:	Erection of house and garage
SITE:	Land adjacent to Carnlea, Main Street, Heiton
APPLICANT:	Mark Graham
AGENT:	None

SITE AND APPLICATION DESCRIPTION:

The site, 0.03 acres in area, situated on the west side of the Heiton, is level ground contained by the gardens of adjacent residential properties. Some years ago, there was a timber chalet on the ground. There is now a garage /shed within the site which would be removed. The site can be accessed from a cul-de-sac road already serving the four neighbouring houses which has an entrance/exit on to Main Street. The application is in outline, although the applicant has indicated he would erect a single storey house.

PLANNING HISTORY:

Planning approval for neighbouring houses was obtained in the mid 1970's and four houses subsequently built, with the application site being land containing a chalet which was removed, although the cleared site has remained undeveloped.

In June 1994, full planning consent for a house on the site (Ref.R127/94) was given which subsequently lapsed in 1999. The committee approved this application contrary to the advice of the Director of Roads and Transportation whose comments were similar to those put forward in relation to the current application. These were that the access on to the Main Street was not of a suitable standard to accommodate a fifth house and visibility on to the main A class road was inadequate. In response to these comments, the Director of Planning's advice to the Committee in 1994 was that "the bungalow is (would be) located on an in-fill site which has already demonstrated its ability to accommodate a house when used for the chalet. The determining issue with this application is that of the access road. While I share some of the concern of the Director of Roads and Transportation, I believe that this application is not creating a worse situation to that which existed when the original chalet was in use. I therefore do not believe that there are sufficient grounds upon which to justify refusal of the application".

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES:

Approved Structure Plan 2001-2011

None

Roxburgh Local Plan 1995

Policy 18

In established residential areas there will be a presumption in favour of retaining existing uses. To protect the amenity and character of these areas any development should meet the following criteria:-

1. Appropriate form of development for a residential area;
2. Appropriate scale of development for a residential area;
3. No unacceptable increase in traffic or noise;
4. Not visually intrusive.

OTHER PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

None.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Scottish Borders Council Consultees

Director of Technical Services – The access on to Main Street (an A class road) has practically zero visibility due to boundary hedges. Unless the access entrance/exit can be widened to allow two cars to pass at the junction the visibility splays of 2.5 x 100 metres in both directions could be achieved, support for the application could not be given.

Other Consultees

Scottish Water – It is understood from the applicant that Scottish Water have confirmed that as the property has an existing sewer connection and is to be rebuilt, they will permit the use of the existing connection, but for domestic purposes only.

Community Council – reply awaited.

OTHER RESPONSES:

None.

PLANNING ISSUES:

Whether further development should be resisted until the road access junction on to the A698 has been widened and visibility improved.

ASSESSMENT OF APPLICATION:

The site is of sufficient size to accommodate a house, having previously accommodated a dwelling house. The land is within a residential area recognised in the Local Plan. There have been no representations from neighbours although in a recent similar application (withdrawn) a neighbour expressed the view that the house should be single storey to have lesser impact on neighbours amenity. The determining issue concerns the adequacy of the access junction on to

the A698 and the visibility requirements at the access entrance. The applicant has been unable to obtain agreement of householders to widen the road and improve or improve visibility which would result in a loss of garden area of the properties concerned and a need to rebuild boundary walls.

The previous Planning Authority approved use of the access in question for four houses, and in 1994, its further use for an additional house. In the latter instance, this was against the advice of the Director of Roads and Transportation. Although this permission has now lapsed, it is maintained that the traffic situation may not be greatly different then as it is some years later, although undoubtedly there has been some increase in traffic on Main Street. As part of the Sunlaws development for 82 houses to the south of the village, traffic calming measures for the village are in prospect with the objective of reducing the speed of vehicles passing through the village. While this will not overcome the situation at the access entrance/exit, it should mean that vehicles are moving more slowly along the Main Street as vehicles from the access are emerging, and similarly, as vehicles are stationary getting ready to turn right off the main Road into the access.

In view of the history of the site in residential use, and the previously granting of consent it is considered that the application can be supported.

RECOMMENDATION BY HEAD OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL:

The application is recommended for approval subject to the following conditions:

1. The subsequent approval by the Planning Authority of the means of access, the layout of the site, the design and siting of any buildings and the landscape treatment of the site.
Reason: Approval is in outline only.
2. The means of water supply and of both surface water and foul drainage to be submitted for the approval of the Planning Authority.
Reason: To ensure that the site is adequately serviced.
3. The details of all boundary walls and/or fences to be submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority before the development is commenced.
Reason : To safeguard the visual amenity of the area.
4. The house and garage to be single storey
Reason: In the interests of maintaining the amenity and outlook of occupiers of neighbouring residential properties.

*Original copy of report signed by
BRIAN FRATER (Head of Development Control)*



TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (SCOTLAND) ACT 1997

Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) (Scotland) Order 1992

Application for Outline Planning Permission

Reference : 04/01984/OUT

To : Mark Graham Fairfield Crailing Jedburgh TD8 6TW

With reference to your application validated on **5th October 2004** for outline planning permission under the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 for the following development :-

Proposal : Erection of dwellinghouse and garage

at : Land Adjacent Carnlea Main Street Heiton Kelso Scottish Borders

The Scottish Borders Council hereby **grant outline planning permission** in accordance with the approved plan(s) and the particulars given in the application and in accordance with Section 59 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 **subject to the standard conditions** on the attached schedule:-

and **subject to the conditions on the attached schedule** imposed by the Council for the reasons stated:-

**Dated 15th December 2004
Economic Development and Environmental Planning
Council Headquarters
Newtown St Boswells
MELROSE
TD6 0SA**

Signed

.....
Head of Development Control

APPLICATION REFERENCE : 04/01984/OUT

STANDARD CONDITIONS

- a) In the case of any reserved matter, the application for approval must be made not later than the expiration of **three years** beginning with the date of grant of this outline planning permission.
- b) That the development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than whichever is the later of the following dates:-
 - i) the expiration of **five years** from the date of this outline planning permission,
 - ii) the expiration of **two years** from the final approval of the reserved matters, or, in the case of approval on different dates, the **final approval** of the last such matter to be approved.

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1 The subsequent approval by the Planning Authority of the means of access, the layout of the site, the design and siting of any buildings and the landscape treatment of the site.
Reason: Approval is in outline only
- 2 The means of water supply and of both surface water and foul drainage to be submitted for the approval of the Planning Authority.
Reason: To ensure that the site is adequately serviced.
- 3 The details of all boundary walls and/or fences to be submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority before the development is commenced.
Reason : To safeguard the visual amenity of the area.
- 4 The house and garage to be single storey
Reason: In the interests of maintaining the amenity and outlook of occupiers of neighbouring residential properties.

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE APPLICANT

N.B: This permission does not include any consent, approval or licence necessary for the proposed development under the building regulations or any other statutory enactment and the development should not be commenced until all consent are obtained.

In advance of carrying out any works it is recommended that you contact Utility Bodies whose equipment or apparatus may be affected by any works you undertake. Contacts include:

Transco, Susiephone Department, 95 Kilbirnie Street, Glasgow, G5 8JD
 Scottish Power, Riccarton Mains Road, Currie, Edinburgh, EH14 5AA
 East of Scotland Water (Borders Division), West Grove, Waverley Road, Melrose, TD6 9SJ
 British Telecom, National Notice Handling Centre, PP404B Telecom House, Trinity Street, Stoke on Trent, ST1 5ND
 Scottish Borders Council, Street Lighting Section, Council HQ, Newtown St Boswells, Melrose, TD6 0SA
 Cable & Wireless, 1 Dove Wynd, Strathclyde Business Park, Bellshill, ML4 3AL
 BP Chemicals Ltd, PO Box 21, Bo'ness Road, Grangemouth, FK2 9XH
 THUS, Susiephone Department, 4th Floor, 75 Waterloo Street, Glasgow, G2 7BD
 Susiephone System – 0800 800 333

If the applicant is aggrieved by the decision of the Planning Authority, an appeal may be made to the Scottish Ministers under section 47 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997, within six months from the date of this notice. The appeal should be addressed to the Chief Reporter, 4 The Courtyard, Callendar Business Park, Callendar Road, Falkirk, FK1 1XR.

If permission to develop land is refused or granted subject to conditions, whether by the Planning Authority or by the Scottish Ministers, and the owner of the land claims that the land has become incapable of reasonably beneficial use in its existing state and cannot be rendered capable of reasonably beneficial use by the carrying out of any development which has been or would be permitted, the owner may serve on the Planning Authority a purchase notice requiring the purchase of his interest in the land in accordance with the provisions of Part V of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act, 1997.

