

[Redacted]

From: Thirlestane [Redacted]
Sent: 20 October 2015 12:13
To: Planning & Regulatory Services
Subject: Planning application 15/00890/PPP

Dear Sirs,

At a meeting yesterday the Upper Tweed Community Council considered planning application 15/00890/PPP - Erection of dwelling house and upgrade access track, redundant water treatment works, north east of Broughton Place Cottage, Broughton.

We should like to register an objection to this application. If it is approved, it would be very difficult to resist other applications to build houses in the countryside, and a proliferation of new houses outside existing settlements would be detrimental to this rural and agricultural area. The proposed house would not be part of an existing building group and as far as we are aware is not required for rural or agricultural use. The objections stated on 30 May 2008 by the Reporter of the Scottish Government would appear to have equal force today. The Local Plan already makes provision for new houses in Broughton and we do not consider that additional provision is needed.

Moreover, we consider that the design of the house would not fit in well with its surrounding environment. The site is up on a hill and any house built there would be visible from a wide area around. Other houses in prominent positions are largely of traditional types and we would be much happier with a house which conformed to this standard, rather than one of a more modern design as is proposed. The site is in a National Scenic Area and the adverse impact which the house, as currently designed, would have on the landscape is unacceptable.

We note that a number of close neighbours of the site have expressed concerns about water supply and drainage, the unsuitability of the proposed access near Broughton Place Cottage for more traffic, the difficult access from the A701 and the impact on the working of the farmland over which access would be required. We recommend that full weight should be placed on these concerns.

Yours faithfully,

Christopher Lewin
Chairman, Upper Tweed Community Council,
Thirlestane House,
Broughton,
Biggar, ML12 6HQ

[Redacted]

PLANNING CONSULTATION

On behalf of: Director of Education & Lifelong Learning

From: Head of Property & Facilities Management

Contact: Marc Bedwell, ext 5242

To: Head of Planning & Building Standards

Contact: Dorothy Amyes ☎ 01835 826743

Date: 26 May 2016

Ref: 15/00890/PPP

PLANNING CONSULTATION

Name of Applicant: Mr Stewart Kane

Agent: Suzanne McIntosh Planning

Nature of Proposal: Erection of dwellinghouse and upgrade access track

Site Redundant Water Treatment Works North East Of Broughton Place Cottage Broughton
Scottish Borders

OBSERVATIONS ON BEHALF OF: Director of Education & Lifelong Learning

CONSULTATION REPLY

I refer to your request for Education's view on the impact of this proposed development, which is located within the catchment area for Broughton Primary School and Peebles High School.

A contribution of £1383 is sought for the High school.

Rolls over 90% place strain on the school's teaching provision, infrastructure and facilities and reduce flexibility in timetabling, potentially negatively effecting quality standards within the school environment. Contributions are sought to raise capital to extend or improve schools, or where deemed necessary to provide new schools, in order to ensure that over-capacity issues are managed and no reduction in standards is attributed to this within the Borders Area.

This contribution should be paid upon receipt of detailed planning consent but may be phased subject to an agreed schedule.

Please note that the level of contributions for all developments will be reviewed at the end of March each year and may be changed to reflect changes in the BCIS index – therefore we reserve the right to vary the level of the contribution if the contribution detailed above is not paid before 1 April 2016.

If you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Scottish Borders Council

Regulatory Services – Consultation reply

Planning Ref	15/00890/PPP
Uniform Ref	15/01854/PLANCO
Proposal	Erection of dwellinghouse and upgrade access track
Address	Redundant Water Treatment Works , North East Of Broughton Place Cottage, Broughton
Date	9th October 2015
Amenity and Pollution Officer	No Comments
Contaminated Land Officer	Gareth Stewart

Contaminated land

Assessment of Application

The above application appears to be proposing the redevelopment and change of use of land which was previously operated as a water treatment works. This land use is potentially contaminative and it is the responsibility of the developer to demonstrate that the land is suitable for the use they propose.

It is recommended that planning permission should be granted on condition that development is not be permitted to start until a site investigation and risk assessment has been carried out, submitted and agreed upon by the Planning Authority.

Any requirement arising from this assessment for a remediation strategy and verification plan would become a condition of the planning consent, again to be submitted and agreed upon by the Planning Authority prior to development commencing.

The attached standard condition may be helpful in this respect

Recommendation

<p>Delete as appropriate – Agree with application in principle, subject to conditions / Further Information Required Before Application is Determined / Information to be Provided Before Work Commences (see conditions) / No Comment / Object / Informative Note</p>

Conditions

Unless otherwise agreed in writing and in advance by the Planning Authority, prior to any development commencing on site, a scheme will be submitted by the Developer (at their expense) to identify and assess potential contamination on site. **No construction work shall commence until the scheme has been submitted to, and approved, by the Council, and is thereafter implemented in accordance with the scheme so approved.**

The scheme shall be undertaken by a competent person or persons in accordance with the advice of relevant authoritative guidance including PAN 33 (2000) and BS10175:2011 or, in the event of these being superseded or supplemented, the most up-to-date version(s) of any subsequent revision(s) of, and/or supplement(s) to, these documents. This scheme should contain details of proposals to investigate and remediate potential contamination and must include:-

- a) A desk study and development of a conceptual site model including (where necessary) a detailed site investigation strategy. The desk study and the scope and method of recommended further investigations shall be agreed with the Council **prior to** addressing parts b, c, d, and, e of this condition.

and thereafter

- b) Where required by the desk study, undertaking a detailed investigation of the nature and extent of contamination on site, and assessment of risk such contamination presents.
- c) Remedial Strategy (if required) to treat/remove contamination to ensure that the site is fit for its proposed use (this shall include a method statement, programme of works, and proposed validation plan).
- d) Submission of a Validation Report (should remedial action be required) by the developer which will validate and verify the completion of works to a satisfaction of the Council.
- e) Submission, if necessary, of monitoring statements at periods to be agreed with the Council for such time period as is considered appropriate by the Council.

Written confirmation from the Council, that the scheme has been implemented completed and (if appropriate), monitoring measures are satisfactorily in place, **shall be required by the Developer before any development hereby approved commences**. Where remedial measures are required as part of the development construction detail, commencement must be agreed in writing with the Council.

Reason: To ensure that the potential risks to human health, the water environment, property, and, ecological systems arising from any identified land contamination have been adequately addressed.

To: **Development Management Service**
FAO Dorothy Amyes

Date: **3 Nov 2015**

From: **Roads Planning Service**
Contact: **Paul Grigor**

Ext: **6663**

Ref: **15/00890/PPP**

**Subject: Erection of Dwellinghouse and Upgrade Access Track
Redundant Water Treatment Works, North East of Broughton
Place Cottage, Broughton, Scottish Borders**

A planning application for a dwelling on this site, 07/01075/FUL, was submitted to the Council in 2007. This application was recommended for refusal by the relevant officer at that time and was subsequently refused by the Tweeddale Area Committee. An appeal against that decision was submitted to the Scottish Government and the reporter upheld the decision of the Council and refused the application for various reasons.

During consideration of the previous application, this section had recommended refusal on the grounds of road safety given that the geometry of the access to the site off the A701 did not permit two vehicles to pass. Should two vehicles meet at the access, and the provision of this property would increase that possibility, this would result in a vehicle having to sit on the main A701 whilst the second vehicle left the site. It was the opinion of this section at that time that this was not a satisfactory situation.

As part of the reasoning behind their decision, the reporter accepted that two vehicles could not pass on the bridge and that one would have to wait on the main road, but due to the forward visibility available to traffic on the main road, they did not see this as a flaw in the application. Whilst I accept his support for the passing situation, I would argue that whilst the visibility available should make drivers aware of any vehicle sitting on the main carriageway, the same visibility also makes overtaking on that stretch of the road available to drivers who may be frustrated at sitting behind slow vehicles. This in itself could cause a danger should an approaching driver not be aware the vehicle in the middle of the road is waiting to turn, or even that it is there.

Furthermore, it is currently not the practice of this service to support development which would require access via a working farm.

Notwithstanding the above, there are also issues with the access track to the site which would all have to be resolved to the Council's satisfaction should the application be approved. It is not clear whether the applicant has enough control to resolve these issues and, until such times that all of the above issues can be resolved to the Council's satisfaction, I would have to recommend against this application in the interest of road safety.

AJS

