

## **APPENDIX B**

### **Summary of Representations**

- Berwickshire Housing Market Area
- Central Housing Market Area
- Northern Housing Market Area
- General comments
- Internal consultation responses

## **Berwickshire Housing Market Area**

- **Ayton**
  - AAYTO004: Page 1 onwards
- **Coldstream**
  - ACOLD009: Page 3
  - ACOLD011: Page 3 onwards
  - ACOLD008: Page 5
- **Duns**
  - MDUNS005: Page 2 & Page 10 onwards
- **Gordon**
  - AGORD004: Page 2 & Page 12
- **Greenlaw**
  - AGREE008: Page 13 onwards
  - AGREE007: Page 14
- **Reston**
  - AREST004: Page 15 onwards
  - AREST003: Page 16 onwards

SETTLEMENT	SITE NAME & SITE CODE	CONTRIBUTOR	COMMENT TYPE	SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATION	PROPOSED RESPONSE	RECOMMENDATION
Ayton	Land North of High Street (AAYTO004)	Edwin Thompson on behalf of the land owner RH & DH Allan	Object to the proposed site capacity	<p>Disagree with the proposed indicative site capacity for 6 units and state it should be increased to 12 units, taking into account the following considerations;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is located within the Ayton village boundary, characterised by pockets of varying housing densities and a mixture of house styles;</li> <li>• 12 units would be in keeping with the mixture of densities within Ayton and would be 17 units per ha. The sites within Ayton vary from 7-31 units per ha;</li> <li>• Planning consent was previously granted for 5 units in 2006, within part of this site. It seems at odds for planning permission to have been granted on the site at a density of 24 units per ha, in comparison to now recommending 8 units per ha;</li> <li>• Large garden type developments within Ayton are not in demand;</li> <li>• Most of the other preferred or alternative sites include densities of 17-20 units per ha;</li> <li>• 12 units is a more appropriate number, to deal with the housing shortfall, in comparison to 6 units.</li> </ul>	<p>The proposed site lies within Ayton and the surrounding area is characteristically lower density, with bungalows evident. Each site must be assessed on its own merits, taking into consideration the context of the site.</p> <p>In this instance, it is considered that a site capacity for 6 units is more in keeping with the character of Ayton.</p> <p>However, it should be noted that the site capacity contained within the Housing SG is only indicative. A site layout, with an increased site capacity, could be tested through the submission of a planning application, whilst ensuring compliance with the relevant LDP policies.</p>	It is recommended that Land North of High Street, Ayton (AAYTO004) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Ayton	Land North of High Street (AAYTO004)	Smith and Garratt on behalf of Millar Partnership and David Wilson	Object to the inclusion of Land North of High Street (AAYTO004)	The contributor states that the site is covered by existing development policies, therefore including the site within the SG does not increase the availability and choice of available sites.	Appendix 2, as contained within the LDP, provides a windfall assumption, which is included within the overall potential contribution towards the housing requirement (up to 2025).	It is recommended that Land North of High Street, Ayton (AAYTO004) is included within the Finalised

		Homes	within the Housing SG, stating that it is covered by existing development policies	Objects to the inclusion of the site on the grounds that it is capable of being developed in accordance with existing planning policies and the inclusion within the Housing SG would not help the Council in meeting the requirements of the SG.	The Scottish Borders is rural in character and a large proportion of the windfall assumption is provided for by housing in the countryside approvals.  The LDP provides development opportunities within settlement boundaries, through housing, re-development and mixed use allocations. Therefore, the SG will continue to identify and provide development opportunities within settlement boundaries, as per the LDP, including brownfield opportunities.	Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Ayton	Land North of High Street (AAYTO004)	SEPA	Support	Support the development requirement to consider the adjacent watercourse in the detailed design of the site.	Comments are noted.	It is recommended that Land North of High Street, Ayton (AAYTO004) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Ayton Gordon Duns	1. Land North of High Street (AAYTO004) 2. Land at Eden Road (AGORD004) 3. South of Earlsmeadow: Phase 1 (MDUNS005)	Edwin Thompson on behalf of several land owners; 1. RH & DH Hall (AAYTO004) 2. Miles Browne (AGORD004) 3. G W Thomson and Sons (MDUNS005)	Object to the distribution of housing sites within the Borders, specifically Berwickshire	Disagree with the distribution of sites contained within the SG, to deal with the housing shortfall. There has been an unfair allocation for Berwickshire, which should be increased to comply with (3.5) as contained within the SG.  The SG states it will look to provide additional sites broadly in line with the population projections; 20% Berwickshire, 60% Central and 20% Northern HMA. The allocations within the SG are split approximately; 15% Berwickshire, 15% Northern and 70% Central.  The majority of the Berwickshire allocation is within Coldstream for 100	The Housing SG seeks to identify an additional 916 housing units, to meet the identified shortfall. It was considered that in order to distribute the shortfall of housing, broadly within the SDA's and surrounding area, the population projections for each SDA and surrounding area were assessed. These projections were used as a guide for allocating sites. However, it should be noted that the LDP does not specify a distribution for the additional 916 units.  It is acknowledged that 100 units are included as the preferred site Hillview North 1: Phase 1 (ACOLD011), in Coldstream. Policy HD4, contained within the LDP states that, ' <i>The longer term housing and mixed use sites identified in the plan will be</i>	It is recommended that Land North of High Street, Ayton (AAYTO004) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.  It is recommended that Land at Eden Road, Gordon (AGORD004) & South of Earlsmeadow: Phase 1, Duns (MDUNS005) are not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

				units and this does not show an even distribution throughout Berwickshire.	<p><i>considered first, but that will not preclude looking beyond those in the event that the shortfall cannot be met from those sites'.</i></p> <p>ACOLD011 forms part of an identified longer term housing site within the LDP. The site ACOLD011 was considered acceptable for housing as part of the SG process.</p> <p>Sites in Ayton &amp; Reston, in Berwickshire, are also contained within the SG.</p>	
Coldstream	<p>1. Hillview North 1 (ACOLD009)</p> <p>2. Hillview North 1: Phase 1 (ACOLD011)</p>	Scott Hobbs Planning on behalf of the land owner Lennel Estate	<p>Object to the exclusion of Hillview North 1 (ACOLD009) from the Housing SG and propose the site is taken forward opposed to only Hillview North 1: Phase 1 (ACOLD011)</p>	<p>1. Welcome the SG and support the findings in relation to the overall site as outlined at ACOLD009. Recognise the SBC position that the 200 unit capacity of ACOLD009 may be beyond the housing land requirement as outlined in the SG.</p> <p>A Development Framework (DF) has been prepared in relation to the overall site, considering a hybrid approach between ACOLD009 and ACOLD011, which allows a longer term approach to be taken to the site, providing certainty going forward. The DF concludes that the Council's estimated capacity for ACOLD011 is 200 units, and that these can be satisfactorily accommodated within the landscape setting of Coldstream, whilst enabling potential future access to additional housing land to the west and facilitating the ongoing expansion of the business land to the east. The DF includes 2 phases, with each phase accommodating 100 units, including all the site requirements contained within the SG. The DF provides a site layout, incorporating ACOLD009, ACOLD011 and the longer term site to the west.</p>	<p>1. Comments are noted.</p> <p>2. The Council note the support for the inclusion of the overall Hill View North site ACOLD009 within the Housing SG. However, the purpose of the Housing SG is to ensure that the Council maintains a 5 year effective housing land supply, for the LDP period. The submission indicates that Phase 1 will be effective within the LDP period, however Phase 2 delivery will be up to 2035. Therefore, Phase 2 will not be effective within the LDP period. However, the site will remain identified within the LDP for longer term housing development.</p> <p>3. Comments are noted.</p>	<p>It is recommended that Hillview North 1: Phase 1, Coldstream (ACOLD011) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.</p> <p>It is recommended that Hillview North 1, Coldstream (ACOLD009) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.</p>

				<p>2. The land owner seeks inclusion of the overall Hill View North ACOLD009 site within the SG, albeit accompanied by a clear statement to the effect that it will be developed over 2 phases. Phase 1 should relate to the current LDP period, while Phase 2 to the period 2035. This has the advantage of providing certainty for the Council, the Estate and the tenant farmer over the long term future of the land.</p> <p>3. No disputing the effectiveness of the overall site, which is in a single ownership, and highly marketable. Services are available and there are no constraints to the site being brought forward for development, subject to detailed planning permission being secured.</p>		
Coldstream	Hillview North 1: Phase 1 (ACOLD011)	Ferguson Planning on behalf of Roxburghe Estates	Object to the deliverability of Hillview North 1: Phase 1 (ACOLD011)	Question the deliverability of the site over the LDP lifespan, as it was allocated for 'longer term' development within the LDP.	<p>The Council note the comments.</p> <p>Policy HD4: Meeting the Housing Land Requirement/Further Housing Land Safeguarding, states that <i>'The longer term housing and mixed use sites identified in the plan will be considered first, but that will not preclude looking beyond those in the event that the shortfall cannot be met from those sites considered to have acceptable impacts'</i>.</p> <p>The owner of ACOLD011 has submitted supporting documentation (Development Framework), as part of the consultation process. There are 3 housing allocations within Coldstream and 1 is actively being developed at present.</p>	It is recommended that Hillview North 1: Phase 1, Coldstream (ACOLD011) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

					It is considered that releasing (Phase 1) of the longer term housing site for 100 units, will be a sufficient contribution towards the housing shortfall, as part of the Housing SG. This would retain the northern part of the longer term site for future housing. It is considered that (Phase 1) of the site will be effective within the plan period.	
Coldstream	<p>1. Land at Ladies Field (ACOLD008)</p> <p>2. Hillview North 1: Phase 1 (ACOLD011)</p>	Savills on behalf of the land owner	Object to the exclusion of Land at Ladies Field (ACOLD008) from the Housing SG and propose it replaces the preferred housing allocation Hillview North 1: Phase 1 (ACOLD011)	<p><b>Support inclusion of ACOLD008</b></p> <p>1. ACOLD008 should be brought forward as a preferred housing site, contributing to the effective housing land supply and requirement for Berwickshire, instead of ACOLD011. ACOLD011 is unlikely to be developed in the time frame.</p> <p>2. The clients are in discussions with the Council in regard to the provision of a cemetery within Coldstream, which could be located on part of the Ladies Field site. The cemetery could be relevant to this representation because the installation of services for the cemetery could significantly enhance the marketability and effectiveness of a housing site.</p> <p>3. The reference to the woodland on the eastern boundary of the site, being a strong and natural boundary to Coldstream is inaccurate, for a number of reasons;</p> <p>a) The settlement boundary extends west of the site on the other side of the road, encompassing the health and dental facility in this location. As a result built development of</p>	<p>Comments are noted.</p> <p><b>ACOLD008</b></p> <p>In 2007 Scottish Borders Council (SBC) commissioned an independent landscape consultant to carry out a Landscape Capacity Study within the Scottish Borders with a view to identifying areas which may be suitable for housing development. With regards to Coldstream, land to the north of the town was identified. With regards to the site in question the study stated that development within the '<i>Wooded Policies and Pasture</i>' character area is constrained by the elevated location of the open field, its detachment from the settlement and the role which the rising ground and substantial woodlands play in creating a sense of containment for the settlement edge. These policy woodlands also contribute to the wider setting of the town, and the River Tweed, as well as for The Lees, and provide a well-used recreational resource for the settlement. In addition, it complements the policies associated with Belmont House on the eastern side of the town, as together they frame the town and its distinctive topographical location.</p> <p>ACOLD008 was previously considered for</p>	<p>It is recommended that Land at Ladies Field, Coldstream (ACOLD008) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.</p> <p>It is recommended that Hillview North 1: Phase 1, Coldstream (ACOLD011) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.</p>

				<p>Coldstream extends to the north and west of this site;</p> <p>b) A 'Welcome to Coldstream' sign is located a significant distance north and west of the site;</p> <p>c) There is a pavement and street lighting extending a significant distance west of the site;</p> <p>d) The 30mph speed limit is located a significant distance west of the site;</p> <p>e) There are three houses to the north of the site and a further dwelling on the same side of the road to the west of the site. Therefore there is already a precedent for residential development in the locale.</p> <p>4. There are no known biodiversity issues/considerations associated with the site, which would preclude development.</p> <p>5. The proposal would not affect the policies/other woodland in the vicinity of the site. The development could be incorporated at the site, which would not extend development along Kelso Road, which the Landscape Capacity Study identifies as damaging the sense of arrival into Coldstream. The development would not be visible from the western approach to Coldstream, due to the woodland on the western side of the site, and as a result development does not affect the factors raised by the Landscape Capacity Study. Views into the site are limited due to existing mature trees above the banks of the River Tweed. The Landscape Study also identifies that the site performs very well in terms of</p>	<p>inclusion as part of the Local Plan Amendment (LPA). The site was subject to Examination by the Reporter and was not taken forward as part of the LPA. The site was again considered for inclusion as part of the Local Development Plan (LDP) process. It was concluded that the site was separated from Coldstream by means of very mature and substantial tree belt, and not appropriate for development, as it extends beyond the mature woodland which finished the boundary to the settlement and would affect the woodland policy setting.</p> <p>It is noted that the clients are in separate discussions with the Council, regarding the provision of a cemetery on part of the site. It is acknowledged that the issue of a new cemetery needs to be addressed as a matter of urgency. Any proposal for housing and/or cemetery would require to be tested through the development management process and would need to be in compliance with the LDP process, specifically Policy PMD4: Development Outwith Development Boundaries.</p> <p>An independent study has identified the site in question as the preferred location for a new cemetery. The landowners have stated they will only allow a cemetery on the land, if they are allowed an element of housing.</p> <p>Previous submissions in respect of the LDP have resulted in the site not being considered appropriate for a housing allocation. It is not considered the proposed cemetery as part of the overall package is sufficient grounds.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--



			<p>sustainability criteria, a key element of placemaking considerations.</p> <p>6. Landscape concerns are addressed within their EDAW report from 2009, they see no counter evidence to the findings of this document within the Council's assessment.</p> <p>7. The client states that the field has never been used for agriculture and so there would be no net loss in productive land if the site was developed. The presence of the River Tweed SSSI is not considered relevant.</p> <p>8. See no evidence as to potential archaeological issues, however, this could be confirmed in due course and would not preclude development. The client has no knowledge of a Reporter having visited the site.</p> <p>9. It is highly unlikely that the combination of the allocated sites would come forward to deliver 60-100 units. They are aware that a number of allocations in Coldstream have not come forward over an extended period of time.</p> <p>10. There is already an existing FRA and Transport Study for Ladies Field. A Masterplan is not required as a DF has already been produced. Major services can be taken from the adjacent road. The access road would, in principle, be delivered through the siting of the cemetery, and this helps viability of development by removing a major</p>	<p><b>ACOLD011</b></p> <p>It should be noted that ACOLD011 is already identified within the LDP as an area for longer term housing development. Policy HD4 states that <i>'The longer term housing and mixed use sites identified in the plan will be considered first'</i>.</p> <p>The site assessment concluded that ACOLD011 integrates well into the settlement and appropriate landscaping and planting. There is good infrastructure, connectivity opportunities, including road access from the adjacent employment allocation. It is considered that phase 1 of the overall longer term allocation would be effective with the remainder of the site retained for future development.</p> <p>The owner of ACOLD011 has submitted supporting documentation and a Development Framework for the site, supporting its effectiveness.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

				<p>infrastructure cost. No landscape buffer is required for this site and there is no need to build pedestrian or cycle links.</p> <p>11. M &amp; J Ballantyne have expressed an interest in the Ladies Field site. As a result, the prospect of development at Ladies Field over the lifetime of the LDP is considerably higher than at ACOLD011.</p> <p>12. The clients believe that Ladies Field is a highly effective and deliverable housing site that is ready to contribute towards the additional housing requirement over the next 5 years.</p> <p>13. The site will not have an adverse landscape impact nor a significant impact on the setting of the southern part of Coldstream.</p> <p>14. Ladies Field has a better relationship with Coldstream and as a result is more attractive place to live than ACOLD011. The marketing of Ladies Field would be easier and a more viable development would result.</p> <p><b>Support exclusion of ACOLD011</b></p> <p>15. Site requirements for ACOLD011 are onerous and question the level of development that could be achieved. The FRA may reduce the developable area for ACOLD011. Significant expense to produce a masterplan, build roads, plant landscape buffers and develop pedestrian and cycle links. These bring risks to the deliverability of the site and</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>its effectiveness.</p> <p>16. There is no developer interest in ACOLD011, therefore the site is not effective or deliverable. Unclear who will market the site.</p> <p>17. Ladies Field is located in better proximity, in comparison to ACOLD011 to; Duns Road, public transport, bus stop, health and dental services and ACOLD011 does not lend itself to walking or public transport links.</p> <p>18. They do not believe that ACOLD011 is as effective as Ladies Field. In addition, they question whether 100 units can be delivered at ACOLD011 in the 5 year period.</p>		
Coldstream	Hillview North 1: Phase 1 (ACOLD011)	SEPA	Support	<p>Support the requirement for investigation of any potential flood risk within the site to be undertaken prior to development and mitigation where required.</p> <p>The site is smaller than the one we commented on as part of the 'Call for sites'. The area of flood risk concern was within the larger site, but not this one. Therefore, SEPA have no further flood risk comments. SEPA has no specific requirement for a FRA, however the Council may want to consider this matter as far as its interests are concerned.</p>	Comments are noted.	It is recommended that Hillview North 1: Phase 1, Coldstream ACOLD011 is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Coldstream	Hillview North 1: Phase 1 (ACOLD011)	Scottish Natural Heritage	Note	<p>SNH agree with the site requirement that boundary features should be protected. However, query the requirement for landscape buffer areas along both the western and eastern boundaries and with</p>	<p>Comments are noted.</p> <p>The proposal includes a buffer protection zone along the southern boundary, to protect and conserve the existing tree belt</p>	It is recommended that Hillview North 1: Phase 1, Coldstream ACOLD011 is included within the Finalised

				<p>the adjacent employment allocation.</p> <p>While this extension to the settlement should be appropriately contained, the existing woodland already separates and somewhat isolates this allocation from the existing settlement. Further changes to boundaries should ensure that development appropriately relates to and connects to the existing settlement and to the remainder of ACOLD009.</p>	<p>to the south.</p> <p>A landscape buffer area is to be formed along the western boundary of the site, as indicated within the SG. Another landscape buffer area is to be formed along the eastern boundary, with the adjacent employment allocation. This will ensure a natural finish to the boundaries of the site and that a buffer area is created between the development site and the adjacent employment allocation.</p> <p>Any proposals showing the buffer areas would need to be submitted and assessed at the time of any detailed planning application. Overall, it is considered that planting should be carried out on both the eastern and western boundaries, although this can be re-assessed at the planning application stage, pending the detailed site layout and positioning of the houses.</p>	<p>Supplementary Guidance on Housing.</p>
Duns	South of Earlsmeadow: Phase 1 (MDUNS005)	Edwin Thompson on behalf of the land owners G W Thomson and Sons	Object to South of Earlsmeadow: Phase 1 (MDUNS005) being an alternative site and state it should be a preferred site	<p>1. The development of MDUNS005 would have the following benefits; improvements to local infrastructure, provision of an events area and open space, improved cycle path and footpath.</p> <p>2. This site has been put forward as an alternative site rather than a preferred site, due to there being allocated sites within Duns, which have not been developed. However, this is the same in other settlements throughout the area, which have preferred sites in the SG. MDUNS005 should be considered as a preferred site within the SG.</p>	<p>1. Comments are noted.</p> <p>2. There are 6 housing allocations and 2 re-development allocations currently within Duns, as contained within the LDP. Each settlement and HMA must be assessed in their own context. In the case of Duns, it is considered that there is sufficient housing land for the plan period and therefore site MDUNS005 is not a preferred option within the SG.</p>	<p>It is recommended that South of Earlsmeadow: Phase 1, Duns (MDUNS005) is not included in the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.</p>
Duns	South of Earlsmeadow:	Sports Scotland	Note	The site is located adjacent to what is listed as a 'playing field' on the OS map.	Comments are noted.	N/A

	Phase 1 (MDUNS005)			While none of the land proposed to be allocated appears within the marked area, it is noted that a secondary access is proposed via Station Avenue which has the potential to impact on the playing field. Should a planning application be submitted that affects the playing field, then Sport Scotland would likely be a statutory consultee and base our response on the SPP criteria.		
Duns	South of Earlsmeadow: Phase 1 (MDUNS005)	SEPA	Support	Support the requirement for a flood risk assessment.  Recommend stating in the developer requirements that consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site which may exacerbate flood risk.  Require a modification to the developer requirement to investigate the possibility of de-culverting.	Comments are noted.  If the site MDUNS005 was to be taken forward for inclusion in the finalised Housing SG, the site requirement would be amended to read;  <i>'Flood risk assessment will be required to assess the risk from the small watercourse and mitigation where necessary and investigate the possibility of de-culverting'.</i>  However, it should be noted that the site is not proposed for inclusion within the Finalised Housing SG.	It is recommended that South of Earlsmeadow: Phase 1, Duns (MDUNS005) is not included in the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Duns	South of Earlsmeadow: Phase 1 (MDUNS005)	Scottish Natural Heritage	Note	We note that our previous comments on retaining and connecting via existing paths in the north of the site have been incorporated in the site requirements.  We again highlight the potential for an important natural open space and green network connection between the public park and the schools to be created for the longer term. While the site requirements draw attention to these issues, we advise that it would be beneficial if the spatial extent and the design principles of the green network	Comments are noted. Acknowledge the final point regarding the proposed site requirement.  If the site MDUNS005 was to be taken forward for inclusion in the finalised Housing SG, the site requirement would be amended to read;  <i>'The long term maintenance of landscaped areas and the wetland area must be addressed'.</i>  However, it should be noted that the site is	It is recommended that South of Earlsmeadow: Phase 1, Duns (MDUNS005) is not included in the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

				<p>requirements for the northern part of the site were set out in further detail. In this regard, we suggest there may be limited opportunities for housing development in the northern field, if wider strategic green network and educational outdoor learning benefits are to be realised on this site and over the longer term of future settlement growth.</p> <p>The site requirements include <i>'The long term maintenance of landscaped areas must be addressed'</i>. It is unclear whether this applies to the requirement to create an attractive wetland feature and scattered woodland to define the site. Both of these will require long-term management.</p>	not proposed for inclusion within the Finalised Housing SG.	
Gordon	Land at Eden Road (AGORD004)	Edwin Thompson on behalf of the land owner Miles Browne	Object to the exclusion of Land at Eden Road (AGORD004) from the Housing SG	<p>1. The overall assessment for AGORD004 states that <i>'Gordon is located within close proximity to Earlston and Greenlaw where there are longer term opportunities which could be brought forward for housing in the first instance'</i>. However, there are no preferred or alternative options put forward in either Earlston or Greenlaw.</p> <p>2. The assessment concludes that <i>'The proposal is for 20-25 units and it is not considered that this would make a significant contribution towards the housing shortfall'</i>. The contributor states that a larger site could have been put forward for Gordon but it would be likely that the Council would deem this to be too large a site for such a settlement'.</p>	<p>1. Comments are noted. If required, there are longer term sites identified within the LDP in the Berwickshire area, which could be brought forward. The conclusion of the Stage 1 RAG for AGORD004 states that if necessary the longer term sites within Earlston and Greenlaw could be looked at in the first instance.</p> <p>Two of the longer term sites, (Coldstream and Reston) are proposed within the Finalised SG on Housing. Along with a smaller infill allocation within Ayton, this is considered sufficient for the Berwickshire HMA, for the plan period. Furthermore, given the size of Gordon and the existing undeveloped housing allocation, it is considered that there is sufficient housing within Gordon for the plan period.</p> <p>2. The Council can only assess the site which</p>	It is recommended that Land at Eden Road, Gordon (AGORD004) is not included in the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

				<p>3. The site at Eden Road is a better site, compared to the existing housing allocation BG09D, which has access issues. Eden Road is closer to service connections, has better access and is closer to the main village amenity services. Various road improvements are required for BG09D, which will include works on land outwith the owner's control, which may impact upon the site being developed. Furthermore, AGORD004 can be delivered within the LDP period.</p>	<p>was submitted as part of the 'Call for Sites' process.</p> <p>3. The existing allocation BG09D forms part of the LDP and is not subject to review as part of the Housing SG. The purpose of the SG is solely to identify new housing opportunities, to meet the housing shortfall. Furthermore, it is re-iterated that given the size of Gordon and the existing undeveloped housing allocation, it is considered that there is sufficient housing land allocated in Gordon for the LDP period.</p>	
Greenlaw	Halliburton Road (AGREE008)	Peter J A Leggate (Land owner)	<p>Object to Halliburton Road (AGREE008) not being a preferred site within the Housing SG</p>	<p>1. Confirm ownership of the field and would be pleased to see it brought forward for development.</p> <p>2. Object that the site has been allocated as an alternative rather than a preferred site. AGREE008 has a unique setting, adjacent to and sharing access/servicing requirements with an undeveloped affordable housing site AGREE004. It would make sense to see the allocation AGREE004 and this site being developed at the same time.</p> <p>The site is as strategically and equally well located as Ayton, Reston and Coldstream. The 144 houses should be more equally apportioned.</p> <p>The houses in Reston are unlikely to be developed until the train station is built and an additional 100 units in Coldstream is more than generous.</p> <p>Greenlaw is well placed and equally suited for development. Sites which have</p>	<p>1) Comments are noted.</p> <p>2) Comments are noted.</p> <p>AGREE008 was proposed as an alternative site, given the number of existing undeveloped housing and mixed use allocations currently within Greenlaw, contained within the LDP.</p> <p>It should be noted that the existing allocations contained within the LDP are not subject to review as part of the Housing SG process. The purpose of the SG is to identify new housing opportunities, to meet the identified housing shortfall.</p> <p>It is considered there is sufficient housing land in Greenlaw and the wider Berwickshire area to meet the identified housing shortfall and the site should remain a longer term opportunity.</p>	<p>It is recommended that Halliburton Road, Greenlaw (AGREE008) is not included in the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.</p>

				<p>already been allocated for housing in Greenlaw and Reston have in recent years not attracted new housing.</p> <p>Request that AGREE008 is put forward as a preferred site within the Housing SG.</p>		
Greenlaw	Greenlaw Poultry Farm (AGREE007)	Turley on behalf of Amber Real Estate Investments Ltd	Object to the exclusion of Greenlaw Poultry Farm (AGREE007) from the Housing SG and suggest it is included	<p>1. The submission states that given the accepted shortfall in effective housing land supply, SPP's presumption in favour of sustainable development which contributes to meeting an effective five year housing land supply, is a significant material consideration in the consideration of planning applications.</p> <p>2. The site is previously developed brownfield land, adjacent to the Greenlaw settlement boundary, which would bring benefits in terms of neighbouring amenity.</p> <p>3. The three existing allocated housing sites within the LDP (AGREE006, BG200 &amp; AGREE004) are all contained within the established housing land supply for 90 units, of which only 15 are deliverable within the plan period. Concerns are raised as to the lack of progress within these sites and the inclusion within the LDP. This site is deliverable and would make a short term contribution to the effective housing land supply. The site is wholly within the control of AREIL. The site is marketable and BNP Paribas agents have been engaged to carry out marketing of the site.</p> <p>4. The re-development of the site will result in a number of construction related</p>	<p>Comments are noted. There are already substantial housing allocations within Greenlaw. Land take-up has been limited in Greenlaw and it is not considered that there is justification to allocate further housing land at this point in time.</p> <p>The proposed site should not be assessed against the criteria contained within Policy PMD4. Policy HD4 sets out the requirement for the Housing SG to address the housing shortfall for the LDP period. Therefore, there is a mechanism in place, to identify the required housing shortfall for the plan period.</p> <p>Since the site was submitted for consideration as part of the Housing SG, a planning application was submitted and refused for housing on the proposed site, for the same reasons as stated above.</p> <p>It should be noted that the existing housing allocations in Greenlaw, contained within the LDP, are not subject to review, as part of the Housing SG.</p> <p>There is nothing substantially new as part of this submission, which would alter the recommendation set out in the Draft Housing SG.</p>	It is recommended that Greenlaw Poultry Farm, Greenlaw (AGREE007) is not included in the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.



				<p>jobs which will benefit the local economy.</p> <p>5. Sufficient capacity in the local network to accommodate additional traffic generated from the site. There are no constraints in respect of flooding, WWTW or surface water run-off.</p> <p>6. There would not be an ecological impact from developing the site.</p> <p>7. The site would provide new housing, in keeping with the character of the area, more than the existing chicken processing facility.</p>		
Greenlaw	Halliburton Road (AGREE008)	SEPA	Support	Support the requirement to consider surface water runoff from the nearby hills and to provide mitigation where necessary.	Comments are noted. However, it should be noted that the site is not proposed for inclusion within the Finalised Housing SG.	It is recommended that Halliburton Road, Greenlaw (AGREE008) is not included in the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Reston	Reston Long Term 2 (AREST004)	Grant & Susan Spence	Object (amenity, access, sewage, drainage)	<p>1. Their property backs directly onto the proposed area, if new houses were built, question how close they would be to their boundary wall.</p> <p>2. Query access, sewage and drainage and the impact 38 units will have upon this.</p> <p>3. When there is open space elsewhere, it is difficult to understand why it would be a consideration to build new houses in a field which is enclosed on all 4 sides.</p>	<p>1. The layout and design of any development would be assessed as part of any future planning application. The allocation is merely concerned with the principle of housing within the site.</p> <p>2. Comments are noted. The Roads Planning Officer and Scottish Water were consulted as part of the Draft Housing SG and any comments have been taken on board and where necessary incorporated into the site requirements.</p> <p>3. Comments are noted. The site is currently identified in the LDP for longer term housing. Policy HD4 in the LDP states that the longer term housing sites will be</p>	It is recommended that Reston Long Term 2, Reston (AREST004) is included in the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

					considered in the first instance, for inclusion within the Housing SG.	
Reston	Reston Long Term 2 (AREST004)	Joyce M McLean	Object (amenity of neighbouring residents, access, other suitable sites)	<p>1. The Church Field which is proposed for inclusion is surrounded on three sides by private housing whose boundaries are all close to the boundary of this field and on the fourth side the field is right next to the main railway station. The privacy of all residents bounding this field would be intruded on if development was considered.</p> <p>2. The field is unsuitable due to access restrictions from both Main Street and The Orchard. It is a myth that the old Railway Station is to be re-opened as it is now all privately owned.</p> <p>3. There have been other sites granted planning consent for development within the village which remain undeveloped, which would be more suitable to be included, these are;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The former Auction Mart Site</li> <li>b) The field to the left as you enter the Village on the south side opposite the turning for Ladeside;</li> <li>c) Site beyond the primary school towards Greenhead to the north of the village.</li> </ul>	<p>1. The comments are noted. The layout and design of any development would be assessed as part of any future planning application. The Housing SG is merely concerned with the principle of housing within the site.</p> <p>2. The comments are noted. The Roads Planning Officer, Lead Officer for Access &amp; Transport and Transport Scotland were consulted as part of the Draft Housing SG and any comments have been taken on board and where necessary incorporated into the site requirements.</p> <p>3. The comments are noted. The former Auction Mart site is already allocated for mixed use development within the LDP and has a pending planning application. Other than the allocated mixed use and housing sites, there are no other large extant sites within Reston, which currently contribute towards the established housing land supply.</p>	It is recommended that Reston Long Term 2, Reston (AREST004) is included in the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Reston	Reston Long Term 1 (AREST003)	Mr J F Cockburn	Object (Flooding grounds)	<p>Prior to the 2003 re-design and improved culvert beneath Chirnside Road, this 'proposed' site lay beneath several feet of water during the floods of October 2002.</p> <p>Consideration should therefore be given</p>	Comments are noted. As part of the consultation process SEPA and the Council's Flood Prevention Officer were consulted and any comments have been taken on board and where necessary incorporated into the site requirements. It should be noted that the site was included within the Draft	It is recommended that Reston Long Term 1, Reston (AREST003) is not included in the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

				to an alternative site for housing.	Housing SG, as an alternative housing site. However, the site is not proposed for inclusion within the Finalised Housing SG.	
Reston	1. Reston Long Term 1 (AREST003) 2. Reston Long Term 2 (AREST004)	Mrs J J McLean	Note (Concerns regarding education capacity)	Welcome more houses within Reston.  From previous planning projects within Reston, it was envisaged that an overall brief was to be provided for any large future developments at Reston, to its cost, has suffered from piecemeal developments.  Concerns raised regarding the future capacity of the Reston Primary School with the additional housing being proposed, along with other sites and consents.	Comments are noted.  A Planning Brief has been prepared, which includes sites (AREST003 & AREST004), although it requires to be updated.  Education advised that Reston Primary School can accommodate the site AREST004. The release of AREST003 would trigger the need to additional capacity.	It is recommended that Reston Long Term 2, Reston (AREST004) is included in the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.  It is recommended that Reston Long Term 1, Reston (AREST003) is not included in the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Reston	Reston Long Term 2 (AREST004)	Reston and Auchencrow Community Council	Object (Future school provision, flooding and visual amenity)	1. The site is a preferred option for the siting of a replacement school for Reston. The existing school is constrained and is not suitable to be extended. Any housing would increase the burden on the school forcing new build.  2. Raised concerns regarding flooding.  3. Housing would have a negative impact on resident's visual amenity of the surrounding area.	1. Comments are noted. However, the site is already identified for longer term housing within the LDP SREST002. It should be noted that Education advised that Reston Primary School can accommodate the site AREST004.  2. Comments are noted. As part of the consultation process, SEPA and the Council's Flood Protection Officer were consulted and any comments have been taken on board and where necessary incorporated into the site requirements.  3. Any planning application would need to be in compliance with Policy HD3: Protection of Residential Amenity.	It is recommended that Reston Long Term 2, Reston (AREST004) is included in the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Reston	Reston Long Term 1 (AREST003)	Reston and Auchencrow Community Council	Object (Future school provision, flooding and	1. The site is adjacent to MREST001 which is allocated for mixed use development and already has a planning brief.	Comments are noted. As part of the consultation process, SEPA, Council's Flood Protection Officer and Council's Landscape Officer were consulted. Any comments were	It is recommended that Reston Long Term 1, Reston (AREST003) is not included in the

			visual amenity)	<p>2. Raised concerns regarding flooding.</p> <p>3. Raised concerns regarding the retention of trees within the site, some of which have TPO's.</p> <p>4. Reference is made to the approved planning brief 'Reston Auction Mart', to which they consider outdated and no longer should be a consideration.</p>	taken on board and where necessary, incorporated into the site requirements.	Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Reston	Reston Long Term 2 (AREST004)	John White	Support Reston Long Term 2 (AREST004) as a preferred site	<p>Support the Council's identification of AREST004 in the Housing SG as a preferred site for housing.</p> <p>1. Raised concerns regarding potential future access to the Railway Station through Mart Street.</p> <p>2. Commented on the orientation of the potential Railway Station in a more linear arrangement.</p>	Comments are noted. However, it is acknowledged that these relate to proposals for a railway station and not specifically for housing on AREST004.	It is recommended that Reston Long Term 2, Reston (AREST004) is included in the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Reston	<p>1. Reston Long Term 1 (AREST003)</p> <p>2. Reston Long Term 2 (AREST004)</p>	Reston & Berwick Farming Co	<p>Support the inclusion of Reston Long Term 2 (AREST004) as a preferred housing site &amp; Reston Long Term 1 (AREST003) as an alternative housing site</p> <p>Object to the site capacity of Reston Long Term 2</p>	<p>1. Support the inclusion of AREST004 as a preferred site for development in the SG.</p> <p>2. Acknowledge the Council's reasons for supporting a smaller allocation at this time and support the identification of AREST003 as an alternative option.</p> <p>3. Do not support the indicative site capacity for AREST004, or the site requirements, particularly in respect of the planning brief. Suggest increasing the site capacity to 40 units.</p> <p>4. The approved planning brief is now out of date.</p>	<p>Comments are noted.</p> <p>It is considered that 38 units is an acceptable site capacity for the site. However, it should be noted that the site capacity is only indicative and a higher density could be tested through the submission of a planning application.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that some concerns relate to proposals for; a Railway Station, education and potential developer contributions. These points do not relate specifically to the sites AREST003/AREST004.</p>	<p>It is recommended that Reston Long Term 2, Reston (AREST004) is included in the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.</p> <p>It is recommended that Reston Long Term 1, Reston (AREST003) is not included in the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.</p>

			(AREST004) and raise concerns regarding education & access	<p>5. Raised concerns regarding the potential future access to the Railway Station through Mart Street and not via The Orchard.</p> <p>6. Commented on the orientation of the potential Railway Station in a more linear arrangement.</p> <p>7. Solution needs to be identified for the school capacity.</p> <p>8. Developer contributions may be required towards the delivery of the Railway Station.</p>		
Reston	Reston Long Term 2 (AREST004)	Scottish Natural Heritage	Note	<p>Query the overall benefits of the proposed structure planting along the southern boundary of this relatively small and contained allocation.</p> <p>The proposal does not appear to connect to existing habitats or provide a wider recreational linkage through the settlement. It may however overshadow and reduce the amenity of the proposed settlement. Advise that other forms of open space, such as street trees or a small pocket park incorporating surface water management may provide a suitable alternative.</p> <p>With regards the small water course which may run through the site we would highlight the rounded ecological and placemaking benefits of opening culverts and managing such water above ground.</p> <p>Would note that they are unclear from the brief as to the station parking</p>	<p>Comments are noted.</p> <p>There is a suggested site requirement which includes structure planting along the southern boundary. However, taking on board the advice from SNH, the site requirement for structure planting will not be taken forward into the Finalised SG on Housing. Ultimately any landscaping proposal would be assessed at the time of any planning application, as part of the wider proposals. It should be noted that the landscaping can be re-assessed at the planning application stage, dependent upon the final site layout and house positioning.</p>	<p>It is recommended that Reston Long Term 2, Reston (AREST004) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.</p> <p>It is also recommended that the site requirement (bullet point 9) is removed and the map updated accordingly.</p>

				requirements and how these may influence site layout.		
Reston	Reston Long Term 1 (AREST003)	Scottish Natural Heritage	Note	<p>This site lies to the south of the allocation MREST001 and is included in the adopted development brief as site 2. The site is identified as a longer term safeguarded site that is separated from the existing settlement by the former auction mart. If developed prior to re-development of the auction mart, this site may be perceived as physically and perceptually detached from Reston and opportunities for wider integration could be missed.</p> <p>As with allocation AREST004 we query the overall benefit of the structure planting proposed and suggest that the open space that such a proposal would entail could be utilised to achieve other objectives, including water management and useable or networked open space and path provision. We again highlight the lack of specify on the parking element of the proposal.</p>	<p>Comments are noted.</p> <p>There is a suggested site requirement which includes structure planting along the southern boundary. However, taking on board the advice from SNH, the site requirement for structure planting will not be taken forward, should the site be included within the Finalised SG on Housing. Ultimately any landscaping proposal would be assessed at the time of any planning application, as part of the wider proposals. It should be noted that the landscaping can be re-assessed at the planning application stage, dependent upon the final site layout and house positioning.</p> <p>However, it should be noted that the site is not proposed for inclusion within the Finalised Housing SG.</p>	It is recommended that Reston Long Term 1, Reston (AREST003) is not included in the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Reston	Reston Long Term 1 (AREST003)	SEPA	Support	Support the requirement for a FRA, however require a modification to the text in the development requirement to remove the word 'potentially' as there is a watercourse through the site. The previous FRA has indicated a significant risk and site will likely to heavily constrained and may not be able to accommodate the housing number.	<p>Comments are noted.</p> <p>If the site (AREST003) is taken forward for inclusion in the Finalised Housing SG, amend the existing site requirement to read;</p> <p><i>'A flood risk assessment is required to assess the risk from the small watercourse which flows through the site'.</i></p> <p>However, it should be noted that the site is not proposed for inclusion within the Finalised Housing SG.</p>	It is recommended that Reston Long Term 1, Reston (AREST003) is not included in the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Reston	Reston Long Term 2	SEPA	Support	Support the requirement for a FRA. However require a modification to the	Comments are noted.	It is recommended that Reston Long Term 2,

	(AREST004)			<p>developer requirement to investigate the possibility of de-culverting.</p>	<p>Amend the existing site requirement to read;</p> <p><i>'A flood risk assessment is required to assess the risk from the small watercourse which potentially flows through the site. Consideration should be given to whether there are any culverted/bridges within or nearby which may exacerbate flood risk. In addition, investigation of the possibility for de-culverting should also be undertaken'.</i></p>	<p>Reston (AREST004) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.</p> <p>It is also recommended that the site requirement (<i>bullet point 2</i>) be amended to include:</p> <p><i>'In addition, investigation of the possibility for de-culverting should also be undertaken'.</i></p>
--	------------	--	--	---	---	--

## Central Housing Market Area

- **Ancrum**
  - AANCR002: Page 1 onwards
- **Bowden**
  - ABOWD013: Page 35 onwards
  - ABOWD014: Page 36 onwards
- **Charlesfield**
  - ACHAR003: Page 152 onwards
  - MCHAR002: Page 152 onwards
- **Darnick**
  - ADARN003: Page 37 onwards
- **Earlston**
  - MEARL001: Page 39 onwards
  - MEARL002: Page 39 onwards
  - MEARL003: Page 39 onwards
- **Ednam**
  - AEDNA010: Page 43 onwards
- **Galashiels**
  - AGALA037: Page 50 onwards
  - AGALA033: Page 52 onwards
  - AGALA032: Page 52 onwards
  - AGALA029: Page 54 onwards
  - AGALA036: Page 56 onwards
  - RGALA005: Page 57 onwards
- **Gattonside**
  - AGATT013: Page 59 onwards
  - AGATT016: Page 61 onwards



- **Hawick**
  - AHAWI025: Page 62 onwards
  - AHAWI026: Page 62 onwards
  - RHAWI011: Page 62 & 68 onwards
  - AHAWI027: Page 63 onwards
- **Kelso**
  - RKELS002: Page 69 onwards
  - AKELS028: Page 72 onwards
  - AKELS026: Page 75 onwards
  - AKELS025: Page 78 onwards
- **Melrose**
  - AMELR012: Page 80 onwards
- **Newstead**
  - ANEWS006: Page 83 onwards
  - ANEWS005: Page 101 onwards
- **Newtown St Boswells**
  - ANEWT009: Page 119 onwards
- **Selkirk**
  - MSELK002: Page 62 & 128 onwards
  - ASELK033: Page 121 onwards
  - ASELK041: Page 138 onwards
  - ASELK040: Page 150 onwards
- **Tweedbank**
  - MTWEE002: Page 153 onwards



SETTLEMENT	SITE NAME & SITE CODE	CONTRIBUTOR	COMMENT TYPE	SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATION	PROPOSED RESPONSE	RECOMMENDATION
Ancrum	Dick's Croft II (AANCR002)	Ilona McDowell and John Ferguson	Note	<p>The contributors are happy new houses are planned. In principal they are not against the creation of new housing in Ancrum, on the proposed site.</p> <p>The contributor raises the following concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Will the dwellings really cater for those who most need accommodation, and will there be sufficient social housing and small units for single people, for disabled and/elderly folks?</li> <li>2. The access by road to the area is going to pose problems, and we cannot see how entry could be affected from either our lane or the lane between the field and the Duke's Field development. Surely more thought and consultation is needed?</li> <li>3. We are very glad to hear that an additional village green is proposed, as this does indicate that as planners you recognise the need to create more</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policy HD1 - Affordable and Special Needs Housing within the adopted Local Development Plan 2016 states that developments such as Dick's Croft II (AANCR002) must provide 25% affordable housing within the total number of units. Affordable housing is provided for a range of users and various tenures.</li> <li>2. The draft Housing Supplementary Guidance only identifies sites for future development along with some key site requirements to be taken into consideration when the site is developed. Further details such as site access and landscaping will be confirmed if a planning application is submitted for the site, although the Council's Roads Planning Team have not identified any unsurmountable issues with development at this location.</li> <li>3. Comments noted.</li> <li>4. Regarding additional land</li> </ol>	It is recommended that Dick's Croft II, Ancrum (AANCR002) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

				<p>community space at the same time as building houses for sale. Actually, Ancrum doesn't need another village green, but we believe the village would welcome a communal space for outdoor activity, which is safe, attractive and in keeping with Council biodiversity principles.</p> <p>4. The area identified for public access is adjacent to "Doctor's Lane", immediately opposite the school. Ancrum school is widely considered an excellent example of a small village school. The children and teachers use all the outdoor space they have to full advantage, gardening in planters, playing and learning in the playground. But they have no garden or green space at all. Would it be possible to discuss how the contractors could gift some land within the development to the school?</p> <p>5. How can the planning department or other council agents assure us that if this goes ahead it will not duplicate a major problem of the "Duke's Field" - namely the neglected land at the northern border, or Duke's</p>	<p>for Ancrum Primary School this is something that would need to be discussed between the landowner and the Council's Estates Department.</p> <p>5. Obviously this is something the Council would not wish to see within the village however if the land is outwith the ownership of the Council or the applicant there is limited action that can be taken. If a planning application were to be submitted for the site in the future any approval would include conditions to ensure satisfactory use and development on land within the applicant's control.</p> <p>6. Comments noted.</p> <p>7a. Comments noted.</p> <p>7b. The Council are legally required to notify all properties within 20 metres of the site. As part of the draft Housing SG consultation we extended this to include all properties within a 25 metre boundary. Should a planning application be submitted for the site there would be</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

				<p>Path, which is claimed by neither the Council nor the Duke's Field residents, and which has consequently become the shame of the village?</p> <p>6. The contributor states that as an Ancrum resident they would welcome proportionate growth in the population, especially if this boosted the school and local business such as the shop.</p> <p>7. Further to the above points the contributor states:</p> <p>a) The village badly needs before and after school care facilities for children at Ancrum school and/or nursery provision. If the SBC wants the excellent Ancrum School to survive, they will prioritise this anyway, but especially when considering new developments.</p> <p>b) The consultation should be widened as early as possible. Not only do all of us residents within the locality of the Ancrum Community Council deserve to have our concerns respected, but you and the developers really should get the benefit of our enthusiasm, creativity and love of our village.</p>	<p>further consultation at that stage.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Ancrum	Dick's Croft II (AANCR002)	Scottish Natural Heritage	Note	The contributor states the site requirements should more clearly state that this site is within the Teviot Valleys Special Landscape Area (SLA). As currently written, it appears that the site is adjacent to the SLA. This underplays the need for careful consideration of site layout and design, boundary treatments and landscape and visual impact assessment.	Should the site be taken forward into the finalised Housing SG the site requirement (bullet point 8) should be amended to read:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The site is adjacent to the Conservation Area and also within the Teviot Valleys Special Landscape Area. Careful consideration should be given to site layout and design, boundary treatments and landscape and visual impact assessment</i></li> </ul>	It is recommended that Dick's Croft II, Ancrum (AANCR002) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Ancrum	Dick's Croft II (AANCR002)	Dr J G Paterson	Object	<p>1. The contributor raises concerns regarding air pollution and the associated effects. The contributor considers it illogical and indefensible to create new housing in areas remote from local centres of employment or from the communities on or near to the Borders Railway route. This would also minimise road travel commuting distances to Edinburgh and the associated environmental impact.</p> <p>2. The contributor states the nature, scale and location of the proposed development would result in further gross imbalance in the housing stock provision and erode</p>	<p>1. Comments noted. Ancrum is located within the Central Strategic Development Area as defined within the Strategic Development Plan (SESplan). The Central Strategic Development Area is where growth will be focused due to the concentration of strategic employment sites and access to the A68 and Borders Railway.</p> <p>2. The site design and layout will be decided at the planning application stage. Any application submitted for the site must adhere to the Local Development Plan policies and the Council's</p>	It is recommended that Dick's Croft II, Ancrum (AANCR002) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

				<p>the village character. The Duke's Field development resulted in years of disruption in the village. The houses were architecturally inappropriate in design and density.</p> <p>3. It seems improbable that the existing village infrastructure could accommodate a development of this scale within significant investment. The school may not be able to accommodate additional children. It is unlikely water and drainage have sufficient capacity to deal with 60 additional units. Any works would cause significant disruption to the village.</p> <p>4. The narrow bridge over the Ale Water has already been deemed structurally compromised with essential works postponed. The bridge represents a traffic constriction which would worsen if additional housing on the scale proposed was built. The contributor states this would be a damaging development in the wrong place that would not represent value for money to either the local authority or private developers.</p>	<p>Placemaking and Design SPG. The SPG clearly states new development must seek to uphold and enhance the local character and sense of place.</p> <p>3. Comments noted. The draft housing SG has gone through an extensive consultation process including the Council's Education Asset Strategy Officer who monitors school rolls and when/if a new school or school extension is required. Regarding this site the Asset Strategy Officer stated if the site was to be developed an extension to the Primary School may be required. This will be addressed at the planning application stage once final housing numbers are confirmed. The consultation also included various key agencies including Scottish Water and any required infrastructure upgrades will also be taken into consideration at the planning application stage. Where appropriate the comments received during the consultation process have been included within the site requirements.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

					4. Comments noted. The Council's Traffic and Road Safety Team have no objections relating to the use of the Ale Water Bridge for access to the village should the site be developed. As stated above any required infrastructure upgrades will be taken into consideration at the planning application stage. The Council's Roads Planning Team have been consulted throughout the Housing SG process.	
Ancrum	Dick's Croft II (AANCR002)	Gerard and Sally Henry	Object	<p>1. The contributor appreciates that an increase in the population of the village may have some potential benefits for the Church, the School, the Shop and the Pub however there are other aspects which need to be taken into account.</p> <p>2. The contributor raises concerns regarding the scale and dimension of the proposed site. It is just over 11 years since the village was subjected to its last impact from housing development from consents given in 2005. In 2005 a letter from the Planning Office stated that 29 new homes were envisaged, In 2011 consent was given to 40 new homes.</p>	<p>1. Comments noted.</p> <p>2. Regarding the development at Duke's Field, Ancrum, the site was allocated within the adopted Consolidated Local Plan 2011. The site was allocated with an indicative site capacity of 40 units within the adopted Local Plan. The indicative capacities included within the Local Plan are based on the site area and the anticipated density of development however these should only be regarded as a guide and the capacity could change at the planning application stage. This was the case with the site at Duke's Field where</p>	It is recommended that Dick's Croft II, Ancrum (AANCR002) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.



				<p>However following representations from developers, the number of consents was increased to 49 houses, a 69% increase on the original concept of 29. The original scale of the development expanded to please the developers, but it should be remembered that last time a new playpark was also promised but for reasons that were never fully made public, disgracefully it was claimed, the developers were allowed to renege on this.</p> <p>3. There are not many 'Ancrums' around. Centred around its village green, for a start it has significant cultural and historic claims. It is partly in a Conservation Area, close to the likely battle site of Ancrum Moor in 1545 – it has significance in Borders history. There is still a thriving village store, an active and well-supported Church with a regularly used Village Hall opposite. Further down the street is a high class pub, and opposite the Village Green on which children play and village events take place. Adjacent is a Bowling Green and a not altogether satisfactory</p>	<p>the indicative capacity increased by nine units through the planning application process with a final approved capacity of 49 units. Any play park provision would be confirmed by the Councils' Neighbourhood Services Team.</p> <p>3. Any application submitted for the site must adhere to the Local Development Plan policies and the Council's Placemaking and Design SPG. The SPG clearly states new development must seek to uphold and enhance the local character and sense of place.</p> <p>4. Comments noted.</p> <p>5. Comments noted. The Council's Traffic and Road Safety Team have no objections relating to the use of the Ale Water Bridge for access to the village should the site be developed.</p> <p>6. Any required infrastructure upgrades will be taken into consideration at the planning application stage. The site has gone</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>children’s playground whilst at the western end is the caring and successful village Primary School. Traditional villages have largely disappeared from the Borders. If the Borders are not to become a poorer place, the need to preserve something which has become increasingly rare and this increasingly valuable must be recognised and must be protected. Otherwise, when every village looks like every other village populated by those commuting to Edinburgh, will the planners be hailed for meeting their numerical targets and justifying the railway link or remembered for destroying the essence of the Borders? Bury the village under a swathe of new houses and something irreplaceable will be lost forever. Ancrum its nature and character will have been swapped by overwhelming housing development. Impossible to recreate villages such as Ancrum must be allowed to expand gradually through nature sustainable growth and gradual integration of increase population.</p> <p>4. Any development phase</p>	<p>through an extensive consultation process where comments were received from various key agencies including Scottish Water. Where appropriate these comments have been included within the site requirements.</p> <p>7. Comments noted. Should the site be developed all health and safety requirements will need to be adhered to.</p> <p>8. Comments noted. Any required infrastructure upgrades will be taken into consideration at the planning application stage. The Council’s Roads Planning Team has been consulted throughout the Housing SG process. In relation to the site they provided the following comments:  <i>The existing roads bounding the site will need to be widened to cater for two way flows along with footways as appropriate and street lighting and speed limits will have to extend accordingly. Pedestrian linkage to the footpath along the north western edge of the new</i></p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>needs sensitive handling. The previous experience was not well handled and was a most unhappy one. A total of four companies of builders were involved, with a history of company bankruptcy, builders disappearing off site leaving incomplete or substandard houses and delays in completion.</p> <p>5. Plant and materials required for this work will have to come over the bridge linking the village with the A68. The bridge is already limited to one-way use. Is it strong enough to withstand the impact of the prolonged heavy traffic usage it will face over this period?</p> <p>6. The contributors are lead to believe the sewage system is already at or nearing maximum capacity, If this is the case, there will have to be additional work in the area on the far side of the road and outwith the hatched area on the plan and not listed in your site requirements.</p> <p>7. The impact of noise and disruption will naturally last for well over ten years and some of it inevitably will be</p>	<p><i>Myrescroft development should also be incorporated into any proposal.</i></p> <p><i>Vehicular access is acceptable from all existing roads adjacent to the site and a strong street frontage onto these roads is recommended.</i></p> <p>9. Comments noted. Should an application be submitted for the site this process would involve consultation with the Council's Asset Strategy Officer who would advise on any education requirements relating to the site.</p> <p>10. The Council are legally required to notify all properties within 20 metres of the site. As part of the draft Housing SG consultation we extended this to include all properties within a 25 metre boundary. Should a planning application be submitted for the site there would be further consultation at that stage.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>in close proximity to the School. The safety of the children due to the proximity of heavy plant will need careful provision. If additional facilities are provided such as pre-school nursery then safe access across Doctor's Road must be provided.</p> <p>8. As the road from the Village Green through to the School is very narrow, it is assumed that the main access onto the site will be from the Ancrum-Denholm back road. Currently those approaching the school from the Myrescroft direction have to walk their children up a very narrow road with no footpaths and have to flatten themselves against the hedge when vehicles pass. This needs attention. Also when it comes to upgrading the private road known variously as Doctor's Road, careful provision will be required not impede access as this road is a cul-de-sac serving seven houses and in continual use.</p> <p>9. The suggestion of creating a Play Area, albeit close to an Electricity Sub-Station, is to be welcomed providing safe</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

				<p>access for the children can be established. The small numbers at the School at present render the school vulnerable, Whilst there are enough children in the village of appropriate age to safeguard its future the problem faced by parents is the lack of nursery/pre-school facilities. Provisions made and enforced through the planning consents for such a facility to be created adjoining the school needs to be included.</p> <p>10. The contributors state the letter dated 5<sup>th</sup> December was send to properties within 20 metres of the site. The contributors suggest that the consultation exercise is flawed ad should be re-run and extended in its scope. The contributors make reference to neighbours who have not received a consultation letter and ask how many others have failed to be notified? Should this proposal be taken further, then the consultation and opportunity to make representation must be open to everyone in the village.</p>		
Ancrum	Dick's Croft II (AANCR002)	Judith and Joseph Coulson	Object	1. The contributor raises concerns regarding no	1. Comments noted. The site requirements have	It is recommended that Dick's Croft II, Ancrum

				<p>mention of the restrictions that were placed on the previous development have not been included in the site requirements.</p> <p>2. The contributor also highlights the map included within the neighbour notification letter does not show the completed Duke's Field development or the new house on Doctor's Row.</p> <p>3. The contributor refers to bullet point two of the site requirements and states that if previous regulations and the wishes of the residents in the village are relevant then vehicular access from all existing adjacent roads should not be considered acceptable. No vehicular or pedestrian access to The Wynd was considered possible previously. Pedestrian linkage to the footpath along the north western edge of the new Myrescroft development is easily possible, the existing roadway from the school to the village centre is too narrow to permit footway construction and the consequent increase in vehicular traffic would lead to problems of safety. The</p>	<p>been produced following extensive consultation with key agencies and relevant consultees. It is a number of years since the previous site was allocated and any site requirements or conditions relevant to the earlier site may not be appropriate to this site.</p> <p>2. The base mapping used for the neighbour notification letters is the most recently available data that is available. The base mapping is not live however it is updated regularly to reflect recently completed units.</p> <p>3. Comments noted. The Council's Roads Planning Team has been consulted throughout the Housing SG process. In relation to the site they provided the following comments:</p> <p><i>The existing roads bounding the site will need to be widened to cater for two way flows along with footways as appropriate and street lighting and speed limits will have to extend accordingly. Pedestrian linkage to the footpath along the north</i></p>	<p>(AANCR002) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

				<p>contributor refers to bullet point four of the site requirements in relation to widening of roads with footways. The contributor states whilst it may be possible to the north and south of the field, if The Wynd is to be protected, then this cannot happen along the length of this side of the field. If roads need to be widened how will the existing hedgerows be retained? Whilst they can be replanted some are of great age.</p> <p>4. The proposed play area is suggested next to an existing electricity substation which it is presumed would be relocated and a new position would need to be identified. The contributor also states that the previous development was to have a new children's play area but despite the best efforts of the Community Council and residents this did not happen.</p> <p>5. The contributor states the previous development was handled inefficiently by the Council as the developer was not made to carry out agreed construction as originally set</p>	<p><i>western edge of the new Myrescroft development should also be incorporated into any proposal.</i></p> <p><i>Vehicular access is acceptable from all existing roads adjacent to the site and a strong street frontage onto these roads is recommended.</i></p> <p>It should be noted that the site requirements also stated the need to retain existing hedgerows where possible and also states existing hedgerows are to be supplemented with new planting to retain the sites rural setting.</p> <p>4. Comments noted. Siting of any new play facility on the site would be detailed at the planning application stage. Regarding the previous Duke's Field development it should be noted since the original application was submitted for the site, policy regarding the provision of play facilities has changed significantly. In 2005, new play facilities in residential developments were adopted by the Council as a matter of course and</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	---	--

				<p>out. Therefore any future scheme would require closer monitoring to ensure the developer was fulfilling the wishes.</p>	<p>without any financial recompense. Often these were small in terms of scale and potentially resulted in the duplication of play equipment on a variety of sites within a relatively small geographical area. However this outcome was not considered to be in the best interest of any stakeholders.</p> <p>There is a geographical test to be considered and there will be instances where there is no feasible option other than to provide a new play area as alternative solutions are inappropriate, usually because existing play areas are too far away. However, in this instance, the existing play facility at Ancrum was in close proximity to the area at Duke's Field provisionally identified for the additional play facility. Following much discussion with the administrators it was agreed that a sum of £18,000, would be provided to enhance existing play facilities in the village.</p> <p>5. Any application on the site would include various conditions and would also</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--



					be subject to a legal agreement. These mechanisms would help ensure the site was developed as approved by the Council.	
Ancrum	Dick's Croft II (AANCR002)	Karen and Michael Howe	Object	<p>1. The contributor raises concerns about the capacity of the existing infrastructure in the village. The contributor states there is already an issue with traffic within the village associated with the Primary School. The contributor highlights that there are also access constraints with The Wynd and School Road. Historically access has not been allowed from The Wynd and therefore the proposed development will be impractical.</p> <p>2. The contributor considers the proposed allocation would have a detrimental impact on the character of the village. The existing properties adjacent to the proposed development are larger houses on large plots and any new development should not look to impose a development that is not in keeping with this area of Ancrum.</p> <p>3. There has already been</p>	<p>1. Comments noted. Any required infrastructure upgrades will be taken into consideration should a future planning application be submitted. The Council's Roads Planning Team has been consulted throughout the Housing SG process. In relation to the site they provided the following comments:</p> <p><i>The existing roads bounding the site will need to be widened to cater for two way flows along with footways as appropriate and street lighting and speed limits will have to extend accordingly.</i></p> <p><i>Pedestrian linkage to the footpath along the north western edge of the new Myrescroft development should also be incorporated into any proposal.</i></p> <p><i>Vehicular access is acceptable from all existing roads adjacent to the site and a strong street frontage onto these roads is recommended.</i></p>	It is recommended that Dick's Croft II, Ancrum (AANCR002) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

				<p>recent development within the village which encountered numerous problems with various developers being involved. This resulted in the development taking years to complete and was very disruptive to the community. The contributor considers the previous development at Duke's Field to have provided the range of housing required in Ancrum and that better sites are available elsewhere in the Borders to meet quotas.</p>	<p>2. The site design and layout will be decided at the planning application stage. Any application submitted for the site must adhere to the Local Development Plan policies and the Council's Placemaking and Design SPG. The SPG clearly states new development must seek to uphold and enhance the local character and sense of place.</p> <p>3. Comments noted. Development of any site may inevitably cause a degree of disruption. However this would not be a reason to prevent a site being developed. A full site assessment has been carried out for the site at Dick's Croft II. The site was considered acceptable for development and the site was included as an alternative site within the draft Housing SG. However various other sites within the Borders have also been identified as preferred housing sites.</p>	
Ancrum	Dick's Croft II (AANCR002)	Martin Driver	Object	<p>1. The contributor understood that following the recent Dukes Field development there would be no further house building in</p>	<p>1. Comments noted. Should this site be allocated within the finalised Housing SG and a planning application be submitted in the future then</p>	<p>It is recommended that Dick's Croft II, Ancrum (AANCR002) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary</p>

				<p>Ancrum for the foreseeable future; that any additional housing would incur the cost of upgrading the sewage works as the current facility is now at capacity; shouldn't this be accepted as a limit on further development – surely this gem of an old village in the valley of the River Teviot is not to become a focus of ongoing mindless housing development?</p> <p>2. The contributor also states that 60 units would significantly increase the population of the village and such a demographic consequence would surely require each house in the village to be notified, not just those within 25 metres of the site.</p> <p>3. The contributor considers the proposed disproportionate development would alter the nature and charm of the village, seriously eroding the sense of identity, over-powering the conservation area radiating out from the village green. Widening roads would change the character of this old village which has seen more than its share of housing development in</p>	<p>any required infrastructure upgrades will be taken into consideration at that stage. The site has gone through an extensive consultation process where comments were received from various key agencies including Scottish Water. Where appropriate these comments have been included within the site requirements.</p> <p>2. Comments noted. The Council are legally required to notify all properties within 20 metres of the site. As part of the draft Housing SG consultation we extended this to include all properties within a 25 metre boundary. Should a planning application be submitted for the site there would be further consultation at that stage.</p> <p>3. The site design and layout will be decided at the planning application stage. Any application submitted for the site must adhere to the Local Development Plan policies and the Council's Placemaking and Design SPG. The SPG clearly states new development must seek to uphold and enhance</p>	<p>Guidance on Housing.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	-----------------------------

				<p>recent years. In my opinion, changes to the Ancrum Brig would be nothing short of vandalism.</p> <p>4. The contributor also states they are aware that there is a still a lot of housing to go up elsewhere in the council area in connection with planning permission that has already been given. The contributor questions why additional flexibility is required by the council at this stage?</p>	<p>the local character and sense of place.</p> <p>4. The Local Development Plan includes housing allocations across the Borders. Some of these are yet to be developed, others have planning consent and some are under construction. As part of the Local Development Plan Examination a shortfall of 916 units was identified. This shortfall is being addressed through the Housing Supplementary Guidance (SG). Additional flexibility is required to provide a range and choice of housing sites for developers throughout the Borders.</p>	
Ancrum	Dick's Croft II (AANCR002)	Moira Leggat	Object	<p>1. The contributor states there is already an issue with traffic within the village associated with the Primary School. The Wynd is a single track road and the nearby road is only single track with a blind corner making it a potential danger. The contributor would like the proposed development to resolve this problem.</p> <p>2. The contributor is concerned that the proposed development will affect the</p>	<p>1. Comments noted. Any required infrastructure upgrades will be taken into consideration at the planning application stage. The Council's Roads Planning Team has been consulted throughout the Housing SG process. In relation to the site they provided the following comments:</p> <p><i>The existing roads bounding the site will need to be widened to cater for two</i></p>	It is recommended that Dick's Croft II, Ancrum (AANCR002) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

				<p>character of Ancrum. It is only just three years since the Duke's Field development. That development had a major impact on Ancrum and changed the character of the village appreciably. The contributor also makes references to the previous developers at Duke's Field going into administration owing local tradesmen significant sums of money. The contributor does not want Ancrum to become characterless and destroying the village which already has a designated Conservation Area.</p> <p>3. The contributor states one must not stand in the way of progress – equally though we must protect something that is good, part of our history and culture and not stand idly by and silently watch its destruction.</p>	<p><i>way flows along with footways as appropriate and street lighting and speed limits will have to extend accordingly. Pedestrian linkage to the footpath along the north western edge of the new Myrescroft development should also be incorporated into any proposal.</i></p> <p><i>Vehicular access is acceptable from all existing roads adjacent to the site and a strong street frontage onto these roads is recommended.</i></p> <p>2. The site design and layout will be decided at the planning application stage. Any application submitted for the site must adhere to the Local Development Plan policies and the Council's Placemaking and Design SPG. The SPG clearly states new development must seek to uphold and enhance the local character and sense of place.</p> <p>3. Comments noted.</p>	
Ancrum	Dick's Croft II (AANCR002)	Mr and Mrs Hickey	Object	<p>1. The contributors state the area proposed would almost double the curtilage of the village. No indication is given as to the types of houses that</p>	<p>1. The site design and layout will be decided at the planning application stage. Any application submitted for the site must adhere to</p>	It is recommended that Dick's Croft II, Ancrum (AANCR002) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary

				<p>would be built. The contributor also states that the demographic of the village would change significantly.</p> <p>2. The initial Dukes Field plan proposed in 2004 was for 29 properties this number increased by over 65% by the time this was finally completed. Were similar adaptations to be allowed, this would effectively double the current number of properties added to the village. Employment opportunities in the locality are limited; therefore the properties would be bought by either commuters or by retired people.</p> <p>3. One implication of such changes would be a possible increase in number of children for the village first school. Whilst this would be of benefit in maintain this rural school the building has little room to expand and already has inadequate outdoor space.</p> <p>4. The contributor also states that one consequence of an additional 60 properties in the village would be a very significant increase in traffic.</p>	<p>the Local Development Plan policies and the Council's Placemaking and Design SPG. The SPG clearly states new development must seek to uphold and enhance the local character and sense of place.</p> <p>2. The indicative capacities included within the draft Housing SG are based on the site area and the anticipated density of development however these should only be regarded as a guide and the capacity could change at the planning application stage.</p> <p>3. Comments noted. The draft housing SG has gone through an extensive consultation process including the Council's Education Asset Strategy Officer who monitors school rolls and when/if a new school or school extension is required. Regarding this site the Asset Strategy Officer stated if the site was to be developed an extension to the Primary School may be required. This will be addressed at the planning application stage once final housing numbers are confirmed.</p>	<p>Guidance on Housing.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	-----------------------------

				<p>The contributor makes reference to bullet points 2 and 4 of the site requirements within the Supplementary Guidance and states there are several issues relating to these statements. When the permission was granted for Dukesfield, one of the restrictions placed was that there could be no access on to the Wynd which is the ancient village access track. The contributor assumes this same restriction should apply to the proposed new development but it does not appear to do so. Access from Doctor's Lane would lead to a marked increase in traffic around the narrow corner by the school. This is already a problem with the properties on Causewayend. Then plan suggests that adjacent roads could be widened and pedestrian footways added. Whilst this could indeed be accomplished on the SW boundary, there is no room to widen the cord of Causewayend to improve access to Doctor's lane and the Wynd and its hedgerow boundaries should remain protected.</p> <p>5. With reference to the final</p>	<p>4. Comments noted. Any required infrastructure upgrades will be taken into consideration at the planning application stage. The Council's Roads Planning Team has been consulted throughout the Housing SG process. In relation to the site they provided the following comments:</p> <p><i>The existing roads bounding the site will need to be widened to cater for two way flows along with footways as appropriate and street lighting and speed limits will have to extend accordingly. Pedestrian linkage to the footpath along the north western edge of the new Myrescroft development should also be incorporated into any proposal.</i></p> <p><i>Vehicular access is acceptable from all existing roads adjacent to the site and a strong street frontage onto these roads is recommended.</i></p> <p>It should be noted that bullet point 7 of the site requirements for Dick's</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>site requirement the contributor states there is currently an electricity sub-station at the corner of Doctor Lane and the Wynd. Security fencing has recently been upgraded due to its proximity to the school; if the area were to become an amenity/play space, there would be further safety implications. Creating of a third amenity area, in addition to the existing village green and play area would create corridors along Causewayend, and the footpath along the north-western edge of the Myrescroft development and across to the Wynd. These roads are already dangerous for pedestrians and do not lend themselves to being widened. Even if they did this would merely increase the danger with the increase in vehicular traffic.</p> <p>6. The contributor makes reference to the site requirement which states "...housing fronting on to the open space in this top corner, and continuing with frontages on to the existing lane". The contributor states this is unspecific in terms of the 'lane' to which it refers.</p>	<p>Croft II states:</p> <p><i>Where possible existing hedgerows are to be retained and supplemented by new planting to relate the development to its rural setting.</i></p> <p>5. Comments noted. Details regarding the play area and associated safety issues will be confirmed at the planning application stage.</p> <p>6. The lane referred to within the site requirements is the lane that runs along the northern site boundary in front of Ancrum Primary School.</p> <p>7. The Council are legally required to notify all properties within 20 metres of the site. As part of the draft Housing SG consultation we extended this to include all properties within a 25 metre boundary. Should a planning application be submitted for the site there would be further consultation at that stage.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--	--



				7. The contributor also states they find it concerning that notification of this proposal was only considered to be relevant to such a limited number of Ancrum residents when the implications affect the whole of the community.		
Ancrum	Dick's Croft II (AANCR002)	Mr and Mrs R J Owen	Object	<p>1. The contributor raises concerns regarding the safety of pedestrians and cyclists especially young children and elderly residents. Within the village there are a number of one-track lanes including The Wynd. The contributor states the proposed development will increase the volume of local traffic and make this hazard even more dangerous.</p> <p>2. Ancrum's historic hedged byway (known as The Wynd) has been impacted by recent development on its east side. Further development on its western edge threatens its integrity further. The contributor states this proposal under values and ignores the heritage of the village.</p> <p>3. There is a lack of pre-school/nursery provision in the village. This issue will be</p>	<p>1. Comments noted. Any required infrastructure upgrades will be taken into consideration at the planning application stage. The Council's Roads Planning Team has been consulted throughout the Housing SG process. In relation to the site they provided the following comments:</p> <p><i>The existing roads bounding the site will need to be widened to cater for two way flows along with footways as appropriate and street lighting and speed limits will have to extend accordingly. Pedestrian linkage to the footpath along the north western edge of the new Myrescroft development should also be incorporated into any proposal.</i></p> <p>2. Comments noted. The site has been through an</p>	It is recommended that Dick's Croft II, Ancrum (AANCR002) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

				<p>accentuated by the proposed development. Previous assurances by the Council regarding facilities for children in relation to the previous development were never implemented.</p> <p>4. The previous development was only completed three years ago. The integration of new residents is a challenging ongoing process within the village. The contributor states integration of the first housing development has not been given adequate time to occur or stabilise.</p> <p>5. The contributor acknowledges the site is put forward as an alternative site however goes on to state that even the possibility has consequences.</p>	<p>extensive internal consultation process which included the Council's Lead Officer of Natural Heritage. The comments from the Natural Heritage Team have been incorporated into the draft SG, bullet point 7 of the site requirements states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Where possible existing hedgerows are to be retained and supplemented by new planting to relate the development to its rural setting.</i></li> </ul> <p>3. Comments noted.</p> <p>4. Comments noted.</p> <p>5. Comments noted. A full site assessment has been carried out for the site at Dick's Croft II. The site was considered acceptable for development and the site was included as an alternative site within the draft Housing SG. However various other sites within the Borders have been identified as preferred housing sites.</p>	
Ancrum	Dick's Croft II (AANCR002)	Pat Driver	Object	1. The contributor feels the previous development at Duke's Field has considerably	1. Comments noted. The Council's Traffic and Road Safety Team have no	It is recommended that Dick's Croft II, Ancrum (AANCR002) is not

				<p>altered the feel of the village, which is no longer a tight community where people know each other. The contributor states that the character of the village would be further eroded if the old bridge, off the A68, had to be widened. There has already been a significant increase in the amount of traffic and parked cars in the village which would only increase with further development, heightening the risk of accidents. The contributor also raises concerns that the village hall would not be big enough to hold community events and would require enlarging.</p> <p>2. The contributor requests that the sense of the local community in Ancrum is preserved and its existing character retained by not swamping it with another development.</p>	<p>objections relating to the use of the Ale Water Bridge for access to the village should the site be developed. Any required infrastructure upgrades will be taken into consideration at the planning application stage. The Council's Roads Planning Team has been consulted throughout the Housing SG process. In relation to the site they provided the following comments:</p> <p><i>The existing roads bounding the site will need to be widened to cater for two way flows along with footways as appropriate and street lighting and speed limits will have to extend accordingly. Pedestrian linkage to the footpath along the north western edge of the new Myrescroft development should also be incorporated into any proposal.</i></p> <p><i>Vehicular access is acceptable from all existing roads adjacent to the site and a strong street frontage onto these roads is recommended.</i></p> <p>2. The site design and layout</p>	<p>included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---	---

					will be decided at the planning application stage. Any application submitted for the site must adhere to the Local Development Plan policies and the Council's Placemaking and Design SPG. The SPG clearly states new development must seek to uphold and enhance the local character and sense of place.	
Ancrum	Dick's Croft II (AANCR002)	Prof A M and Mrs M Davison	Object	<p>1. The contributor considers sixty additional houses with impact the current nature of the village. There are no proposals for additional employment nearby and therefore the housing would be used for commuters or those wishing to retire to the rural community. Therefore this will change the demographic of the village and turn it into a dormitory.</p> <p>2. The proposed development will result in an increase of traffic along South Myrescroft which is already congested. Also on-street parking by residents results in the road being single track. The contributor raises concerns regarding a narrow bridge along the A6400 which is single carriageway. The contributor states Scottish Borders</p>	<p>1. Comment notes.</p> <p>2. Comments noted. Any required infrastructure upgrades will be taken into consideration at the planning application stage. The Council's Roads Planning Team has been consulted throughout the Housing SG process. In relation to the site they provided the following comments:  <i>The existing roads bounding the site will need to be widened to cater for two way flows along with footways as appropriate and street lighting and speed limits will have to extend accordingly. Pedestrian linkage to the footpath along the north western edge of the new Myrescroft development should also be incorporated</i></p>	It is recommended that Dick's Croft II, Ancrum (AANCR002) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

				<p>Council have advised the bridge requires attention at which point traffic will require traffic to use the Denholm road or along the A6400. Neither of these routes are suitable for increased traffic for any length of time.</p> <p>3. The contributor raises concerns about the capacity of the waste water infrastructure in the village which will require to be upgraded.</p> <p>4. Ancrum is in an area of outstanding natural beauty which attracts visitors from far and wide. The previous development at Dukes Field resulted in houses which in no way reflect the indigenous rural architecture of the village and therefore detracting from the visual attraction of the area. There was also a lack of supervision by Scottish Borders Council during development of the site resulting in significant disruption for an unacceptable length of time, more houses than originally planned and failure to provide an additional play area.</p>	<p><i>into any proposal.</i></p> <p><i>Vehicular access is acceptable from all existing roads adjacent to the site and a strong street frontage onto these roads is recommended.</i></p> <p>3. Comments noted. As stated above any required infrastructure upgrades will be taken into consideration at the planning application stage. The site has gone through an extensive consultation process where comments were received from various key agencies including Scottish Water. Where appropriate these comments have been included within the site requirements.</p> <p>4. The site design and layout will be decided at the planning application stage. Any application submitted for the site must adhere to the Local Development Plan policies and the Council's Placemaking and Design SPG. The SPG clearly states new development must seek to uphold and enhance the local character and sense of place.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

				<p>5. The contributor makes reference to the site requirement for a village green and states this is a narrow lane with a blind corner adjacent to the school. Therefore it would be inappropriate to increase traffic without widening the road. The contributor has concerns regarding traffic safety and trusts that the Director of Education has been consulted on the proposal.</p>	<p>The indicative capacities included within the Local Development Plan are based on the site area and the anticipated density of development however these should only be regarded as a guide and the capacity could change at the planning application stage. This was the case with the site at Duke's Field where the indicative capacity increased by nine units through the planning application process with a final approved capacity of 49 units.</p> <p>Regarding the previous Duke's Field development it should be noted since the application was submitted for the site, policy regarding the provision of play facilities has changed significantly. In 2005, new play facilities in residential developments were adopted by the Council as a matter of course and without any financial recompense. Often these were small in terms of scale and potentially resulted in the duplication of play equipment on a variety of sites within a relatively small geographical area.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

					<p>However this outcome was not considered to be in the best interest of any stakeholders.</p> <p>There is a geographical test to be considered and there will be instances where there is no feasible option other than to provide a new play area as alternative solutions are inappropriate, usually because existing play areas are too far away. However, in this instance, the existing play facility in Ancrum was in close proximity to the area at Duke's Field provisionally identified for the additional play facility. Following much discussion with the administrators it was agreed that a sum of £18,000, would be provided to enhance existing play facilities in the village.</p> <p>5. Comments noted. The draft housing SG has gone through an internal consultation process which includes the Education Asset Strategy Officer who monitors school rolls and when/if a new school or school extension is required. The comments received have been</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

					incorporated into the draft Housing SG.	
Ancrum	Dick's Croft II (AANCR002)	Ferguson Planning on behalf of Roxburghe Estates	Support	<p>1. The contributor considers the site superior to a number of the preferred sites. The contributor refers to Scottish Planning Policy which requires Councils to identify a generous supply of land for housing within all market areas and should maintain a 5 year supply of effective housing land at all times. The contributor considers the site will make an effective addition to the Council's current shortfall in housing land supply, particularly given the limited constraints distinguished within the phase two assessment. Therefore the site should be allocated for residential development on the basis that it is effective and any constraints can be overcome in the plan period in order to bring forward development.</p> <p>2. The subject site seeks to provide approximately 60 additional dwellings. This proposed level of development will enable the provision of 25% affordable housing; Eildon Housing Association have committed to the provision of this level of affordable housing on the</p>	<p>1. Support noted.</p> <p>2. Comments noted.</p> <p>3. It should be noted that the site has not been dismissed for development. The site was considered acceptable for development as part of the site assessment process. Following this assessment the site was included as an alternative site. This was due to a number of reasons including the sites location within a Special Landscape Area and also due to recent development within the village. A fairly substantial extension to the village has relatively recently been completed at Duke's Field and it is not considered desirable to allocate a further housing development so soon afterwards. It is considered there are more preferable sites within the Scottish Borders which can address the identified housing shortfall.</p> <p>4. Comments noted.</p> <p>5. With reference to the</p>	It is recommended that Dick's Croft II, Ancrum (AANCR002) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.



				<p>site.</p> <p>3. The contributor challenges why AANCRO02 was dismissed for development when it clearly represents a natural extension to Ancrum and one which will not represent coalescence with Jedburgh. There are no site constraints and no contamination issues. The site is on the edge of an existing settlement and is in a sustainable location with regular bus services. The site will not have a major impact on the local road network and is easily accessible to the village centre. The site is not identified within the SEPA flood maps. Mitigation measure can be incorporated in relation to surface water runoff. There are no designated sites within or adjacent to the site with the closest designation being the River Tweed SAC. There are no significant biodiversity features which could potentially be affected by the development of dwellings. In terms of heritage the site is outwith the Conservation Area with no adjacent listed buildings. The site can be screened with significant boundary planting which will</p>	<p>300no units proposed at Lowood, the Scottish Government document entitled "Borders Railway - Maximising the Impact: A Blueprint for the Future" identifies the opportunities the railway corridor offers in terms of being a catalyst for new housing developments, businesses or visitor destinations. It supports the potential of the line in triggering significant economic benefits. The SG on Housing will become part of the statutory Development Plan and it is therefore a key document to ensure implementation of the Blueprint. Lowood is within a highly accessible and sustainable location given its location on land immediately to the north of the Tweedbank Railway terminus. The site is within the Central Borders Housing Market Area which has a proven record of housing market developer interest and consumer demand. The parkland and woodland setting and its proximity to the scenic River Tweed make the site a highly attractive development opportunity. Whilst it is acknowledged there are</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	---	--

				<p>mitigate against any visual impact. The contributor states there are no constraints associated with the site following initial discussions with Scottish Water and Scottish Power and Energy Network (SPEN).</p> <p>4. The contributor states that all sites should be assessed on their individual merits. The site identified at Ancrum should be allocated as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is deliverable within this Local Plan lifespan</li> <li>• No allocation within this area of Ancrum despite it being very popular for new homes</li> <li>• Not within an area of Flood Risk</li> <li>• Sustainable location: Highly accessible to Ancrum Village Centre, Bus services and local education provision</li> <li>• Next to current built form and thus easy access to utilities/ infrastructure</li> <li>• Does not represent coalescence with Jedburgh</li> </ul> <p>5. The site should not be dismissed due to it essentially being too effective especially when</p>	<p>some site constraints to be addressed and overcome, none of these are identified as being insurmountable, and work on a masterplan has already commenced which increases the effectiveness, promotion and delivery of the site. This will investigate in close detail the constraints to be mitigated. It is contended that Lowood is a prime site with an extremely attractive setting for market interest and should be included within the SG.</p> <p>The following was the conclusion of the assessment undertaken for the Draft Housing SG, this remains pertinent:</p> <p><i>The submission of a Flood Risk Assessment would be required to assess risk from the River Tweed as well as surface water flooding issues. Co-location issues include potential for odour from E Langlee landfill (Pollution, Prevention and Control) and WML (Waste Management Licensing) exempt composting site at Pavillion Farm. There is moderate risk to biodiversity and mitigation would be</i></p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>allocating 300 units to another site that has not yet demonstrated its ability to deliver the proposed level of housing. It is important to allocate housing in the Scottish Borders where there is a strong demand – which there is in Ancrum.</p>	<p><i>required to ensure no significant adverse effects on the integrity of the River Tweed SAC. Archaeological investigation would be required. This site is outwith the Tweedbank settlement boundary however it benefits from its close proximity to the station at Tweedbank and business and industrial sites as well as a range of services in Galashiels. The site is entirely enclosed by the River Tweed to the north and by the existing settlement of Tweedbank to the south. The development of the site would not result in settlement coalescence. It is considered that the site offers a strategic opportunity due to its immediate proximity to the railway terminus and its location within the Central Borders. Internally there are a number of constraints which would require to be sensitively addressed. Although lacking in designations, the estate shows clear indications of being a 'designed landscape' with an attractive meandering driveway leading from the gatehouse through parkland to the</i></p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p><i>main house and associated buildings. There is also a significant tree and woodland structure on the estate as well as a pond which is a notable feature. These issues will require careful consideration through the process of the aforesaid masterplan and a tree survey. A Transport Appraisal will be required, with the need for at least two key vehicular access points into the site and effective pedestrian/cycle connectivity. Site access must take cognisance of the possible extension of the Borders Railway and of the potential for a replacement for Lowood Bridge as identified in the Local Access and Transport Strategy. Potential contamination would require investigation/mitigation. A full Drainage Impact Assessment would be required. There is currently no capacity at the Waste Water Treatment Works to accommodate development. The site, with its close proximity to the existing business and industrial uses at</i></p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					<i>Tweedbank offers the opportunity for the extension of the Central Borders Business Park. A masterplan for the site is currently being prepared which will address relevant matters in more detail, including taking account of the existing planned landscape and the consideration of appropriate zoning and phasing.</i>	
Ancrum	Dick's Croft II (AANCR002)	Save Scott's Countryside	Support	We note with great concern that 50% of the Preferred Sites total numbers for the whole Borders are within five miles of Abbotsford House and Scott's Managed Landscape; and nearly 40% no more than two miles distant. We therefore urge SBC, in order to take some pressure off this small middle portion of the central Borders, to use the identified Alternative Sites in Ancrum, Hawick and Kelso.	Support noted.	It is recommended that Dick's Croft II, Ancrum (AANCR002) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Ancrum	Dick's Croft II (AANCR002)	Scottish Environmental Protection Agency	Support	The contributor supports the requirement to consider surface water mitigation measures during the design stage.	Comments noted.	It is recommended that Dick's Croft II, Ancrum (AANCR002) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Bowden	Land to West of Bowden (ABOWD013)	Smith & Garratt on behalf of D Maxwell	Object to the non-allocation of (ABOWD013) within the Housing SG	Object to the non-allocation of the site.	The site was considered as part of the Housing SG. An initial stage 1 RAG assessment was undertaken which concluded that the	It is recommended that Land to West of Bowden (ABOWD013) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary

					<p>site should not be taken forward as part of the Housing SG. The conclusion of the assessment stated: Development of this site is considered to be unacceptable due to the potential adverse impact upon the NSA. Development would not integrate with the existing layout of the settlement at this prominent western approach. Access to services is limited in Bowden and increased car journeys would be necessary to reach services/employment. (Note: Agent wrongly refers to this site as ABOWD011 in his submission).</p>	Guidance on Housing.
Bowden	Land to West of Bowden 2 (ABOWD014)	Smith & Garratt on behalf of D Maxwell	Object to the non-allocation of (ABOWD014) within the Housing SG.	Object to the non-allocation of the site.	<p>The site was considered as part of the Housing SG. An initial stage 1 RAG assessment was undertaken which concluded that the site should not be taken forward as part of the Housing SG. The conclusion of the assessment stated: Development of this site is considered to be unacceptable due to the potential adverse impact upon the NSA. Development would not integrate with the existing layout of the settlement at this prominent western</p>	<p>It is recommended that Land to West of Bowden (ABOWD014) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.</p>

					<p>approach. Access to services are limited in Bowden and increased car journeys would be necessary to reach services/employment. A smaller portion of this site was considered at Examination during the process of the Local Plan Amendment, the Reporter concluded: ‘the site is within the Eildon and Leaderfoot National Scenic Area, and Scottish Natural Heritage has supported its exclusion on landscape grounds. The council makes a general statement about the availability of other more suitable sites, but this would be a matter for a future review of the local plan. In the meantime I find no justification for its inclusion in the finalised plan’.</p>	
Darnick	Bankend (ADARN003)	Edwin Thompson LLP on behalf of H Smith	Objects to site not being included within Housing SG	<p>1. The contributor is concerned that coalescence between Darnick and Tweedbank has been identified. Development of Bankhead field has scope to retain open space or create tree planting as a means of separation at the western end of the field and need not involve any building further to the west of Darnick than the existing house at Darnlee to the south of Waverley</p>	<p>1. The Countryside Around Towns policy seeks to prevent coalescence between settlements within the CAT policy area. Whilst the policy does not preclude any development in the CAT area, the site in question is considered to sit within one of the more sensitive parts of the policy area. Indeed, the forerunner to the CAT policy (Policy EP3 – Prevention of Settlement</p>	<p>It is recommended that Bankend (ADARN003) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.</p>

				<p>Road.</p> <p>2. The contributor notes that the site is not considered to relate to the settlement of Darnick, however it can also be argued that the site is a natural extension and this is echoed in the current local plan which indicates that any further extension of Darnick would be expected to be to the west.</p> <p>3. The contributor considers the potential adverse impacts on the Southern Upland Way, the setting of Darnick, listed building in the vicinity and Eildon &amp; Leaderfoot National Scenic Area are all overstated and could be addressed through landscaping of the site.</p> <p>4. The contributor considers the proposal could provide a much needed site for good quality executive housing with links to Tweedbank railway terminus, Melrose and the Central Borders generally.</p>	<p>Coalescence) was extended by the Reporter at the time of the Local Plan examination to specifically include a stretch of greenfield land between Darnick and the River Tweed which included this site, noting that this was an exceptionally sensitive area. The retention of open space or tree planting would not be sufficient to overcome the harm to the distinct characters of Tweedbank and Darnick which would result from developing this site.</p> <p>2. The site lies broadly to the north west of Darnick across Waverly Road, where the road briefly becomes a dual carriageway. Whilst there are other dwellings and premises north of Waverly Road, the core of Darnick lies to the south of the road and is screened by trees. The development of the site would not represent a natural extension of the village. There is an allocation in a secluded field to the west of Darnick within the LDP, but this does not establish any clear direction for the future development of the</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	---	--



					<p>settlement, and has little to no bearing on the suitability of the proposed site.</p> <p>3. The initial site assessment concluded that development would be expected to result in only potentially adverse impacts on the constraints listed, and these potential impacts were not the basis for excluding the site.</p> <p>4. The benefit of close proximity to Tweedbank Railway Station was considered as part of the wider Stage 1 RAG Assessment. Whilst this was considered to be an advantage for the site, other issues were considered to outweigh it.</p>	
Earlston	Georgefield (MEARL001, MEARL002 & MEARL003)	Felsham Planning and Development on behalf of Rural Renaissance Ltd	Object	<p>1. The contributor supports the adoption of a common set of measures to address the obvious housing land supply shortfall but believes that the Council should go further than is required by the Reporter and ensure that sufficient sites are allocated to actually deliver the 916 unit shortfall.</p> <p>2. The contributor's criticism of the Council is that in making its allocations for the</p>	<p>1. Comments noted. As part of the draft Housing SG the housing shortfall was updated to reflect allocated sites and changes to site capacities. Therefore the SG was required to provide 811 additional units. The total site capacity of the preferred sites is 931 units. This provides additional flexibility and allows for a range and choice of sites.</p> <p>2. The sites included within</p>	It is recommended that the housing sites at Georgefield, Earlston (MEARL001, MEARL002 & MEARL003) are not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

				<p>draft SPG there is a requirement for more rigour in assessment and review. The housing land audit should be the starting point for assessment but it must be up to date and accurate. The contributor details various comments on the Council's Housing Land Audit approach and methodology.</p> <p>3. The contributor objects to the non-inclusion of a housing site in Earlston. The contributor states the site at Georgefield is allocated in the Local Plan for 250 units. The contributor states the area has been judged suitable for development. Recognition should also be given to the opportunity to bring forward land identified for later phases earlier than currently envisaged due to the need to maintain a five year land supply and address questions raised by sites not coming forward as quickly as anticipated.</p> <p>4. The contributor wishes to re-iterate the case in support of the allocation at Earlston and to set out the argument to ensure that this site is developed to its fullest extent as a priority within the</p>	<p>the draft Housing SG have been through a full site assessment process including consultation with various key agencies and internal consultees. It should be noted as part of the Housing Examination as part of the Local Development Plan 2016 the Reporter agreed with the methodology in determining housing land supply used in the Scottish Borders Housing Land Audit.</p> <p>3. Comments noted. In relation to meeting the housing shortfall the Reporter asked the Council to look at redevelopment opportunities and longer term sites to help meet the shortfall. Each of the longer term sites were assessed for potential development however it is not considered that the longer site at Georgefield is effective due to infrastructure constraints and therefore will not be developed within the Local Development Plan period. It should be noted there is already a healthy housing land supply in the town and land take-up in recent years has been limited.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>Local Development Plan. The majority of the Earlston site is already allocated. This proposal seeks the allocation of an additional area, outside the development boundary but extending the current principles underlying the current allocation. The contributor sets out how the site would be developed over nine phases with a total capacity of 796 units, 255 of these units will be in the first five year period. The site will also include a mixed use element.</p> <p>5. The contributor argues that the Central Borders Housing Market Area is too large and needs to focus on areas where there is known demand. Allocations need to be in towns that are known to be marketable and need to be well located to the new Borders railway.</p> <p>6. The site is within the primary development hub as defined by the SESplan Development Strategy. The settlement form is typical of a side valley settlement, extending away from the River Leader and into a valley side along a tributary (Turfford Burn). The</p>	<p>4. Part of the site covers two existing housing allocations – AEARL010 and AEARL011 which have a total indicative site capacity of 100 units. The remainder of the site is identified in the LDP as a potential mixed use longer term site with no indicative capacity stated. It should be noted the longer term sites identified are subject to review as part of Local Development Plan process.</p> <p>5. The Central Borders Housing Market Area was formed as part of the Housing Market Area Review undertaken for the Structure Plan Alteration in 2007. The Central Housing Market Area functions well in its current form. It also includes the Central Strategic Development Area as set out within the Strategic Development Plan (SESplan). Within Earlston there is a substantial housing land supply including recent allocations at the former High School site (AEARL002), East Turfford (AEARL010) and phase one of the land at Georgefield (AEARL011). Therefore it is considered</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	---	--

				<p>contributor believes that a case can be made to show that the site can be satisfactorily developed. The contributor goes on to detail the assessment of the site against a number of Local Plan policies including Policy G1, G5, G6, NE4 and Inf4.</p> <p>7. The contributor has assessed the proposal against Scottish Planning Policy, SESplan and Local Development Plan policies has concluded that the site is suitable for development and that it should be included in the list of development sites required to be prepared by the LDP Reporter.</p> <p>8. The contributor states the site can be delivered within a five year timeframe, is free from significant constraints and will not have a significant adverse effect on any natural or built heritage interests or any national or international environmental designations. The majority of the land is already allocated and the contributor seeks the allocation of an additional 27 acres and a revision to site capacity to maximise the potential of the site and make the best use of the</p>	<p>there is no need to allocate further housing land within Earlston and additional land at Georgefield should not be brought forward until phase one has been progressed. It should be noted that this area of land was also subject to the recent Local Development Plan Examination. The Reporter shared the opinion of the Council that <i>“the level of potential development in Earlston is adequate. Whilst it is reasonable to identify Georgefield East as a preferred area for future expansion, it is appropriate to give priority to the currently allocated sites. Additionally, it is clear that further impact analysis is required for Georgefield East”</i>.</p> <p>6. Comments noted although it should also be noted that these policies and subsequent criteria referred to by the contributor are out of date and have been superseded.</p> <p>7. Comments noted.</p> <p>8. The site was submitted as part of the Call for Sites process and was assessed</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>site's ability to contribute to the housing land supply in a location that has already been deemed to be acceptable.</p>	<p>under site codes MEARL001, MEARL002 and MEARL003 for mixed use development. The sites were assessed as unacceptable as there are significant infrastructure constraints within Earlston in relation to wastewater treatment capacity. Scottish Water have a growth project being designed and built with completion in 2018 this will be enough to accommodate the current population with some extra capacity for limited growth, no further capacity will be available until post 2025. It should also be noted that part of the site is included within the 1:200 year flood risk area along the Turrford Burn which runs directly through the site.</p>	
Ednam	Cliftonhill IV (AEDNA010)	Archie & Maggie Stewart	Object	<p>1. The contributors state the allocation of houses in large sites in a few locations rather than allowing development throughout the Borders is detrimental to the region. This policy leads to the stagnation of our villages with young families forced to live in soulless commuter housing estates depriving the areas outwith the allocated area of services and income.</p> <p>2. There are six sites of over</p>	<p>1. The draft Housing SG aims to distribute the shortfall of housing broadly within the Strategic Development Areas (SDA) and surrounding area. The population of each SDA and surrounding area has been assessed to ensure a proportional distribution of housing sites across each of the SDAs. The majority of sites included in the draft Housing SG are located in areas with nearby transport</p>	<p>It is recommended that Cliftonhill IV, Ednam (AEDNA010) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.</p>

				<p>50 houses accounting for 695 houses or 75% of the allocation in Coldstream, Kelso, Tweedbank, Peebles and Selkirk. The development of these sites can realistically only be carried out by the large national housing companies such as Persimmon, Barrett and Wimpey. At present these companies seem to have little interest in building quality homes in the Scottish Borders.</p> <p>3. Within these large sites there is an allocation of 300 houses at Lowood, site MTWEE002, this site having so many constraints attached that it is not likely to ever be developed, nor should it be.</p> <p>4. The effect of allocating only a few large sites is that these sites can only be developed by large national builders with any associated profits leaving the region. Our villages are left to stagnate with fewer opportunities for young families to return, and the proceeds from the development of the land remains in a few hands rather than being spread around the region. Large</p>	<p>links and local services and facilities.</p> <p>2. Comments noted. The draft Housing SG includes a range of site sizes many of which are redevelopment opportunities. It should be noted that many of the sites actively being developed in the Scottish Borders are being developed jointly between a Registered Social Landlord and a local/regional mainstream developer. National housebuilders have interest and/or a presence within some larger towns in the Borders.</p> <p>3. The Scottish Government document entitled "Borders Railway - Maximising the Impact: A Blueprint for the Future" identifies the opportunities the railway corridor offers in terms of being a catalyst for new housing developments, businesses or visitor destinations. It supports the potential of the line in triggering significant economic benefits. The SG on Housing will become part of the statutory Development Plan and it is therefore a key document</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>sites have more constraints and a large impact on the environment together with infrastructure problems. Large new build sites do not have a sense of place which runs contrary to the principle of placemaking as stated on page 9 of the consultation document.</p> <p>5. If development was allowed evenly throughout the area local building firms and associated trades would prosper with the profits remaining in the Borders. The proceeds of land development would be in many more hands which in turn would no doubt be invested in farms and local services. Villages would be able to grow in a manner that is sustainable and accessible to young families.</p> <p>6. The contributors object to the omission of Site AEDNA010 from this guidance. This site has been identified in the Local Development Plan as an area for future expansion. There have been two houses recently completed by local builders bringing young families into the village, proving a market for village</p>	<p>to ensure implementation of the Blueprint. Lowood is within a highly accessible and sustainable location given its location on land immediately to the north of the Tweedbank Railway terminus. The site is within the Central Borders Housing Market Area which has a proven record of housing market developer interest and consumer demand. The parkland and woodland setting and its proximity to the scenic River Tweed make the site a highly attractive development opportunity. Whilst it is acknowledged there are some site constraints to be addressed and overcome, none of these are identified as being insurmountable, and work on a masterplan has already commenced which increases the effectiveness, promotion and delivery of the site. This will investigate in close detail the constraints to be mitigated. It is contended that Lowood is a prime site with an extremely attractive setting for market interest and should be included within the SG.</p> <p>The following was the</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	---	--

				<p>housing. The allocation of sites such as this will help to attract young families back to the area to live and work bringing income and vibrancy into the community and generating income for the area.</p>	<p>conclusion of the assessment undertaken for the Draft Housing SG, this remains pertinent:</p> <p><i>The submission of a Flood Risk Assessment would be required to assess risk from the River Tweed as well as surface water flooding issues. Co-location issues include potential for odour from E Langlee landfill (Pollution, Prevention and Control) and WML (Waste Management Licensing) exempt composting site at Pavillion Farm. There is moderate risk to biodiversity and mitigation would be required to ensure no significant adverse effects on the integrity of the River Tweed SAC. Archaeological investigation would be required. This site is outwith the Tweedbank settlement boundary however it benefits from its close proximity to the station at Tweedbank and business and industrial sites as well as a range of services in Galashiels. The site is entirely enclosed by the River Tweed to the north and by the existing settlement of Tweedbank to the south. The development</i></p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--



					<p><i>of the site would not result in settlement coalescence. It is considered that the site offers a strategic opportunity due to its immediate proximity to the railway terminus and its location within the Central Borders. Internally there are a number of constraints which would require to be sensitively addressed. Although lacking in designations, the estate shows clear indications of being a 'designed landscape' with an attractive meandering driveway leading from the gatehouse through parkland to the main house and associated buildings. There is also a significant tree and woodland structure on the estate as well as a pond which is a notable feature. These issues will require careful consideration through the process of the aforesaid masterplan and a tree survey. A Transport Appraisal will be required, with the need for at least two key vehicular access points into the site and effective pedestrian/cycle connectivity. Site access must take cognisance of the</i></p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p><i>possible extension of the Borders Railway and of the potential for a replacement for Lowwood Bridge as identified in the Local Access and Transport Strategy. Potential contamination would require investigation/mitigation. A full Drainage Impact Assessment would be required. There is currently no capacity at the Waste Water Treatment Works to accommodate development. The site, with its close proximity to the existing business and industrial uses at Tweedbank offers the opportunity for the extension of the Central Borders Business Park. A masterplan for the site is currently being prepared which will address relevant matters in more detail, including taking account of the existing planned landscape and the consideration of appropriate zoning and phasing.</i></p> <p>4. As stated above the draft Housing SG provides a range and choice of sites throughout the Scottish Borders. There are various</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>existing housing allocations within smaller settlements identified within the Local Development Plan, including Ednam.</p> <p>5. Comments noted.</p> <p>6. Comments noted. The site at Cliftonhil, Ednam has been an extensive site assessment process which has involved consultation with various stakeholders and key agencies. Sites at this location have also recently been subject to Examination as part of the Local Development Plan process. The Reporter stated "that further housing between the two plots (11/00750/PPP) and the village of Ednam would lead to an impression of ribbon development and any future review of housing land potential would no doubt take this into account. The Reporter then goes on to state 'construction of some 30 houses on the land to the north-east of the War Memorial would widen the range of choice of housing at Ednam, including affordable housing. However, this consideration does not lead me to</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>conclude that the land should be allocated for development".</p> <p>It should also be noted that there is an existing housing site within Ednam at West Mill which was allocated as part of the Local Plan Amendment. The site is undeveloped although the site is currently being marketed.</p>	
Galashiels	Former Castle Warehouse site (AGALA037)	Smith & Garratt	Object to the inclusion of (AGALA037) within the Housing SG	Object to the inclusion of this site on grounds that, being developable in accordance with existing planning policies, its inclusion would not help the Council to meet the requirements of the SG.	<p>Appendix 2, as contained within the LDP, provides a windfall assumption, which is included within the overall potential contribution towards the housing requirement (up to 2025).</p> <p>The Scottish Borders is rural in character and a large proportion of the windfall assumption is provided for by housing in the countryside approvals.</p> <p>The LDP provides development opportunities within settlement boundaries, through housing, re-development and mixed use allocations. Therefore, the SG will continue to identify and provide development opportunities within</p>	It is recommended that Former Castle Warehouse site (AGALA037) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

					settlement boundaries, as per the LDP, including brownfield opportunities.	
Galashiels	Former Castle Warehouse site (AGALA037)	Scottish Environmental Protection Agency	Support (Flooding)	Support the requirement to investigate surface water flood risk as a small part of the site along the south western boundary is included within the 1:200 year surface water flood risk area. This investigation of surface water should acknowledge the steep slopes to the north-east which could direct surface runoff towards the site. We <b>support</b> the requirement to establish the existence of a culverted watercourse and to ensure that no buildings are constructed over an existing drain/lade that is to remain active.	Support noted. The first site requirement should be amended to read:  <i>A small part of the site along the south western boundary is included within the 1:200 year surface water flood risk area. This matter would require to be investigated. This investigation of surface water should acknowledge the steep slopes to the north-east which could direct surface runoff towards the site. Site investigations would be required to establish whether or not a culverted watercourse exists. No buildings should be constructed over an existing drain/lade that is to remain active.</i>	It is recommended that Former Castle Warehouse site (AGALA037) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.  It is also recommended that the site requirement (bullet point 1) be amended to read:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>A small part of the site along the south western boundary is included within the 1:200 year surface water flood risk area. This matter would require to be investigated. This investigation of surface water should acknowledge the steep slopes to the north-east which could direct surface runoff towards the site. Site investigations would be required to establish whether or not a culverted watercourse exists. No buildings should be constructed over an existing drain/lade that is to</i></li> </ul>

						<i>remain active</i>
Galashiels	Huddersfield Street (AGALA033)	SNH	Comments (AGALA033)	Reference to the River Tweed SAC should be updated to clearly state the requirement for submission of information to support Habitats Regulations Appraisal. This will be required to identify what mitigation, if any, is to be delivered.	Further to the advice of SNH it is recommended that a site requirement is added in respect of the River Tweed SAC, to read as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>In respect of the River Tweed SAC, the submission of information to support the Habitats Regulations Appraisal would be required to identify what mitigation, if any, is to be delivered.</i></li> </ul>	It is recommended that Huddersfield Street (AGALA033) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Galashiels	Huddersfield Street (AGALA033)	Scottish Environmental Protection Agency	Seek the removal of the site (Flooding)	Require the removal of this site from the Supplementary Guidance. Would repeat the report with the initial response to the 'call for sites' consultation in summer 2016. Require a modification to the text of the development requirement to remove the text ' <i>flood risk issues to be discussed and agreed with SEPA</i> '. The full detailed response submitted by SEPA is available for viewing if necessary.	Given SEPA's objection to the site on flooding grounds it is contended the site is not included within this SG. The site is currently subject to a planning application and the flooding issue will be addressed via that process.	It is recommended that Huddersfield Street (AGALA033) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Galashiels	Lintburn Street (AGALA032)	Scottish Environmental Protection Agency	Comment (Flooding)	Suggest a modification to the development requirements to read "Investigation and mitigation measures may be required in relation to surface water run-off within the site" and to make contact	Comments noted. An additional site requirement has been added as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Investigation and mitigation measures may be required in relation to</i></li> </ul>	It is recommended that Lintburn Street (AGALA032) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

				with the Council Flood Protection Officer.	<i>surface water run-off within the site".</i>	It is also recommended that the following site requirement be added: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Investigation and mitigation measures may be required in relation to surface water run-off within the site".</i></li> </ul> Contact should be made with the Council's Flood Protection Officer.
Galashiels	Lintburn Street (AGALA032)	Smith & Garratt	Object to the inclusion of (AGALA032) within the Housing SG	Object to the inclusion of this site on grounds that, being developable in accordance with existing planning policies, its inclusion would not help the Council to meet the requirements of the SG.	Appendix 2, as contained within the LDP, provides a windfall assumption, which is included within the overall potential contribution towards the housing requirement (up to 2025).  The Scottish Borders is rural in character and a large proportion of the windfall assumption is provided for by housing in the countryside approvals.  The LDP provides development opportunities within settlement boundaries, through housing, re-development and mixed use allocations. Therefore, the SG will continue to identify and provide development	It is recommended that Lintburn Street (AGALA032) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

					opportunities within settlement boundaries, as per the LDP, including brownfield opportunities.	
Galashiels	Netherbarns (AGALA029)	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (NLP) on behalf of M&J Ballantyne Ltd	Object to the non-allocation of (AGALA029) within the Housing SG	<p>Object to the exclusion of the site on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No specific justification has been provided for the 'amber scoring' of the site within the RAG Assessment, however it can be assumed by the comments within the Stage 2 Assessment that both this and the decision to exclude the site as a preferred or alternative site, is based upon the Reporters' comments. NLP strongly object to this and consider that the findings of the Reporters can no longer be considered valid as they were based upon past assessments of specific development proposals, which were of a higher density than those presently posed, and did not make reference to any new developments, such as the Heritage Assessment. NLP consider the implementation of the landscaping strategy would in fact further</li> </ul>	<p>The following was the conclusion of the assessment undertaken to the original submission through the process of the call for sites, it is considered that this remains relevant to the most recent submission:</p> <p><i>This site was considered in the Local Plan Inquiry and at the recent Local Development Plan Examination. The Reporter's recommendation at both the Inquiry and the Examination was for the site to be removed from the Local Plan/LDP.</i></p> <p><i>As part of the recent LDP Examination the Reporter concurred with the conclusions reached at the previous Local Plan Inquiry. The Reporter noted the lack of formal objection by Historic Scotland and stated that cultural and landscape considerations combine to provide an asset which should remain free of the impact of the suggested allocation and any subsequent development of</i></p>	It is recommended that Netherbarns (AGALA029) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.



				<p>enhance the setting of Abbotsford House.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The land at Netherbarns is effective and free from constraints which could impact upon its viability. The Stage 2 Assessment proved the site to be favourable with consultees, who highlighted that the site has good access to local services, facilities and employment due to the public transport links and close proximity to major roads. Additionally the site was found to be acceptable in relation to the potential impact on open space, archaeology, biodiversity and education. The site is supported through a previous planning approval and has long been supported by Scottish Borders Council and its officers. The allocation of the site would make a valuable contribution toward the delivery of new housing in Galashiels, of which there is a recognised shortfall to the tune of 916 units, although NLP consider the true shortfall to be</li> </ul>	<p><i>Netherbarns. The Reporter did not accept that the woodland screening would adequately mitigate the adverse impacts of the allocation on the setting of the house or the designed landscape.</i></p> <p><i>Additionally, the re-opening of the railway link to Galashiels is likely to increase the volume of visitors to Abbotsford, therefore further strengthening the need to protect the heritage of the vicinity.</i></p> <p>It is acknowledged that this recent submission has re-emphasised why the applicants consider that the proposal will have a minimal detrimental impact on the setting of Abbotsford House. However given that this case has twice been dismissed by Reporters, most recently with regards to the adopted 2016 Local Development Plan, it is clear the concerns the Reporters have with regards to the allocation of this site and therefore it is not considered there are any further grounds nor information provided which</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>significantly higher.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The development of Netherbarns presents an opportunity to realise these benefits on a sustainably located site.</li> </ul> <p>NLP consider that the site should be assessed against the Stage 1 Assessment as 'green' as opposed to 'amber', and given the support shown by the Council and the consultees should be presented as a preferred or alternative site within the Draft Housing SG.</p>	<p>will alter that stance. Therefore the site is not being taken forward into the Housing Supplementary Guidance.</p> <p>It is considered that the Applicant/Agent would again need to consider the options available for woodland screening and the impacts on Abbotsford House for this site to be reassessed in the future.</p>	
Galashiels	Rose Court (AGALA036)	Andrew T. Bramhall, St. John's Church	Note (AGALA036)	As the trustees of the former manse in Hawthorn Road on land to the west of AGALA036. The property is currently on the market for sale. Would this property and ground be of interest for future housing consideration being adjacent to site AGALA036?	A site plan was requested but not submitted. In any event, there would be an opportunity to submit the site for consideration during the process of Local Development Plan 2. In the meantime, the site is located within the settlement boundary of Galashiels and could be considered for infill development without a formal housing allocation. Any such planning application would be considered primarily against Policy PMD5 – Infill Development of the Scottish Borders Local Development Plan 2016.	This site could be considered during the process of Local Development Plan 2.
Galashiels	Rose Court	Smith & Garratt	Object to the inclusion of	Object to the inclusion of this	Appendix 2, as contained	It is recommended that

	(AGALA036)		(AGALA036) within the Housing SG	site on grounds that, being developable in accordance with existing planning policies, its inclusion would not help the Council to meet the requirements of the SG.	<p>within the LDP, provides a windfall assumption, which is included within the overall potential contribution towards the housing requirement (up to 2025).</p> <p>The Scottish Borders is rural in character and a large proportion of the windfall assumption is provided for by housing in the countryside approvals.</p> <p>The LDP provides development opportunities within settlement boundaries, through housing, re-development and mixed use allocations. Therefore, the SG will continue to identify and provide development opportunities within settlement boundaries, as per the LDP, including brownfield opportunities.</p>	Rose Court (AGALA036) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Galashiels	Rose Court (AGALA036)	Scottish Environmental Protection Agency	Support (Flooding)	Support the requirement to consider potential surface water runoff from nearby hills along with appropriate mitigation.	Support noted.	It is recommended that Rose Court (AGALA036) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Galashiels	Winston Road (RGALA005)	Ferguson Planning on behalf of Amcows 59 Ltd	Object to the non-allocation of (RGALA005) within the Housing SG	All sites should be assessed on their individual merits. The site should be allocated for housing to meet the 916 housing shortfall for the following reasons:	The south eastern half of the site is allocated within the Scottish Borders Local Development Plan 2016 for redevelopment. The site requirements highlight that	It is recommended that Winston Road (RGALA005) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is deliverable within this Local Plan lifespan. The developer owns the land and has the finances and resources to bring forward the development within the plan period.</li> <li>• 71 units can be delivered outside the overhead power line zone. However the aim is decommission these pylons and relay underground in order to get a maximum developable area.</li> <li>• It is in a sustainable location, highly accessible to Galashiels Town Centre, bus services and Tweedbank Train Station.</li> <li>• It is a brownfield site and relates well to the existing built up area, with existing residential properties to the west and next to MGALA003, a mixed use development opportunity.</li> <li>• It has very easy access to utilities/infrastructure.</li> <li>• The site is not at risk of flooding from the River Tweed.</li> <li>• Affordable housing will be provided on part if not all of the site in</li> </ul>	<p>due to the nature of the existing adjoining uses, it is not considered that this site could be developed for residential purposes. The adjoining uses include the former abattoir (forming part of RGALA005) and the Electricity Sub Station to the north. The sewage works are also located to the south. For the reasons highlighted within the original site assessment it is not considered that this site is appropriate for a housing allocation, as follows:</p> <p><i>The location of the site is acceptable in principle for residential development. However, a key issue is potential conflict with adjacent uses. These include the substation site (noise, vibration, overhead lines), sewage works (odours), railway line (noise/vibration) and an exclusion zone with gas pipeline running on the eastern boundary of the site. These are all issues which would require to be explored in great detail by the developer. A Flood Risk Assessment would be required. There is moderate biodiversity risk. Assessment</i></p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>accordance with Policy HD1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are no issues with access to the site.</li> <li>• The site is considered acceptable in principle for residential development.</li> </ul> <p>It is highly important to allocate housing in the Scottish Borders where there is a strong demand to live and especially on brownfield land. For these reasons the subject site should be allocated as a 'preferred site'.</p> <p>Ferguson Planning believes that there are numerous 'preferred' or 'alternative' sites indicated that are less superior than the subject site.</p>	<p><i>and mitigation of impact on SAC required. Capacity of the site would depend upon the wayleaves required for OH powerlines and this may take out parts of the site. Environmentally there are few limits although existing trees within the site on the south and near eastern side should be retained to provide setting and minimise impacts on River Tweed adjoining. A Transport Assessment would be required. Contamination would require to be investigated and mitigated.</i></p>	
Gattonside	Gateside Meadow-Castlefield (AGATT013)	Felsham Planning and Development on behalf of Rural Renaissance Ltd	Object to the non-allocation of (AGATT013) within the Housing SG	<p>The proposal will meet the aims and objectives of the development plan by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensuring sufficient new housing land is available allowing for a phased approach to the release of housing land;</li> <li>• Meeting the economic prosperity and environmental quality strategic objectives;</li> <li>• Locating development which minimises number and length of car</li> </ul>	<p>The following was the conclusion of the assessment undertaken to the original submission through the process of the call for sites, it is considered that this remains relevant to the most recent submission:</p> <p><i>The site was identified as constrained in the Development and Landscape Capacity Study for the following reasons: development across the</i></p>	It is recommended that Gateside Meadow-Castlefield (AGATT013) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

				<p>journeys by providing new homes adjacent to a transport corridor;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The contribution to the strategy and policies of the Development Plan and other national and local policy objectives;</li> <li>• Delivering a proposal within a 5 year timeframe, or within such timeframe that it helps reduce the pressure on the planning authority to deliver it's already allocated sites;</li> <li>• The provision of choice across the housing market area;</li> <li>• The design, quality and density of development that can be achieved;</li> <li>• The proposal will not have a <i>significant adverse effect</i> on any natural or built heritage interests or any national or international environmental designations;</li> <li>• The proposal can support the existing services in the village;</li> <li>• The proposals can contribute to the facilitation of improved facilities in the village and in neighbouring villages; and</li> </ul>	<p><i>undulating slopes is constrained by the more complex topography and often steep slopes which would require earthworks; the area is highly open and relatively exposed because of the broadly convex curvature of the hill flank; the slopes are very visible, particularly from the south and the Eildon Hills, from where they contribute to the scenic quality of the National Scenic Area; the fields are a valuable agricultural resource. There are also considerable access issues to be addressed and resolved.</i></p> <p><i>It should also be noted that this site formed part of the 2006 Local Plan Inquiry and the recent Local Development Plan Examination for 150 units. The Reporter of the LDP Examination agreed with the findings of the previous Reporter who noted that, "in view of its elevated position and slope, development would be prominent when viewed from the immediate vicinity and in more distant views from the south, including the Eildon Hills.</i></p>	
--	--	--	--	---	---	--

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are no other significant environmental dis-benefits or risks, for example flooding.</li> </ul> <p>There is a clear requirement for the Local Development Plan to identify further housing land supply in the Central Borders Housing Market Area, and within the area identified as rest of central housing market area. Allocation of the subject site to the full extent shown on the attached plan will help to meet the 5 year housing land supply shortfall. Accordingly, it is requested that Gattonside Mains be included in the list of allocated sites within the Local Development Plan.</p>	<p><i>Development of this greenfield site would also have an adverse effect on the rural setting of this part of Gattonside. I am not satisfied that development at a low density would satisfactorily resolve those matters. That is a consideration to which I must attach great weight given the likely impact on the Eildon and Leaderfoot National Scenic Area". This position remains unchanged and therefore it is not considered appropriate to allocate this site for housing.</i></p>	
Gattonside	Lower Gateside (AGATT016)	Ferguson Planning on behalf of Moyle L & D (MLD)	Request that the site (AGATT016) be considered for allocation in the Housing SG	<p>All sites should be assessed on their individual merits. The reasons it is considered that this site should be allocated for housing to help meet the 916 housing shortfall are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is deliverable within this Local Plan lifespan.</li> <li>No allocation within this area of Gattonside despite it being very popular for new homes.</li> <li>Not within an area of Flood Risk.</li> </ul>	<p>The site has been through the full site assessment process which concluded that it is doubtful and it is considered there are more appropriate sites within the Central SDA to meet the housing shortfall. The main issues relate to access, impact upon the settlement, impact upon the NSA and the overall scale of the proposal in relation to Gattonside. Please refer to the full site assessment contained within Appendix</p>	<p>It is recommended that Lower Gateside (AGATT016) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.</p>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sustainable location – highly accessible to Tweedbank railway station and industrial estate Melrose and Gattonside, and local education provision. Existing footpath provision runs past the site.</li> <li>• Next to current built form and thus easy access to utilities/infrastructure.</li> <li>• Does not represent coalescence with Melrose of Tweedbank.</li> </ul> <p>It is stressed that it is highly important to allocate housing in the Scottish Borders where there is a strong demand to live. There is a clear high demand for homes in Gattonside and thus request that it is considered.</p>	D – Stage 2 Database Report.	
Hawick	<p>1. Leishman Place (AHAWI025)</p> <p>2. Henderson Road (AHAWI026)</p> <p>3. Factory, Fairhurst Drive (RHAWI011)</p> <p>4. Heather Mill (MSELK002)</p>	Smith and Garratt on behalf of Millar Partnership and David Wilson Homes	<p>Object to the inclusion of; Leishman Place (AHAWI025), Henderson Road (AHAWI026), Factory, Fairhurst Drive (RHAWI011) &amp; Heather Mill (MSELK002)</p> <p>within the Housing SG, stating that it is covered by existing development</p>	<p>The contributor states that the site is covered by existing development policies, therefore including the site within the SG does not increase the availability and choice of available sites.</p> <p>Objects to the inclusion of the site on the grounds that it is capable of being developed in accordance</p>	<p>Appendix 2, as contained within the LDP, provides a windfall assumption, which is included within the overall potential contribution towards the housing requirement (up to 2025).</p> <p>The Scottish Borders is rural in character and a large proportion of the windfall</p>	<p>It is recommended that Leishman Place (AHAWI025), Henderson Road (AHAWI026), Factory, Fairhurst Drive (RHAWI011) &amp; Heather Mill (MSELK002) are all included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.</p>



			policies	with existing planning policies and the inclusion within the Housing SG would not help the Council in meeting the requirements of the SG.	assumption is provided for by housing in the countryside approvals.  The LDP provides development opportunities within settlement boundaries, through housing, re-development and mixed use allocations. Therefore, the SG will continue to identify and provide development opportunities within settlement boundaries, as per the LDP, including brownfield opportunities.	
Hawick	Burnfoot Phase 1 (AHAWI027)	Scottish Environmental Protection Agency	Notes	<p>1. The contributor supports the requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA).</p> <p>2. The contributor requires a modification to the developer requirement stating that no built development takes place on top of culverted watercourses/ drains</p>	<p>1. Support noted.</p> <p>2. Comments noted. If the site was to be taken forward for inclusion within the Finalised Housing SG, the site requirement in respect of flood risk would be amended to read:</p> <p><i>'A flood risk assessment is required to take cognisance of the possibility of a culverted water course within the site, the need for a sustainable drainage system and the wetland area to the south west. No built development should take place on top of culverted watercourses/ drains'.</i></p>	It is recommended that Burnfoot Phase 1 (AHAWI027) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

					However, it should be noted that the site is not proposed for inclusion within the Finalised Housing SG.	
Hawick	Burnfoot Phase 1 (AHAWI027)	Jane Mitchell	Objects (Various)	<p>1. The population is growing in Scotland and the world. Land is one of Scotland's most valuable natural resources and it should be protected where possible. Agriculture is one of the most important industries in Scotland, and the Scottish Borders. The loss of land to development leads to a reduction in the amount of food produced. The proposed area for Employment and residential on the Eastern side of Hawick is the most productive land surrounding Hawick. The Council and the Scottish Government should be assessing less productive areas of land to develop instead of highly productive land. I understand the need for development but planning should give greater consideration to the need for future food supplies.</p> <p>2. The margins which farmers receive for their products are marginal, therefore the contributor relies on economies of scale in order</p>	<p>1. Comments are noted. The protection of agricultural land is an aim of the planning system and national policy affords particular protection to land which is designated as Prime Agricultural land by the James Hutton Institute. The site in question is not classified as such, and whilst planning seeks to protect other agricultural land where possible, the Council has a duty to find effective housing land. There is a limited amount of effective brownfield land within the Borders and it is inevitable that an element of greenfield land is required to ensure an adequate supply of effective land is maintained.</p> <p>2. Comments are noted, however this is not a material planning consideration.</p> <p>3. The edge of Borders settlements are often characterised by agricultural uses meeting residential</p>	It is recommended that Burnfoot Phase 1 (AHAWI027) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

				<p>to ensure they make a profit. By reducing the productive area of the land farmed, this increases the costs of production. The contributor states that by constantly nibbling away at the productive area there is a severe danger that their farming enterprise will become unsustainable.</p> <p>3. Farming arable land next to housing areas becomes exceedingly difficult as can be demonstrated at the field adjacent to Burnfoot. The contributor states that they are constantly battling with vandalism, especially at harvest time.</p> <p>4. There is a huge fire risk created with the development of residential housing at the proposed area. The road currently provides a fire break both for the town from the fields and vice versa. If a fire was to break out in the proposed area without a break such as the road there is a huge risk that a fire could spread, all the way to Appletreehall.</p> <p>5. The town already owns MHAW1001 which with the correct infrastructure would</p>	<p>uses and whilst there is potential for some degree of conflict in these circumstances, on balance, the two uses are considered to be of acceptable compatibility.</p> <p>4. There are many places in the Borders where fields run next to towns without fire breaks and this is not considered to be a reason to preclude development.</p> <p>5. MHAW1001 is allocated for mixed use. Sites proposed for mixed use could be developed for a variety of uses subject to other LDP policies, including housing. This site was considered at the initial stage 1 assessment stage, but it was concluded that the site should not be taken forward as part of the Housing SG. The conclusion of the assessment is as follows:</p> <p><i>This site is allocated for mixed use within the Scottish Borders LDP. There are several allocated sites in the vicinity, including housing sites, and in particular, a longer term housing site [SHAW1003].</i></p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>be suitable for housing. There is no infrastructure in the proposed SHAW1003.</p> <p>6. Is it really safe having children crossing major roads in order to get to school and other amenities.</p> <p>7. Why is there not more housing proposed at zEL49 where the amenities are much easier to access?</p> <p>8. If the proposed extension to the Scottish Borders railway to Hawick is granted this is most likely to run to the Southern side of the town, it would make more sense for housing to be increased around this area in order to make it more accessible for more people.</p> <p>9. Loss of land to development reduces biodiversity. The land at Burnhead is currently involved in an Agri-Environment Scheme supported by the Scottish Government which aims to protect and enhance Scotland's natural heritage and mitigate and adapt to climate change.</p>	<p><i>There is insufficient capacity for all of these sites to be allocated for housing at this time, and this site is considered less appropriate than the longer term housing site at Burnfoot. This site cannot be considered further at this time.</i></p> <p>6. The Council would consider the need to improve pedestrian crossings at the time of any future planning application. This would ensure any improvements were commensurate with the scale of development proposed and the anticipated vehicle and pedestrian flows identified through the accompanying Transport Assessment, which is a requirement of development of the site.</p> <p>7. Site zEL49 is safeguarded employment land. This land is protected to secure the supply of employment land.</p> <p>8. There has been no decision on whether to extend the Borders Railway, or on the route any extension may take.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>10. Hawick already has a large unemployment rate due to business decline such as the closure of several textile companies recently e.g. Allflex. Further housing only exacerbates this.</p>	<p>9. The Council's Ecology Officer was consulted as part of the Council's initial assessment of the site and advised that there were no significant known biodiversity issues on the site. Nevertheless the draft SG set out a requirement that any impact on ecology must be assessed and that mitigation be required as appropriate.</p> <p>10. Hawick sits within the Central Strategic Development Area as defined within the Strategic Development Plan (SESplan) and sits within the Central Housing Market Area. The Central Strategic Development Area is where growth will be focused due to the concentration of strategic employment sites and good transport links. The site is considered to have good access to employment opportunities within the Hawick and Central Borders area. It is not agreed that further housing in Hawick will exacerbate unemployment issues.</p>	
Hawick	Burnfoot Phase 1 (AHAWI027)	SNH	Support	1. The site lies adjacent to business and employment allocation BHAWI001. A	1. If the site was to be taken forward for inclusion in the Finalised Housing SG, the	It is recommended that Burnfoot Phase 1 (AHAWI027) is not

				<p>planning brief is required for both sites and the contributor recommends that a brief that sets out requirements for both sites is prepared. This would support a coordinated, strategic approach to development here from the outset. This should include connectivity between the sites, which is not explicitly set out in the current site requirements in the draft Supplementary Guidance and the LDP.</p> <p>2. The contributor welcomes the requirement that design and layout should aim to enhance biodiversity value of the site. Viewed in its wider context, appropriate habitat networks within this site could provide links between existing habitats on sites to the west and east, bridging an existing gap.</p>	<p>site requirement relating to the need for a planning brief, would be amended to read:</p> <p><i>'A planning brief is required covering both AHAWI027 &amp; BHAWI001 sites to ensure a co-ordinated and strategic approach to development. The brief should address connectivity between the two sites and reflect the principles of Designing Streets'.</i></p> <p>2. Support noted.</p> <p>However, it should be noted that the site is not proposed for inclusion within the Finalised Housing SG.</p>	<p>included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.</p>
Hawick	Burnfoot Phase 1 (AHAWI027)	Save Scott's Countryside	Support the inclusion of the site	The contributor urges SBC to take pressure off sites within 5 miles of Abbotsford House and Scott's Managed Landscape and use identified Alternative sites including this site in Hawick.	Support for this site is noted, however it is concluded that there are more appropriate sites available and this site will not therefore go forward for allocation.	It is recommended that Burnfoot Phase 1 (AHAWI027) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Hawick	Fairhurst Drive (RHAWI011)	Ferguson Planning on behalf of Roxburghe Estates	Note	This site has most recently been in use as employment and the Economic Development team have suggested that the site be	The majority of the site has not been in active employment use for many years, is derelict and adversely affecting the	It is recommended that Fairhurst Drive (RHAWI011) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance

				retained for continued employment use rather than lose it to housing development. They feel that the site needs to be considered in association with the Borders railway extension to Hawick as the route could possibly impact on its southern edge. The Council assert that there is sufficient available employment land within the Hawick area, however as stated within the adopted LDP <i>"The town remains in need of regeneration and the Council's Economic Development team is working in partnership with the community to maximise the town's potential and create new jobs."</i> This would suggest that the Economic Development team have an active insight in the employment prospects within the town and more weight should be placed on their objection to housing development on this site.	amenity of the local area, which is partly residential in character. The site is not allocated for employment use but rather is allocated for redevelopment. The principle of supporting non-employment uses on the site is therefore already established. Comments from the Council's Economic Development team in relation to the Borders Railway relate to potential for the route of any extension to impact on the site's southern edge. This has been addressed by the first site requirement which requires a buffer zone to be formed to the south of the site.	on Housing.
Hawick	Fairhurst Drive (RHAWI011)	Scottish Environmental Protection Agency	Supports	The contributor supports the requirement to consider surface water runoff from the nearby hills at design stage.	Support noted.	It is recommended that Fairhurst Drive (RHAWI011) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Kelso	Former Kelso High School (RKELS002)	Ferguson Planning on behalf of	Note	The contributor is not opposed to the principle of	Comments noted. There is currently a Concept Design	It is recommended that the Former Kelso High

		Roxburghe Estates		<p>redevelopment of this brownfield site; however they question the level of capacity being proposed. SEPA have indicated that there may be flooding issues adjacent to the site which requires further investigation. The Landscape Officer also comments that a feasibility study is required to consider the development options based on the significant constraints imposed by the listed buildings, restricted access and potential tree retention. The capacity of the site for development cannot be determined until study has been undertaken.</p>	<p>Report being undertaken for the site. It should be noted the site capacity is indicative and this may change once a planning application is submitted for the site. The site requirements included within the draft Housing Supplementary Guidance also state that a tree survey is required to influence the design and layout of the site.</p>	<p>School, Kelso (RKELS002) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.</p>
Kelso	Former Kelso High School (RKELS002)	Sports Scotland	Note	<p>The contributor notes that this is a school site which is to be replaced with a new school including sports facilities developed in consultation with sportscotland. Nevertheless, as the last use of part of the site appears to be an outdoor sports facility, we would be a statutory consultee under the Development Management Procedure (Scotland) Regulations 2013 and would determine our position on any proposal against the above mentioned SPP</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>It is recommended that the Former Kelso High School, Kelso (RKELS002) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.</p>



				criteria.		
Kelso	Former Kelso High School (RKELS002)	Historic Environment Scotland	Object	The contributor recommends that the Council reword the requirement relating to the listed building to ensure that the demolition criteria provided are only applicable to buildings on site which are not considered to be listed (including those buildings listed by curtilage).	<p>Comments noted. Following further discussions with the Council's Built Heritage Principal Officer and Historic Environment Scotland it has been agreed that should the site be taken forward into the finalised Housing SG the site requirement (<i>bullet point 5</i>) should be amended to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The presumption is for retention of the B-listed building. The removal of less significant parts of the complex will likely be acceptable. Any proposal for substantial or total demolition of the listed building will need to demonstrate that one of the demolition tests within the Historic Environment Scotland Policy Statement can be met.</i></li> </ul>	<p>It is recommended that the Former Kelso High School, Kelso (RKELS002) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.</p> <p>It is also recommended that the site requirement (<i>bullet point 5</i>) be amended to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The presumption is for retention of the B-listed building. The removal of less significant parts of the complex will likely be acceptable. Any proposal for substantial or total demolition of the listed building will need to demonstrate that one of the demolition tests within the Historic Environment Scotland Policy Statement can be met.</i></li> </ul>
Kelso	Former Kelso High School (RKELS002)	Smith & Garratt on behalf of the Millar Partnership and David Wilson Homes	Object	The SG includes a number of small sites within settlement boundaries. These appear to be covered by existing development policies, adding these to the SG, does not increase the availability and choice of available sites, which includes RKELS002.	Appendix 2, as contained within the LDP, provides a windfall assumption, which is included within the overall potential contribution towards the housing requirement (up to 2025).	It is recommended that the Former Kelso High School, Kelso (RKELS002) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

				Object to the inclusion of this site on the grounds of, being developable in accordance with existing planning policies, their inclusion would not help the Council to meet the requirement of the SG.	The Scottish Borders is rural in character and a large proportion of the windfall assumption is provided for by housing in the countryside approvals.  The LDP provides development opportunities within settlement boundaries, through housing, re-development and mixed use allocations. Therefore, the SG will continue to identify and provide development opportunities within settlement boundaries, as per the LDP, including brownfield opportunities.	
Kelso	Former Kelso High School (RKELS002)	Scottish Environmental Protection Agency	Support	The contributor supports the requirement for investigation and mitigation measures in relation to surface water run-off within the site.	Comments noted.	It is recommended that the Former Kelso High School, Kelso (RKELS002) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Kelso	Hendersyde - Phase 2 (AKELS028)	Scottish Natural Heritage	Note	1. The contributor notes that the site requirements include assessment of impact on the River Tweed SAC. Due to the distance from the SAC and the intervening landform and use, including intervening walls along the A698, we do not consider there to be a pathway between the SAC and this site. This requirement could therefore be removed.	1. Comments noted. Should the site be taken forward into the finalised Housing SG the site requirement referring to the River Tweed SAC should be removed.  2. Bullet point seven of the site requirements makes reference to the need for structure planning along the north-eastern and north-western boundaries.	It is recommended that Hendersyde - Phase 2, Kelso (AKELS028) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

				<p>2. This site and AKELS002 (<i>SBC assume the contributor means AKELS022</i>) are open and, due to this lack of containment, careful consideration of boundary treatments will be required. Establishment of new structure planting along the north-eastern and north-western boundaries would generally accord with the existing settlement edges, which are characterised by woodland belts. Nevertheless, careful consideration will be required to ensure that an appropriate gateway to the settlement is established. We consider that this could be achieved more effectively if this site was included in the planning brief for AKELS022 as well as a joint masterplan for these sites.</p>	<p>However should the site be taken forward into the finalised Housing SG the site requirement (bullet point 7) should be amended to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>New structure planting is required along the north-eastern and north-western boundaries to provide new visual containment and shelter and screening of views from the north. Careful consideration will be required to ensure that an appropriate gateway to the settlement is established. Structure planting should integrate with existing woodland and walled area adjoining the cemetery site. A management scheme for planting is required</i></li> </ul> <p>There is already an approved planning brief for Hendersyde – Phase 1 (AKELS022) therefore this site cannot be included within it. However a separate planning brief could be produced for the site if deemed necessary in due course.</p>	
Kelso	Hendersyde - Phase 2	Smith & Garratt on	Support	The contributors support the	Support noted.	It is recommended that

	(AKELS028)	behalf of the Millar Partnership and David Wilson Homes		allocation of AKELS028 for residential development. Phase 1 of the site is under option to a national housebuilder. Marketing testing undertaken in the autumn shows good demand but at weak prices, so development is unlikely to start until perceived risks such as Brexit and IndyRef2 have settled down, when it does being progress should be quick. The contributors believe it is entirely appropriate to list this in the SG but would prefer to see the site identified as a preferred not an alternative site.	However, it is considered that there are more appropriate sites to meet the housing land shortfall.	Hendersyde - Phase 2, Kelso (AKELS028) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Kelso	Hendersyde - Phase 2 (AKELS028)	Save Scott's Countryside	Support	We note with great concern that 50% of the preferred sites total numbers for the whole Borders are within five miles of Abbotsford House and Scott's Managed Landscape; and nearly 40% no more than two miles distant. We therefore urge SBC, in order to take some pressure off this small middle portion of the central Borders, to use the identified alternative sites in Ancrum, Hawick and Kelso.	Support noted.  However, it is considered that there are more appropriate sites to meet the housing land shortfall.	It is recommended that Hendersyde - Phase 2, Kelso (AKELS028) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Kelso	Hendersyde - Phase 2 (AKELS028)	Scottish Environmental Protection Agency	Support	The contributor supports the requirement stating that investigation and mitigation measures may be required in	Comments noted.	It is recommended that Hendersyde - Phase 2, Kelso (AKELS028) is not included within the

				relation to surface water run-off within the site.		Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Kelso	Nethershot - Phase 2 (AKELS026)	Scottish Natural Heritage	Note	<p>1. The contributor welcomes the requirement that this site should be masterplanned alongside earlier development phases at Nethershot. While we are unsighted as to the content or merits of these earlier masterplans, as discussed in our comments on the site sift, it is important that a coordinated, strategic approach to development here is achieved from the outset. In particular we highlight the need to ensure appropriate design consistency and connections between the landscape frameworks of development areas and an appropriate continuity and connection of the proposed routes for walking and cycling. Delivering successful co-ordination may require greater detail on the site requirements for these issues.</p> <p>2. While we welcome the site requirements to include pedestrian and cycle links from the site to the new adjoining High School site, there is no reference to the National Cycle Network</p>	<p>1. Comments noted. The final masterplan for the site will take cognisance of the points raised and will be subject to public consultation.</p> <p>2. Comments noted. Should the site be allocated within the finalised Housing SG the final site requirement should be amended to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Pedestrian and cycle links from the site to the new adjoining High School site are required. The National Cycle Network Route 1 runs along the northern boundary of the site and appropriately designed active travel connections to the network should be incorporated into the site design.</i></li> </ul> <p>3. Comments noted.</p>	<p>It is recommended that Nethershot - Phase 2 (AKELS026) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.</p> <p>It is also recommended that the final site requirement should be amended to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Pedestrian and cycle links from the site to the new adjoining High School site are required. The National Cycle Network Route 1 runs along the northern boundary of the site and appropriately designed active travel connections to the network should be incorporated into the site design.</i></li> </ul>

				<p>(NCN) Route 1, which runs along the north boundary of the site. We advise that appropriately designed active travel connections to the NCN should also be sought.</p> <p>3. As the site requirements identify the minor public road here as a potential access point, any transport assessment and design for a reconfigured road should include provision to maintain this as a safe route for cyclists and pedestrians.</p>		
Kelso	Nethershot - Phase 2 (AKELS026)	Scottish Environmental Protection Agency	Support	The contributor supports the requirement to investigate and mitigate surface water run-off from the site.	Comments noted.	It is recommended that Nethershot - Phase 2, Kelso (AKELS026) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Kelso	Nethershot - Phase 2 (AKELS026)	Clarendon Planning and Development Ltd & Aitken Turnbull Architects Ltd on behalf of Lord Ralph Kerr, The Ferniehirst Trust & Roxburghe Estates	Support	1. The contributor supports the allocation and reaffirms the deliverability of the site within the Local Development Plan up to 2025. The contributor provides the background of the site and states there is scope for approximately 100 dwellings on the site including 25% affordable. Anticipated phasing shows the site could potentially be completed by 2021/22. The contributor goes on to detail the process of producing the Supplementary Guidance	1. Support noted. 2. Comments noted.	It is recommended that Nethershot - Phase 2, Kelso (AKELS026) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

				<p>(SG) and state they support the aims and objectives of the SG. The contributor also supports the Council's assessment and consultation of the land at Nethershot.</p> <p>2. The contributor provides additional points that further support the land being allocated for future housing. These include that the site is in the ownership of a willing sellers and discussions are currently being held with housing developers regarding future development of the site. The site is free of constraints and can be developed. The development would be privately funded which would allow for any infrastructure improvements that are required. Kelso is a highly marketable location within the Borders. The site could be programmed for completion within the LDP period based on the estimated capacity of 100 units. The further assessment of the site clearly confirms it is an effective housing site and can make a significant contribution to the housing land supply. The contributor has also submitted an indicative masterplan for the site and the previously</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				approved site to the south east (AKELS021).		
Kelso	Tweed Court (AKELS025)	KA and EM Nisbet		<p>1. The contributors have no objections in principle. However as the information available is minimal the contributors reserve the right to raise concerns once more detailed plans become available. The contributors state the 20 units on the site does seem rather a lot.</p> <p>2. In relation to the mature trees on the site, our main concern is whoever takes over the site may not maintain the trees to an acceptable level. Therefore we request that the removal of the trees be factored in to any planning application. The contributors understand from the Supplementary Guidance there are no Tree Preservation Orders in place.</p>	<p>1. Comments noted.</p> <p>2. Any planning application submitted for the site would need to meet the site requirements contained within the finalised SG. One of the site requirements for AKELS025 states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>A tree survey is required to influence the design and layout of site. The existing trees within the site are to be retained wherever possible, subject to the outcome of the survey to confirm condition.</i></li> </ul>	It is recommended that Tweed Court, Kelso (AKELS025) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Kelso	Tweed Court (AKELS025)	Lorraine & Raymond Elliot	Note	The contributors raise concerns regarding parking provision for any new development at Tweed Court. The contributors highlight an existing issue with parking at the location which is restricting access to resident's driveways.	Comments noted. Any issues relating to parking will be addressed at the planning application stage.	It is recommended that Tweed Court, Kelso (AKELS025) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Kelso	Tweed Court (AKELS025)	Mr and Mrs Ritchie	Note	The contributors raise concerns regarding parking provision for any new development at Tweed	Comments noted. Any issues relating to parking will be addressed at the planning application stage.	It is recommended that Tweed Court, Kelso (AKELS025) is included within the Finalised



				Court. The contributors highlight an existing issue with parking at the location which is restricting access to resident's driveways.		Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Kelso	Tweed Court (AKELS025)	Mr and Mrs Tinline	Note	The contributors have no objections in principle to the building of these houses. If the proposal moved to the planning stage the contributors would comment in more detail about the design of the houses and the protection of the mature trees and bushes that form a natural boundary that gives both side of the road some privacy.	Comments noted.	It is recommended that Tweed Court, Kelso (AKELS025) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Kelso	Tweed Court (AKELS025)	Mrs S Todd	Note	The contributor has no objections in principle to the building of these houses. If the proposal moved to the planning stage the contributor would comment in more detail about the design of the houses and the protection of the mature trees and bushes that form a natural boundary that gives both side of the road some privacy.	Comments noted.	It is recommended that Tweed Court, Kelso (AKELS025) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Kelso	Tweed Court (AKELS025)	Smith & Garratt on behalf of the Millar Partnership and David Wilson Homes	Object	The SG includes a number of small sites within settlement boundaries. These appear to be covered by existing development policies, adding these to the SG, does not increase the availability and choice of available sites,	Appendix 2, as contained within the LDP, provides a windfall assumption, which is included within the overall potential contribution towards the housing requirement (up to 2025).	It is recommended that Tweed Court, Kelso (AKELS025) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

				<p>which includes AKELS025. Object to the inclusion of this site on the grounds of, being developable in accordance with existing planning policies, their inclusion would not help the Council to meet the requirement of the SG.</p>	<p>The Scottish Borders is rural in character and a large proportion of the windfall assumption is provided for by housing in the countryside approvals.</p> <p>The LDP provides development opportunities within settlement boundaries, through housing, re-development and mixed use allocations. Therefore, the SG will continue to identify and provide development opportunities within settlement boundaries, as per the LDP, including brownfield opportunities.</p> <p>It should be noted that due to the involvement of a Registered Social Landlord (RSL) it is considered the site is an appropriate and effective site to be included within the SG.</p>	
Melrose	Bleachfield (AMELR012)	Ferguson Planning on behalf of JS Crawford Estates	Objects to the site not being included	<p>1. The contributor states that there has been strong demand shown for 48 houses together with a potential care home for this site. The contributor also notes that there has been no housing allocated in this area of Melrose despite it being highly popular for new</p>	<p>1. Comments noted. The site was rejected at the initial stage 1 site assessment stage primarily due to the unacceptable harm to the distinct identities of Melrose and Darnick that the development would result in, and which Countryside</p>	<p>It is recommended that site Bleachfield, Melrose (AMELR012) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.</p>

				<p>homes and will be evidently delivered over the lifespan of the local plan. It is important that land allocations are made in sustainable and sought after locations to live. Large land allocations in areas that are not in demand will not address the housing shortfall within the specified time period. The contributor stresses that it is highly important to allocate housing in the Scottish Borders where there is a strong demand to live. There is a clear high demand for homes in Melrose and the site should be allocated as a 'preferred site'. The site is deliverable in full within this Local Plan lifespan.</p> <p>2. The site actually represents a natural extension to Melrose and will no way lead to urban coalescence to Darnick given the existing fields that run between the settlements. The contributor questions why site AMELR012 was dismissed so early in the assessment as the site represents a natural extension to Melrose.</p> <p>3. The site represents a logical northern rounding off</p>	<p>Around Towns policy seeks to maintain. The potential effectiveness of the site is not in question.</p> <p>2. Sensitivity within the CAT policy area varies, particularly in relation to coalescence, and this was reflected in the assessment of sites within the CAT policy area. The area between Darnick and Melrose is amongst the most sensitive within the CAT area and this was the basis for excluding this site. Prevention of coalescence seeks to help retain the individual identity of settlements. The assessment in relation to this site stated:</p> <p><i>The site is located within one of the most sensitive parts of the CAT policy area, where coalescence between Darnick and Melrose is of key concern. The proposal cannot be considered further due to the unacceptable harm to the distinct identities of these settlements the proposed development would result in.</i></p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>of the Melrose development boundary. The houses to the south of the site along High Cross Avenue would remain the closest built form to Darnick. The separation between the Darnick and Melrose development boundaries would remain with hedging along the site boundary providing a defensible boundary which would be enhanced and further fields between it and the nearest Darnick house. The site is low lying and considerable distance from the River Tweed and Eildon hills. It is next to built form and would not significantly impact on these sensitive areas in terms of visual impact. Again the current and proposed hedging along the site boundary would lessen the visual impact. To dismiss this allocation based on the site being within the CAT area is questionable, especially when allocating 300 units to another CAT site nearby which is disjointed from the nearby settlement and has significant deliverability issues to address. There are no potential constraints associated with the site and no contamination issues.</p>	<p>3. Comments noted. However, the site was fundamentally dropped from inclusion within the SG due to the CAT policy which sought to prevent coalescence between the settlements of Darnick and Melrose. It should be noted that a portion of the northern extent of the site does sit within SEPA's one in 200 year river flood event area. Issues regarding the 300no units referred to at Lowood are addressed elsewhere in this table.</p> <p>4. Comments noted. The sites referred to are discussed elsewhere in this table.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

				<p>There are no flooding concerns with the site. The site is on the edge of the urban settlement and therefore is in a sustainable location close to Tweedbank Train Station and regular bus services and also close to all existing utilities. The site will not have a major impact on the local road network and is highly accessible to Melrose Town Centre and thus assist in enhancing the use and vitality and viability of the town centre.</p> <p>4. The contributor lists a number of 'preferred' or 'alternative' sites which the contributor considers less superior than the subject site.</p>		
Newstead	Newstead North (ANEWS006)	Lynda Marwood	Notes	<p>The contributor states that they do not object to thoughtful planning and acknowledges that there are many excellent housing schemes around the UK. The contributor hopes the Council manages to satisfy Scottish Government but hopes this site does not come to fruition. The contributor is enthusiastic about the Borders Railway but is concerned the area may be spoiled by hundreds of newly built houses that</p>	Comments noted.	It is recommended that Newstead North (ANEWS006) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

				aren't sympathetic and in keeping with the local towns and villages that make this area very special indeed.		
Newstead	Newstead North (ANEWS006)	Save Scott's Countryside	Notes	<p>This site is largely screened, from viewpoints across the Tweed at the level of the B6360, by the present tree screen between the site and the river. However, from more aerial viewpoints to the north and more especially from the south i.e. the Eildons, it would produce an enlargement towards the river of the main body of this otherwise linear village in the National Scenic Area. The contributors therefore urge that, in the event of it needing to be used, the house numbers should be reduced and positioned mainly between the existing developments, leaving the land along the tree belt as extended gardens or additional tree-planting.</p>	<p>Comments relating to the site being largely screened from the north are noted.</p> <p>With regards to viewpoints from more elevated positions, it is accepted that any development on the site has the potential to be visible from such locations, but the planning and sustainability benefits of developing this largely contained site on the edge of an established settlement would be considered to outweigh any adverse impacts of this nature.</p> <p>Site capacities are indicative only and the site layout and design will considered should any planning application be submitted. It is not considered necessary or beneficial to preclude the erection of dwelling houses in the northern portion of the site through the Housing SG process.</p>	It is recommended that Newstead North (ANEWS006) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead North (ANEWS006)	SNH	Notes	The site requirements state that existing trees on site should be protected. The contributor suggests that there are also opportunities	It is agreed that managing this woodland could benefit the setting of the site and would help in achieving an acceptable site layout and it	It is recommended that Newstead North (ANEWS006) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary

				to review management of the adjacent woodland to enhance its role in setting of the site and in its role in delivering further path connectivity through the site and to the River Tweed.	is noted that the developer's submission identifies this land as being within the ownership of the developer. If the site were to go forward for allocation it is proposed that an additional site requirement be added to read as follows:  <i>'The opportunity to review management of the adjacent woodland to enhance its role in the setting of the site and in its potential role in delivering further path connectivity through the site and to the River Tweed should be considered and explored through the planning application process'</i>	Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead North (ANEWS006)	Elizabeth Ellis	Notes (trees)	The part of the field where "war memorial" is wrongly marked is bounded by mature trees which should be preserved.	If the site were to go forward for allocation any future planning application submitted would need to comply with the site requirements contained within the finalised SG. One such requirement states that the site layout should ensure protection of healthy trees on the site, and that no trees on the site should be removed without the prior agreement of the Council's Landscape section.  The Draft SG uses OS	It is recommended that Newstead North (ANEWS006) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

					basemapping and any basemapping errors are outwith the Council's control.	
Newstead	Newstead North (ANEWS006)	James Hubbocks	Objects	The contributor acknowledges there is a need for housing in Scotland but suggests there are better sites available. The contributor believes the site is totally unsuitable for housing.	The Council assessed a total of 165 sites in the production of the Draft Housing SG. The Newstead North site emerged as an 'alternative' site from that process. Following the public consultation, the Council has concluded that the site is not deliverable, and that there are better sites available.	It is recommended that Newstead North (ANEWS006) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead North (ANEWS006)	Lisa Cowan Charles Cowan Eileen Clark Peter Wood Mrs N Ramage	Objects (Built Heritage)	The contributors object to any adverse impact on Newstead and Newstead's historic built heritage, noting that Newstead is the oldest inhabited village in Scotland.	If the site was to be included in the SG this matter would be addressed at the planning application stage.	It is recommended that Newstead North (ANEWS006) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead North (ANEWS006)	Lisa Cowan & Charles Cowan	Objects	The honour of being the longest inhabited settlement in Scotland should be reflected in the preservation of the village's green spaces, especially as the field is adjacent to the site of Trimontium.	Newstead's heritage is reflected in its Conservation Area status and the Trimontium is designated a Scheduled Monument. If the site was to be included within the SG a site requirement would state that the "design and layout of the site should take account of the Conservation Area and any adverse impacts upon any Scheduled Monuments in the vicinity".	It is recommended that Newstead North (ANEWS006) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead North (ANEWS006)	Sandra Brown Isobel King	Objects (Land Ownership)	The contributors question the ownership of the site.	The planning authority has sought supporting	It is recommended that Newstead North



		Lisa Cowan Charles Cowan & Sandra Duncan			documentation from the agent to confirm land ownership of the site. To date this information has not been received.	(ANEWS006) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead North (ANEWS006)	Isobel King	Objects (Light Pollution)	Development on this site would destroy the rural environment of a historically important village and would cause light pollution to the surrounding habitation. Such lights would be visible from the Gattonside side of the river and in likelihood, from Scott's View.	It is not anticipated that the development of this site for housing should result in unacceptable light pollution.	It is recommended that Newstead North (ANEWS006) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead North (ANEWS006)	Lynda Marwood	Objects (Loss of farmland)	The land is used for grazing sheep and cows and the farmer has used these fields for many years. It would be a loss to local farming.	The land is not recognised as being of prime agricultural value and there are no planning grounds to prevent an alternative use of the site.	It is recommended that Newstead North (ANEWS006) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead North (ANEWS006)	Lisa Cowan & Charles Cowan	Objects (Loss of farmland)	The land is an ancient pasture which has been traditionally used for farming for hundreds of years.	The land is not recognised as being of prime agricultural value and there are no planning grounds to prevent an alternative use of the site.	It is recommended that Newstead North (ANEWS006) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead North (ANEWS006)	Lynda Marwood	Objects	The contributor would prefer brownfield sites to be developed and considers local towns and villages to be at capacity.	The Council has a duty to find effective housing land. Whilst the Council allocates a large volume of brownfield land, including new brownfield housing sites identified through the Housing SG process, it is not possible nor practical to rely entirely upon brownfield sites.	It is recommended that Newstead North (ANEWS006) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead North	Isobel King;	Objects	The contributors are	If the site were to go	It is recommended that

	(ANEWS006)	Lisa Cowan & Charles Cowan	(Trees)	concerned about the potential impact on trees on the site.	forward for allocation any future planning application submitted would need to comply with the site requirements contained within the finalised SG. One such requirement states that the site layout should ensure protection of healthy trees on the site, and that no trees on the site should be removed without the prior agreement of the Council's Landscape section.	Newstead North (ANEWS006) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead North (ANEWS006)	Roy Mack	Objects (access at Barnethead Cottage)	The contributor objects to the site and notes that access would pass the North side of their property [Barnethead Cottage]. Given the narrowness of the entry it would require construction of a wider road. This in turn would require part of the contributor's land to be acquired for that purpose which the contributor would not agree to.	The contributor states that they own land immediately north of Barnethead Cottage, land which is required for access upgrade purposes. This is at odds with the developer's understanding. The planning authority has sought assurances and documentation from the developer which would confirm the developer's ownership of this land. To date no such documentation has been received.  Given the uncertainty regarding land ownership the planning authority cannot be confident that the developer can deliver the required access improvements to and from	It is recommended that Newstead North (ANEWS006) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

					Rushbank. The site cannot be considered deliverable and therefore cannot be considered further.	
Newstead	Newstead North (ANEWS006)	Lynda Marwood Morag Crawford Kathleen Breeze Elizabeth Ellis Mrs Jane McCaul Sandra Brown Lisa Cowan Charles Cowan John Crighton Mr & Mrs Ireland Isobel King Mrs Burns	Objects (Access to site from The Eddy)	The contributors object to the site on the grounds that access from The Eddy will not be possible, largely due to the limited width of the road and third party ownership issues. There are also concerns regarding the junction with Main Street.	<p>The Council's roads planning section were previously consulted as part of the initial site assessment, and were able to support the site's allocation subject to a number of improvements being made to enable suitable vehicular access to, from and through the site from Eddy Road and Rushbank. This was reflected in the Draft Housing SG document which required it to be demonstrated that land needed to achieve access could be acquired from adjoining property owners.</p> <p>The initial masterplan submitted through the call for sites process would have required numerous improvements to enable suitable access from Eddy Road, including addressing pinch points which are created by two buildings on the west side of Eddy Road. The developer has now submitted a revised masterplan which sets out a new approach to access from Eddy Road. This would</p>	It is recommended that Newstead North (ANEWS006) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

					<p>see access taken into the site further south than was originally envisaged, through the land of an adjoining property owner, avoiding one of the two pinch point buildings referred to above. The agreement of the same adjoining landowner would still be required and the developer's agent has stated that they have been in contact with that adjoining landowner. However, through the public consultation, it has become clear that the developer is not in a position to carry out these improvements. The landowner in question has made clear they are completely unwilling to contemplate agreeing to sell their land, to enable access improvements on their land, or to enter discussions with the developer's agent. To ensure the site would be effective, the planning authority requires confidence that access into the site could be achieved. As the key neighbouring landowner does not agree to enable access improvements to be made, it is concluded that access</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>from Eddy Road cannot be achieved. The site cannot therefore be considered deliverable and cannot be considered further.</p> <p>Evidence which confirms the applicant is in control of the required land to upgrade access routes into the site has not been submitted.</p>	
Newstead	Newstead North (ANEWS006)	<p>Lynda Marwood Kathleen Breeze Elizabeth Ellis Mrs Jane McCaul Sandra Brown Lisa Cowan Charles Cowan John Crighton Mr &amp; Mrs Ireland Isobel Kind Mrs Burns</p>	Objects (Access to the site from Rushbank)	<p>The contributors object to the site on the grounds that access from Rushbank will not be possible. There are also safety concerns related to using Rushbank, and a recent incident has been cited whereby Paramedics responding to an emergency call could not get their ambulance close to a property in Rushbank due to the narrow road and parked vehicles. It has also been suggested that a Housing Association owns land required to enable access which they are unwilling to sell.</p>	<p>The Council's roads planning section were previously consulted as part of the initial site assessment, and were able to support the site's allocation subject to a number of improvements being made to enable suitable vehicular access to, from and through the site from Eddy Road and Rushbank. This was reflected in the Draft Housing SG document which required it to be demonstrated that land needed to achieve access could be acquired from adjoining property owners.</p> <p>To ensure the site would be deliverable, the planning authority requires confidence that access can be achieved. The planning authority sought assurances and documentation from</p>	<p>It is recommended that Newstead North (ANEWS006) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.</p>

					<p>the developer which would confirm that agreements with the relevant adjoining land owners are in place. To date no such documentation has been received.</p> <p>Given the uncertainty regarding land ownership the planning authority cannot be confident that the developer can deliver the required access improvements to and from Rushbank. The site cannot be considered effective and therefore cannot be considered further.</p>	
Newstead	Newstead North (ANEWS006)	Lynda Marwood Sandra Brown Isobel King Lisa Cowan Charles Cowan	Objects (Bio-diversity)	The contributors have concerns regarding the effect of the development on local biodiversity.	<p>The Council's Ecology Officer was consulted as part of the Council's initial assessment of the site and advised that there were no significant biodiversity issues on the site.</p> <p>Nevertheless, given the proximity of the site to the River Tweed the draft SG sets out a requirement that any impacts on ecology are assessed and that mitigation be required as appropriate. It is considered that this would address any potential adverse impacts on local biodiversity satisfactorily were the site to go forward for allocation.</p>	It is recommended that Newstead North (ANEWS006) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

Newstead	Newstead North (ANEWS006)	Isobel King	Objects (Brownfield sites preferable)	The contributor asks why such sites are put forward whilst there are brownfield sites available, where regeneration would enhance Borders town centres. These areas would more readily meet the needs of people requiring affordable housing.	The Council has a duty to find effective housing land. Whilst the Council allocates a large volume of brownfield land, and new brownfield housing sites have been identified through the Housing SG process, it is neither reasonable nor practical to rely entirely upon brownfield sites.	It is recommended that Newstead North (ANEWS006) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead North (ANEWS006)	Lynda Marwood Morag Crawford Kathleen Breeze Elizabeth Ellis Lisa Cowan Charles Cowan Victoria Roy John Crichton Peter Wood Mr & Mrs Ireland Mrs Margaret Elmi Mrs N Ramage Isobel King	Objects (Capacity of local roads)	The contributors object to the site on the grounds that there would insufficient capacity in the local road network within Newstead to safely accommodate additional vehicles and/ or pedestrians. There are specific concerns related to the lack of pavement provision within Newstead.	The capacity of the local road network (including Main Street) to accommodate further development at the proposed site has been considered as part of the Council's roads planning team's assessment of the site. There was considered to be sufficient capacity in the local network to accommodate development on the scale proposed, subject to the formation of an internally connected road within the site, which would join the two site accesses to/ from Rushbank and Eddy Road. As per the responses set out above, it has been concluded that the developer is not in a position to achieve access to/ from Eddy Road, and there is uncertainty regarding access to/ from	It is recommended that Newstead North (ANEWS006) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

					Rushbank. It must therefore be concluded that a road linking these two access points from the east and west cannot be achieved. It is concluded that the requirements of the Roads Planning team with respect to local road network capacity cannot be met.	
Newstead	Newstead North (ANEWS006)	Lisa Cowan Charles Cowan Kathleen Breeze Elizabeth Ellis Mrs Jane McCaul Isobel King Lynda Marwood	Objects (Conservation Area)	The contributors object to any adverse impact on Newstead Conservation Area.	The site sits within or adjacent to Newstead Conservation Area and the site assessment concluded that this was a key consideration. If the site was to be included within the SG a site requirement would state that the “design and layout of the site should take account of the Conservation Area” and any development proposal will need to comply with the Council’s LDP planning policy regarding development in Conservation Areas.	It is recommended that Newstead North (ANEWS006) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead North (ANEWS006)	Sandra Brown Lisa Cowan Charles Cowan Mrs N Ramage	Objects (Construction Traffic)	The contributors object to the site on the grounds that the accesses are unsuitable for construction traffic and could be dangerous.	The responsibility for the safe and orderly construction of any future development would rest with the developer, in discussion with the Council’s Roads Planning section.	It is recommended that Newstead North (ANEWS006) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead North (ANEWS006)	Mr and Mrs Ireland & Lynda Marwood	Objects (Education Capacity)	The contributors believe Melrose Primary School is at capacity. Further	The Education Officer has confirmed that there would be capacity within the local	It is recommended that Newstead North (ANEWS006) is not



				development will put a strain on service delivery.	primary and secondary school to accommodate the development.	included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead North (ANEWS006)	Mrs Jane McCaul Isobel King Lynda Marwood & Eileen Clark	Objects (Impact on local walking routes)	The contributors object to the adverse impact on popular walking routes and local paths resulting from the additional housing and traffic, including on Eddy Road and the guided Trimontium walk.	Concerns regarding any potential impact on walking routes and local paths are acknowledged. It should be noted that the draft SG sets out a requirement that:  <i>'Pedestrian access from St John's Wynd and Townhead Way to be maintained. Pedestrian paths through the site to be established linking with the local path network including paths at the River Tweed.'</i>	It is recommended that Newstead North (ANEWS006) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead North (ANEWS006)	James Hubbocks Kathleen Breeze & Mrs N Ramage	Objects (Local services)	There is no local services provision within Newstead.	It is acknowledged that Newstead itself does not benefit from local service provision but the village is a short distance from Melrose, where most key local services are provided.	It is recommended that Newstead North (ANEWS006) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead North (ANEWS006)	Roy Mack Lisa Cowan Charles Cowan Victoria Roy Mr & Mrs Ireland Lynda Marwood	Objects (Loss of green space etc)	The contributors object to the loss of green space and/or natural landscape/ environment that would result from developing the site.	Development within or on the edge of existing settlements is generally more sustainable than development in the countryside and it is considered that developing this relatively contained site could be achieved without unacceptably detracting from the existing settlement.	It is recommended that Newstead North (ANEWS006) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead North (ANEWS006)	Elizabeth Ellis	Objects (Loss of open space)	It is very important to preserve open spaces in and	The Council has a duty to find effective housing land.	It is recommended that Newstead North

				around our villages and towns so surely it is infinitely preferable to develop brown field sites and, as far as possible, leave our beautiful countryside to be loved and enjoyed by all.	Whilst the Council allocates a large volume of brownfield land, and new brownfield housing sites have been identified through the Housing SG process, it is neither reasonable nor practical to rely entirely upon brownfield sites.	(ANEWS006) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead North (ANEWS006)	Isobel King	Objects (NSA and CAT)	Newstead is situated in the Eildon and Leaderfoot National Scenic Area (NSA) and a Countryside Around Towns area (CAT).	<p>Whilst the site sits within Newstead Eildon and Leaderfoot NSA, this does not preclude development. The Council's policy for development within the NSA (EP4) permits development which will not compromise the objectives of designation and the overall landscape value of the NSA. It is considered that this relatively contained site could be developed without compromising the objectives of the NSA.</p> <p>With regards to the Council's Countryside Around Towns policy, the site sits partly within the Countryside Around Towns (CAT) policy area which aims to prevent piecemeal development in the countryside and coalescence of settlements. The CAT policy does not</p>	It is recommended that Newstead North (ANEWS006) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

					preclude development, and this particular part of the CAT is less sensitive than other areas, and the risk of coalescence in this location is minimal or nil.	
Newstead	Newstead North (ANEWS006)	Isobel King James Hubbocks Kathleen Breeze John Crichton Mrs Jane McCaul Mr & Mrs Ireland Elizabeth Ellis	Objects (Subsidence)	The contributors state that the river bank to the north of the site is subsiding at the NHS Borders offices and believe the site to be unsuitable for housing.	It is acknowledged that land to the north east of the site which adjoins the river suffers from erosion. However there is no evidence the site in question is at risk.	It is recommended that Newstead North (ANEWS006) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead North (ANEWS006)	Lisa Cowan & Charles Cowan	Objects (Subsidence)	The contributor's home is situated at the top of this sensitive bank, adjacent to NHS Borders, and the contributor is extremely concerned about any further land disturbance which would threaten their safety.	It is acknowledged that land to the north east of the site which adjoins the river suffers from erosion. However there is no evidence the site in question is at risk.	It is recommended that Newstead North (ANEWS006) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead North (ANEWS006)	Mr & Mrs Ireland	Objects (Traffic levels and noise pollution)	Higher volumes of traffic will bring greater levels of noise pollution to the local area.	Whilst levels of background noise or noise pollution may increase slightly this is not considered a reasonable justification to preclude the site.	It is recommended that Newstead North (ANEWS006) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead North (ANEWS006)	Mr & Mrs Ireland	Objects (Various)	Impact on built and natural environment: Newstead is a conservation village, an Eildon and Leaderfoot Scenic Area and a Countryside Around Towns area, it is also the oldest inhabited village in Scotland. This development will have an inevitable negative impact on the traditional character of the village and the natural	Whilst the site sits within Newstead Eildon and Leaderfoot NSA, this does not preclude development. The Council's policy for development within the NSA (EP4) permits development which will not compromise the objectives of designation and the overall landscape value of the NSA. It is considered	It is recommended that Newstead North (ANEWS006) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

				environment surrounding it.	<p>that this relatively contained site could be developed without compromising the objectives of the NSA.</p> <p>With regards to the Council's Countryside Around Towns policy, the site sits partly within the Countryside Around Towns (CAT) policy area which aims to prevent piecemeal development in the countryside and coalescence of settlements. The CAT policy does not preclude development, and this particular part of the CAT is less sensitive than other areas, and the risk of coalescence in this location is minimal or nil.</p> <p>If the site were to go forward for allocation any future planning application submitted would need to comply with the site requirements contained within the finalised SG. One such requirement states that the "design and layout of the site should take account of the Conservation Area" and any development proposal will need to comply with the Council's LDP planning policy</p>	
--	--	--	--	-----------------------------	---	--

					regarding development in Conservation Areas.	
Newstead	Newstead North (ANEWS006)	Lynda Marwood	Objects (Views/ property value)	The contributor is an artist and bought their house to look out onto countryside, not houses and is concerned their property may reduce in value.	There is no right to a view in planning legislation, and similarly, property values are not a consideration in planning.	It is recommended that Newstead North (ANEWS006) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead North (ANEWS006)	John Crichton	Objects to proposed site capacity	23 new houses at this site is far too many and only about half of that number should be permitted and that they should not be packed closely together, but spread evenly over the area of the slope.	Site capacities are indicative only and it will be for the developer to come forward with a scheme appropriate to the site. This would be considered fully at the planning application stage.	It is recommended that Newstead North (ANEWS006) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead North (ANEWS006)	Alan Couper Consulting, on behalf of Lord Devenport	Support	<p>The contributor notes that the access proposal submitted under the Call for Sites required widening of Eddy Road on its west side. It is now intended to take access into the site from a different location on Eddy Road, significantly shortening the length of Eddy Road which requires widening.</p> <p>The contributor states that they have been in contact with several adjoining landowners and have a received a positive response from several.</p>	See response above.	It is recommended that Newstead North (ANEWS006) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead North (ANEWS006)	Alan Couper Consulting on behalf of Lord Devenport	Support	The contributor notes with reference to the site assessment that new development needs to complement the varied townscape already in the	Comments noted. The suitability of any site design and layout will ultimately be determined at the planning application stage. The site assessment concluded that the relationship with the	It is recommended that Newstead North (ANEWS006) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

				village and states that that is why the Master Plan prepared by Aitken Turnbull Architects deliberately reflects a varied typology of housing.	Conservation Area would be a key consideration and that sensitive integration would be essential. The site progressed as an alternative site in the Draft SG and no judgement on the suitability of the proposed masterplan would be made until a future planning application, were the site to become allocated.	
Newstead	Newstead North (ANEWS006)	Alan Couper Consulting on behalf of Lord Devonport	Supports inclusion of site	<p>The contributor believes access from Rushbank can be achieved, and requires only a relatively minor widening of the existing access which runs between Nos 14 and 15 Rushbank and a widening further in at Tweedwood Cottage which the contributor states is owned by Lord Devonport.</p> <p>The boundary of the private property on the south side of the access, Barnethead Cottage, is the front elevation of the cottage. The contributor concludes that this means all the land from the front elevation of Barnethead Cottage to Tweedwood Cottage, including Tweedwood Cottage itself, are owned by the developer.</p> <p>The contributor believes they are in a good position to overcome these issues</p>	<p>The contributor's comments are at odds with other contributors on the question of ownership of land immediately north of Barnethead Cottage.</p> <p>The planning authority has sought assurances and documentation from the developer which would confirm the developer's ownership of this land, as well as a copy of correspondence which confirms the agreement of other key adjoining landowners. To date no such documentation has been received.</p> <p>Given the uncertainty regarding land ownership and the agreement of necessary adjoining landowners, the planning authority cannot be</p>	It is recommended that Newstead North (ANEWS006) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

				following contact with adjoining landowners.	confident that the developer can deliver the required access improvements to and from Rushbank. The site cannot be considered deliverable and therefore cannot be considered further.	
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Debbie Chabluk	Comments	The contributor suggests that requirements of existing residents adjacent to the site also be listed as a site requirement, with specific consideration to height of buildings and the provision of parking space allocated specifically to Townhead Farmhouse.	Consideration of effects on neighbours is a fundamental component of considering planning applications and will be addressed fully at that stage. Site layout and design, and the designs of buildings including building heights will be considered through that process. Parking arrangements will also be addressed at the time of a planning application though it should be noted that these would only address parking issues relative to the development and the site itself.	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Graham Barker Donald Gordon	Note (Sewer pipe runs through site)	I believe that the main sewer pipe for the East of the village runs through North of the orchard and also some old water culverts which may have been installed during the railway construction in 1849.	Comments noted. This is a matter for the developer to consider.	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Graham Barker Donald Gordon	Notes (Road description)	The contributor wishes to correct the Draft SG description of access to the site, and state that access is from the B6361 Main Street East via the private unadopted single carriageway roads of Hazeldean Road and Back Road.	Comments noted. The Council's Street Gazetteer identifies the entire loop to and from Main Street as Back Road. In order to maintain consistency with the Council's Street Gazetteer, it is considered appropriate to retain current naming.	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Colin and Jeanette Tuddenham	Notes	The contributor states that the previous approval was for 6 units described as 'executive houses' and that this may not be appropriate for this conservation site. The contributors realise there are no actual plans to make comment on but wish to register a concern that any proposed housing would not impact negatively on such an historic village.	The Council cannot control how the developer describes or markets the development.  The design and layout of any development will be required to take account of the Conservation Area, and will need to comply with planning policies contained within the LDP, including those related to Conservation Areas.	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Evelyn & David Oliver	Notes	The contributor notes the historical and cultural importance of Newstead, which claims to be the oldest continuously inhabited village in Scotland. The contributor believes there has been a great deal of development in the village in the last 25 – 30 years, leaving very few green spaces to enjoy.	Whilst there has been infill development within Newstead over recent years there has been no allocation in the village for over twenty years. It should be noted this site has previously been granted planning consent and this allocation effectively reflects this consent.	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Graham Barker Donald Gordon	Notes	The hedge which partially bounds the site to the South (Backroad) is very old. The	The Council's Roads DM team have confirmed via the previous planning	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included



				hedge makes the sight lines difficult especially at the East corner and is very much a road safety issue.	application and site assessment that suitable access into the site can be achieved. Detailed access arrangements will be considered through the planning application process. Any effect the hedge has on access visibility will be considered at that time.	within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Debbie Chabluk	Notes	The contributor is pleased that site requirements included consideration of wildlife, conservation and the possible historical significance of this area.	Support noted.	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Debbie Chabluk	Notes	Townhead Farmhouse should be clearly illustrated on the map, perhaps by use of the same shading you have used to identify all other dwelling houses in the immediate area.	The Council uses standard Ordnance Survey base-mapping to illustrate the locations of sites which the Council is not able to change.	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	SEPA	Notes	1. As explained in our previous response, consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site. Developable area/ development type may be constrained due to flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues at this site. This is a matter for	1. Bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site, and detailed consideration of surface water flood risk will be assessed through FRA at the planning application stage.	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

				<p>the Council to consider.</p> <p>2. We also support the requirement to explore the potential for culvert removal and channel restoration.</p>	2. Comments noted.	
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	John Crichton	Notes (Access arrangements)	On the South side of the site, there is a very old high mixed hedge, which is overgrown and would best be removed. If this were done, and the fence on the North side of the hedge moved to the North by one Metre, this would allow Back Road to be widened and thus be able to be upgraded and made up to adoptable standards.	Precise arrangements for access and landscaping will be addressed through the planning application process. However, the Council can only ask for the upgrade of Back Road from the junction with Main Street to the access into the site as vehicle trips are unlikely to be made via Claymires Lane. Any requirement to upgrade past access into the site would be unreasonable.	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Donald Gordon	Notes (Archaeology)	The contributor brings to attention an archaeological find previously made on the site and handed in to the Trimontium Trust, and the subsequent assessment of the find by the National Museum of Scotland.	Comments and submitted information are noted. The archaeological assessment of the site, including archaeological evaluation and any associated mitigation as identified will be required. The Council Archaeologist has also been notified of the details of the find and the background of this find for future reference, including the documentation submitted.	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Isobel King John Crichton James M Annand	Notes (Boundary walls)	The contributors seek the retention of the historic boundary walls to the site.	The retention of the historic wall to the north of the site is already a site requirement	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included

		Evelyn & David Oliver Mr A. Martin Neilson		More specifically, one contributor seeks reassurance that the western boundary wall would also be retained as it is of historic significance as well as providing screening between Big Well Wynd and the proposed development [Mr A. Martin Neilson].	for the development. This site requirement has been amended to ensure the western side of the site boundary wall is also retained.	within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.  It is also recommended that the site requirement ( <i>bullet point 3</i> ) be amended to read:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The historic wall to the north and west of the site should be retained.</i></li> </ul>
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Graham Barker Donald Gordon Maria Hawkes	Notes (Boundary walls)	The contributors highlight the condition of the historic walls that bound the site, which they say are in a serious state of decay. One contributor [Maria Hawkes] asks for the walls to be repaired by the developer.	Comments noted. Maintenance of the historic wall would be a matter for the owner to address. The historic wall to the west and north of the site will need to be retained as part of the development in accordance with the related site requirement.	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Mr A. Martin Neilson	Notes (Flood risk)	The contributor notes an accumulation of debris around the watercourse downstream of the proposed site which would require to be cleared, with subsequent attention to ensure that such debris does not gather in the future as this could cause a serious flood risk to the new site.	Comments noted. A flood risk assessment is required as part of any subsequent planning application and will address these issues.	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Graham Barker Donald Gordon	Notes (Flooding)	The site has a small partially covered watercourse running East to West on its North side which until recently had not been maintained for	Comments noted. This matter will be addressed at the planning application stage.	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance

				decades. Hazeldean Road and Backroad are prone to surface flooding each winter after heavy rain. The road surface level should be raised substantially to avoid future flooding. The excessive winter surface water originates from a blocked/broken field drain in a field to the South of the A6091 and inadequate drainage maintenance at the Hazeldean Road underpass.		on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Graham Barker Donald Gordon	Notes (Naming of site)	This site has been referred to by residents as 'Townhead Orchard' to distinguish it from EHA Orchard at the West End of the village.	The site name has been chosen by the Council solely as a reference to be used within the LDP process. Changing the name now will lead to confusion and will affect the paper trail.	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Graham Barker Donald Gordon Stewart & Linda Ritchie Colin and Jeanette Tuddenham John & Anne Walker Evelyn & David Oliver	Notes (requests upgrade of Hazeldean Road and Back Road)	The contributors request that Hazeldean Road and Back Road be improved and upgraded to an adoptable standard at the cost of the developer of the site as part of any development. If this was carried out it would allow all of the road along to and including Hazeldean Meadow to be adopted onto the list of Public Roads.	The Council can only require the upgrade of Back Road from the junction with Main Street to the access into the site. Given the location of the site, vehicle trips to and from the site are expected to come via the Main Street/ Back Road junction. It is considered most unlikely that significant vehicle movements to and from the site would be via the longer and more restricted Back Road/ Claymires Land route. It would therefore be unreasonable and	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

					unjustified to require any developer to upgrade Back Road to an adoptable standard other than the part directly from the site onto the Main Street.	
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Graham Barker John Walker and Anne Walker	Notes (timing of access improvement works)	Improvement works to Back Road should be completed before any houses are built or a Bond taken out by the developer to cover the costs of this work if necessary.	The precise mechanism for achieving the required upgrade of Back Road to the access into the site will be determined at the planning application stage. Similarly, the timing of upgrade works will be determined at the planning application stage, but it may be beneficial to wait until construction has been completed before undertaking upgrade works.	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Graham Barker Donald Gordon	Notes (upgrade of Back Road)	I am of the opinion that a firm commitment was made by Borders Regional Council Director of Roads & Transportation Mr R.Hill in a letter to me in March 1988 and I quote an extract from that letter "In conjunction with any new development, my department have, and will continue to recommend to the Planning Committee that upgrading of Back Road relating to each project should be affected by the developer."	Comments regarding a letter from 1988 from the Director of Roads and Transportation are noted.  It is confirmed that the advice from the Council Roads Planning Section is that the Council can only reasonably require an upgrade of Back Road from the junction with the Main Street to the access into the site.	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Sandra Brown Isobel King	Notes [trees]	The contributors note that the site contains a number of good quality trees and would like to see these retained.	The site allocation is subject to a site requirement that no trees can be removed without the prior	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised

					agreement of planning authority. Consideration of the quality and significance of the trees will be decided at that time.	Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Smith and Garratt on behalf of Millar Partnership and David Wilson Homes	Object to the inclusion of Newstead North (ANEWS005) within the Housing SG, stating that it is covered by existing development policies	<p>The contributor states that the site is covered by existing development policies, therefore including the site within the SG does not increase the availability and choice of available sites.</p> <p>Objects to the inclusion of the site on the grounds that it is capable of being developed in accordance with existing planning policies and the inclusion within the Housing SG would not help the Council in meeting the requirements of the SG.</p>	<p>Appendix 2, as contained within the LDP, provides a windfall assumption, which is included within the overall potential contribution towards the housing requirement (up to 2025).</p> <p>The Scottish Borders is rural in character and a large proportion of the windfall assumption is provided for by housing in the countryside approvals.</p> <p>The LDP provides development opportunities within settlement boundaries, through housing, re-development and mixed use allocations. Therefore, the SG will continue to identify and provide development opportunities within settlement boundaries, as per the LDP, including brownfield opportunities.</p> <p>It must be noted that this site has previously been granted planning consent for 6 houses.</p>	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Isobel King	Objects	Any houses in this area should be single storey to avoid blocking the view from existing houses in Back Road.	There is no right to a view in planning legislation. The design of dwellings and consideration of any perceived impacts on existing surrounding residential properties will be assessed during the planning application process.	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Mrs Jane McCaul	Objects	Newstead is an ancient village of national importance and interest. Many of the historic walls were built without foundations and are at serious risk from traffic vibration and more cars going up and down the Main Street is most undesirable.	We are not aware of any reports that traffic vibrations are adversely affecting walls or buildings in Newstead. The Council's Roads DM team consider the increase in traffic associated with 6 dwellinghouses to be fairly minimal when compared with the existing traffic flows. It is worth noting that in the past, before the Melrose By-pass, there would have been more traffic going through the village and certainly more HGVs.	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Isobel King Christopher Hawkes Maria Hawkes	Objects	The contributors note that Newstead sits with a National Scenic Area.	Whilst Newstead sits within various heritage and environmental constraint areas these do not preclude all development and the principle of developing this site is already established following the earlier planning approval on the site (06/02207/FUL).	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead Orchard	Isobel King	Objects	The site is situated in a	Newstead is not located	It is recommended that

	(ANEWS005)			Countryside Around Towns area.	within the area covered by the Countryside Around Towns policy, which applies only to areas outwith settlement boundaries. The policy aims to prevent piecemeal development in the countryside and coalescence of settlements. This site would result in 'infill' development which would help ensure the aims of the CAT policy are met.	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Adeline Boyd	Objects	The contributor objects stating that whilst housing needs seek to be addressed, there is also a need to take into account the impact of any development on existing residents.	The impact of development on existing residents is a fundamental consideration in assessing sites and has been fully considered.	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Adeline Boyd	Objects	It should be a priority to retain natural habitat wherever possible.	Retention of natural habitats and protecting biodiversity were amongst the aims of the site assessment process, and assessment of this site did not identify any concerns which would prevent development. Assessment of ecology impacts and provision of appropriate required mitigation would be addressed at the planning application stage.	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Christopher Hawkes Maria Hawkes	Objects	In principle, the contributor believes the council should ensure that there is adequate housing for all of its residents, taking account	It is considered that the Council does give due cognisance to the matters listed. It should be noted that there has not been an	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance



				of population growth. The council also has a duty to protect the unique environment of its green spaces and historic villages. Therefore planning decisions need to take account of what can appear to be irreconcilable principles; the need for housing and the need to protect our culture.	allocation within Newstead for over 20 years.  It must be noted that this site has previously been granted planning consent for 6 houses.	on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	James M Annand	Objects	The site development for housing is very much a last resort and counsel of desperation and I would hope that the planning authority will not sanction a proposal which has little to recommend it. Some other use for the ground should be preferred.	The site has been tested previously for residential development via a planning application which concluded the site was appropriate for residential development.	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Isobel King Mrs N Ramage Maria Hawkes	Objects to construction traffic	The contributors are concerned that access is unsuitable for construction vehicles, which could endanger those using the Back Road and could undermine improvements made to Back Road by residents.	It is not envisaged that construction vehicles will or even physically could access the site via Back Road/ Claymires Land. The existing road between the site access and the Main Street will ultimately be made up to an adoptable standard for the benefit of all Back Road users. Any damage to Back Road caused by the developer outwith the part to be upgraded to adoptable standard will be a private matter between the parties involved.	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

					In terms of access into the site itself, this will be addressed during the planning application process, and arrangements for the construction period will be decided upon at a later date following discussion with the Council's Roads DM team.	
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Isobel King	Objects (archaeology)	A full in-depth and detailed archaeological survey should be carried out.	The archaeological assessment of the site, including archaeological evaluation and any associated mitigation as identified is already a site requirement.	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Isobel King	Objects (brownfield sites preferable)	The contributor questions why such sites are put forward whilst there are brownfield sites available, where regeneration would enhance Borders town centres. These areas would more readily meet the needs of people requiring affordable housing.	The Council has a duty to find effective and deliverable housing land. Whilst the Council allocates a large volume of brownfield land, including several new brownfield housing sites identified through this Housing SG process, it is not reasonable to rely entirely upon brownfield sites to deliver effective sites.	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Isobel King Christopher Hawkes Maria Hawkes Mrs N Ramage	Objects (conservation area)	The contributors note that Newstead is a conservation area of great historical importance.  One contributor [Isobel King] states that the village has already had significant	Whilst the development site sits within Newstead Conservation Area, this designation does not preclude development and it is considered that an appropriate scheme which respects the Conservation	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

				development both within and adjacent to the conservation area.	<p>Area can be achieved at this location. The design and layout of any development will be required to take account of the Conservation Area, and will need to comply with planning policies contained within the LDP, including those related to Conservation Areas.</p> <p>It should be noted that no new housing sites have been allocated in Newstead for well over 20 years.</p> <p>It must be noted that this site has previously been granted planning consent for 6 houses.</p>	
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	James M Annand	Objects (conservation area)	Local residents have been put to considerable expense over the years to help maintain the character of the Conservation Area and it would be most unfortunate if developers should be permitted to get off without doing a complete and proper job of preservation. This would involve a great deal of expense added to the expense and difficulties of access and drainage and would scarcely allow the six houses into the category of relatively cheap and affordable homes which after	<p>Whilst the development site sits within Newstead Conservation Area, this designation does not preclude development and it is considered that an appropriate scheme which respects the Conservation Area can be achieved at this location. The design and layout of any development will be required to take account of the Conservation Area, and will need to comply with planning policies contained within the LDP, including those related to Conservation</p>	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

				all is the main object of your exercise.	Areas.  It should be noted that no new housing sites have been allocated in Newstead for well over 20 years.	
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Isobel King	Objects (field drain beneath access)	The part of Back Road from Main Street to the site entrance has a field drain running beneath the road surface and would make it unsuitable.	Comments noted. Detailed roads issues in and around the site would be a responsibility for the developer to address in discussion with the Council's Roads Planning section at the planning application stage or thereafter.	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	James M Annand	Objects (flooding at access)	Access from Back Road presents difficulties as that area is liable to flooding from the burn that passes under the road and that traverses the site. In recent years its flow has been augmented by water from a loch that has formed at the junction of Main Street and the by-pass. Piping the burn under the road and through the site will be a considerable matter which may not be worth the expense for just 6 houses.	A flood risk assessment is required as part of any subsequent planning application. Detailed local flooding related issues can be considered at the planning application stage.	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	John Walker and Anne Walker Stewart and Linda Ritchie Isobel King Sandra Brown	Objects (flooding)	The contributors note that the site floods.  One contributor is concerned flooding could affect houses further down the village [Sandra Brown].	Comments noted. The risk of surface water flooding was identified at the site assessment stage and a flood risk assessment is required as part of any subsequent planning application in order to	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

					address this matter.	
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Christopher Hawkes Maria Hawkes	Objects (growth of Newstead)	Newstead has experienced an inexorable growth in the last 25 years that is removing the historic nature of Newstead. Newstead becomes an extension of Melrose and Melrose an extension of Galashiels. The very aspect of the community which is unique is gradually being eroded.	There have been no allocations within Newstead in the last twenty years. It is considered that two recent developments, at Barnethead Lane and The Orchards, both developed in the last 20 years, are well designed developments which are in keeping and appropriate additions to the village. The Council has put in place firm policy protection to prevent coalescence between settlements within the Countryside Around Towns area which includes Galashiels, Melrose and Newstead. This policy aims to prevent coalescence by promoting infill development within settlements at sites such as this.  It must be noted that this site has previously been granted planning consent for 6 houses.	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Stewart and Linda Ritchie	Objects (house design)	The contributors are concerned about the style of housing that may be developed on the site.	The design and layout of any development will be required to take account of the Conservation Area, and will need to comply with planning policies contained within the LDP, including those related to	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

					Conservation Areas.	
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Isobel King	Objects (ownership of Back Road)	The contributor questions whether the ownership of Back Road has been established and whether access into the site has been agreed with the owner.	Back Road is not adopted by the Council and it is understood there are a number of parties in Back Road with a joint ownership and who have a right of access over it. It is anticipated that the developer will be able to upgrade the necessary part of Back Road as per the associated site requirement.	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Mrs N Ramage Stewart and Linda Ritchie	Objects due to lack of services	The contributors highlight the lack of local services within Newstead.	It is acknowledged that Newstead itself does not benefit from local service provision but the village is a short distance from Melrose, where most key local services are provided.	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Isobel King	Objects due to risk of subsidence	The lower part of the site regularly floods. Additional houses in this area could render the ground liable to subsidence through erosion, and this may also have a knock-on effect on Back Road.	Any development on the site will be required to comply with modern building regulations, which would address any risk from subsidence.	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Mrs Jane McCaul	Objects to increased traffic levels	The centre of the village is extremely narrow with no room for pavements and as things are now pedestrians, riders and dog walkers are at risk from traffic – more aren't needed. It is a quaint and beautiful village - indeed it is a conservation area - and its low density of housing and open views are part of	The development of this small site would have a limited impact on overall traffic levels in the area. The site has been assessed by the Council's Roads DM team who consider the local road network capable of accommodating any resulting increase in traffic.	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

				its charm. Many people come to walk here and enjoy its amenities and its peace and quiet which would be destroyed by another 50 or so cars going up and down.		
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Isobel King Mrs N Ramage James M Annand	Objects to increased traffic levels	The contributors are concerned about the capacity of local roads to deal with additional traffic. Main Street is already a very busy thoroughfare with no pavements and is used as a shortcut to and from the A6091 to Melrose. Although there is a recommended 20 mph through the village many drivers ignore such signs. Any more traffic using Main Street is only going to exacerbate already dangerous areas in the village.	The capacity of the local road network (including Main Street) to accommodate further development at the proposed site has been considered as part of the Council's Roads DM team's assessment of this site. There is considered to be sufficient capacity to accommodate development on the scale proposed.	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Margaret Elmi Evelyn & David Oliver	Objects to increased traffic levels	The contributors are concerned about the potential increase in traffic on Back Road that could result from development, which they note is un-adopted.	The upgrade of Back Road from the junction with Main Street to the access into the site will be required of any development of the site. Given the location of the site, vehicle trips to and from the site are expected to come via the Main Street/ Back Road junction. Any additional adverse impact on Back Road or Claymires Lane is expected to be minimal.	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Isobel King Mrs Jane McCaul	Objects to proposed site capacity	The contributors consider 6 houses to be too many for	Planning permission was previously granted on the	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard

				the size of the site.	site for 6 dwelling houses. The site has therefore shown to have potential to accommodate six dwelling houses and a capacity of six units is considered appropriate. Site capacities are indicative only and it will be for the developer to come forward with a scheme appropriate to the site.	(ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Isobel King Stewart and Linda Ritchie Sandra Brown Mrs Jane McCaul Maria Hawkes John Crichton	Objects to site access	<p>The contributors believe that access to the site will be unsuitable. Contributors note that access is on a sharp bend from an unadopted road which is used by pedestrians, dog walkers, horses etc.</p> <p>Other contributors make related points: the current site entrance floods [John Crichton; Jane McCaul; Stewart and Linda Ritchie]; the junction of Hazeldean Road and Main Street is dangerous with poor site lines to the East, as the road comes up a fairly steep gradient to meet Main Street [John Crichton].</p>	<p>Access to and from the site has been assessed by the Council's Roads DM team via the previous planning application, and via the site assessment process, who confirm suitable access into the site can be achieved.</p> <p>Back Road will be required to be made up to adoptable standard from the junction with Main Street to the access point into the site.</p>	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Graham Barker Donald Gordon	Requests planning brief	I request that a planning brief is prepared by Scottish Borders Council for this site before planning applications are asked for.	Given the previous approval [06/02207/FUL] on the site, it would not be justifiable to require a planning brief for this site. In effect, a site layout would have been	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.



					agreed when that planning permission was granted, although any new application would be required to reflect any subsequent changes in policy.	
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Save Scott's Countryside	Supports	The contributor considers to proposal to be reasonable.	Comments noted.	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newstead	Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005)	Scottish Environmental Protection Agency	Supports requirement for FRA	We support the requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment.	Comments noted.	It is recommended that Newstead Orchard (ANEWS005) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Newtown St Boswells	Land South of Whitehill (ANEWT009)	Holder Planning on behalf of CW Properties	Object to the non-allocation of (ANEWT009) within the Housing SG	<p>ANEWT009 is considered to offer clear potential as a housing development opportunity (capacity 500 units) which can significantly contribute to the shortfall. An indicative Masterplan is submitted. Disagree with the conclusions of the RAG assessment for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As shown in the indicative Masterplan, contrary to the development of the site eroding the settlement identities of Newtown St Boswells and St Boswells, the proposed tree belt and landscaping will</li> </ul>	<p>The following was the conclusion of the assessment undertaken to the original submission through the process of the call for sites, it is considered that this remains relevant to the most recent submission:</p> <p><i>The site was considered as part of the Housing SG. An initial stage 1 RAG assessment was undertaken, however this concluded that the site should not be taken forward as part of the Housing SG. The conclusion of the assessment is as follows: The majority of this site was</i></p>	It is recommended that Land South of Whitehill (ANEWT009) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

				<p>create a strong 100-metre buffer between the settlements, which will ensure no visual or perceptual coalescence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Woodland planting and landscaping will ensure development is not visible along the A699, ensuring that the rural character is retained and reducing the impact on the landscape character of the area.</li> <li>• Newtown St Boswells is an accessible location within the Central Borders Housing Market Area. The site is accessed from the new proposed junction on the A68 and directly from Newtown St Boswells. It is intended to create a primary route through the proposed site from these two points, which will connect directly with the A699.</li> <li>• Development of the site will be a natural extension to the allocated Newtown St Boswells Expansion Area (ANEWT005). The site is effective and free from any physical constraints that would impact upon development, there are</li> </ul>	<p><i>considered as part of the previous Local Plan and the more recent Local Development Plan Examination under site code ANEWT008. The LDP Reporter's conclusions raised the following concerns:</i></p> <p><i>"As local considerations are concerned, the council has drawn attention to the findings of the report into the inquiry of the current local plan. That report emphasised the importance of the settlement identities of Newtown St Boswells and St Boswells to the south. Taking into account the proposed housing land allocation at site ANEWT005, the separation distance is some 600 metres. This is a narrow but sensitive strip which I agree is important in visually containing the two settlements. The contours of the land within the strip, particularly the low hillock, assist in providing visual separation. The findings of the previous inquiry also attached importance to the need to retain the northern side of the A699 free from development. I agree that,</i></p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>no known issues relating to either ground stability or ground conditions. There are no known infrastructure or servicing constraints that cannot be overcome in order to allow development to progress.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The sites development represents an economically viable and realistic prospect, it is proposed that the site will be developed in parallel with the existing allocated site, thereby increasing overall delivery of housing significantly. It is anticipated that the site can deliver a range of house types and tenures, including affordable housing from 2019/20.</li> <li>• Development of the site will bring economic benefit to the town, with an increased local population providing support for local business and services.</li> <li>• Overall, the site is deliverable and meets the specific criteria for 'effectiveness' as set out in PAN2/2010.</li> </ul>	<p><i>despite the tree belt shown on the indicative plan, the degree of urban encroachment on the A699 would be unacceptable and result in an adverse landscape character impact on this area of essentially rural character. Having regard to the local adverse impact that would result as a consequence of the proposed enlarged expansion area, despite the strategic housing land assessment; I conclude that the additional housing land allocation is not justified".</i></p> <p>This remains the case and therefore the housing site will not be included as part of the Housing Supplementary Guidance. It is considered there are more appropriate sites for inclusion within the Supplementary Guidance.</p>	
Selkirk	Angles Field	Historic	Comment (ASELK033)	This site is fully or partially	Comments noted. The site	It is recommended that

	(ASELK033)	Environment Scotland		within the Inventory Battlefield – Battle of Philiphaugh. However, the site requirements for this site refer only to the need to consider the setting of the battlefield, rather than the necessity to ensure that development is sensitive and appropriate to the location within the battlefield. The site requirements should be amended to require that development must not have a negative impact on key landscape characteristics and special qualities of the battlefield.	requirements have been amended to read:  <i>‘Development must not have a negative impact upon the key landscape characteristics, special qualities and setting of the historic battlefield (Battle of Philiphaugh) and the adjacent SBC Garden and Designed Landscape’.</i>	Angles Field (ASELK033) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.  It is also recommended that the final site requirement should be amended to read:  <i>‘Development must not have a negative impact upon the key landscape characteristics, special qualities and setting of the historic battlefield (Battle of Philiphaugh) and the adjacent SBC Garden and Designed Landscape’.</i>
Selkirk	Angles Field (ASELK033)	Scottish Natural Heritage	Comments (ASELK033)	SNH note that their previous comments have been included in the site requirements. SNH highlight that there may be site and wider community benefit in also setting the requirements for links from this site to the existing path network.	Comments noted. The fourth bullet point should be amended to read:  <i>‘Pedestrian/cycle links to be improved between the site and Selkirk and the existing path network within the vicinity’.</i>	It is recommended that Angles Field (ASELK033) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.  It is also recommended that the following site requirement be amended to read:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• Pedestrian/cycle links to be improved between the site and Selkirk and the existing path network within the vicinity</i></li> </ul>
Selkirk	Angles Field (ASELK033)	Scottish Environmental Protection Agency	Comments (Flooding)	Whilst SEPA supports the requirement for a FRA, the development requirement	SEPA have not objected to the allocation of the site and asked for its removal.	It is recommended that Angles Field (ASELK033) is included within the

				does not mention the fact that the site is likely to be heavily constrained due to flood risk and therefore recommend that the Council may consider removing this site from the LDP as it may not be able to accommodate the desired number of houses indicated.	Ultimately, the number of houses approved on the site will be determined via a planning application, taking cognisance of the Flood Risk Assessment and SEPA's response to it.	Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Selkirk	Angles Field (ASELK033)	Ian Wells	Object	<p>Would wish to be consulted on type and design of properties which should reflect the natural element of the countryside and the effect on the business at Philipburn House Hotel. Object to potential noise and pollution development would cause to local residents and the aforesaid business. Would wish to discuss further with Environmental Health Officers to cause the least disruption to all concerned. Request further details and request that no work commences before 9am and no activity takes place after 4.30pm Monday to Friday and no activity takes place at the weekend. Noise surveys and ways to reduce noise must take place.</p>	<p>Neighbours would be notified of any planning application and would have the opportunity to comment on house types and design. Issues relating to noise and pollution would be dealt with by Environmental Health through the process of any planning application.</p> <p>For construction projects of two or more dwellings, Environmental Health would require the developer to submit a Construction Method Statement (CMS). This would require to identify all potential adverse amenity and environmental impacts, including hours of work and site delivery times. The CMS would also need to specify remediation measures and allocate responsibility for implementing these to specific individuals/roles</p>	It is recommended that Angles Field (ASELK033) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

					<p>within the developer's organisation.</p> <p>Environmental Health would thereafter ask for a planning condition to be attached to any consent granted prohibiting all work that is not in accordance with the CMS, without the written consent of the Planning Authority. Noise Impact Assessments may be required for some renewables, such as air-source heat pumps, which can cause noise issues in residential situations.</p>	
Selkirk	Angles Field (ASELK033)	Mr & Mrs R Nichol	Object to the inclusion of (ASELK033) within the Housing SG	<p>Dismayed that SBC feels the need to erect 30 units in front of Lingle Road, Selkirk following the endurance by residents of the works associated with the flood prevention scheme for the good part of two years. Purchased house due to the view towards the Yarrow Valley, the privacy with no other houses looking into the front of it and because it is within a quiet area of Bannerfield. Bannerfield, which was being labelled the worst place to live in Selkirk, is now slowly turning itself around. Crime rate is falling, people are taking pride in their gardens, and it has a good school and nursery.</p>	<p>There is no right to a view in planning legislation. The development of the site should not result in increased crime and/or antisocial behaviour. The Education Officer has confirmed that there would be capacity within the local primary and secondary school to accommodate the development. The Roads Officer has raised no objections to the site being allocated for housing from a roads safety point of view. Due to various constraints there are limited other areas within the town which could be allocated for housing.</p>	<p>It is recommended that Angles Field (ASELK033) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.</p>

				<p>Fear that as well as spoiling the landscape, there would be a rise in crime and antisocial behaviour, the school would become crowded, the main road to Peebles would become busier and the corner of Linglie Road and more accidents would occur. Development would spoil the landscaped natural walk way along the Philipburn. There are many more areas in Selkirk where houses could be built.</p>		
Selkirk	Angles Field (ASELK033)	Iain Poe	Object to the inclusion of (ASELK033) within the Housing SG	<p>The Flood Protection Scheme, although welcomed, involved lots of heavy road traffic, noise, dirt and vibration. This has impacted upon house sale. Further works of a similar nature would postpone this yet again. A new housing development would spoil the area, which has recently improved with the new park in the Angles Field. The area now with its new park in the Angles Field is not only pleasing to look at is great for walks and relaxing. A new housing development would spoil this. The road immediately outside no4 Linglie Road and the Primary School has already seen an increase of traffic due to the</p>	<p>Whilst it is acknowledged that the works undertaken during the Flood Protection Scheme would undoubtedly cause disruption to existing residents, the benefits of the Scheme are significant to the area. It is considered that a sympathetic and well-planned development for the site in question would not have a detrimental impact upon the character of the area. The Roads Planning Team has raised no objections to the allocation of the site for housing. There are several options available for both vehicular access and pedestrian/cycle linkage therefore the site can connect and integrate well with its surroundings as</p>	<p>It is recommended that Angles Field (ASELK033) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.</p>

				road closure on the opposite side of the Angles Field. New housing will in no way add to the scenic beauty of the area that has seen a rebirth after the flood protection works.	well as internally.	
Selkirk	Angles Field (ASELK033)	Kate Jenkins	Support the inclusion of (ASELK033) within the Housing SG	<p>The support for this site is supported by further information contained in a supporting statement, masterplan, 3D sketches and a letter of support from the Eildon Housing Association.</p> <p>The masterplan includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Principles of 'Creating Places' and 'Designing Streets';</li> <li>• Possibly housing mix, including RSL (affordable housing) requirement;</li> <li>• Three areas which could be developed in phases;</li> <li>• Landscape principles (soft and hard);</li> <li>• Access and permeability;</li> <li>• Acknowledgment of LDP policy including PMD1 'Sustainability' and PMD2 'Quality Standards'.</li> </ul> <p>The following key points are made under 'Information on Angles Field':</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is within the settlement boundary of Selkirk.</li> <li>• The Council has set out a number of site</li> </ul>	Comments are noted. The masterplan and 3D sketches provide detail which would be considered as part of any future planning application / planning brief.	It is recommended that Angles Field (ASELK033) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.



				<p>requirements which are demonstrated within the Masterplan document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development Management has stated “full support” for the site and stated “It is considered that this is the best of the Selkirk sites brought forward by a considerable margin”.</li> <li>• The site has no environmental designations over it.</li> <li>• Scottish Water has confirmed there is capacity to accommodate development.</li> <li>• Public transport is available and a general store and primary school. The Roads Planning team are supportive of the proposals.</li> </ul> <p>The following key points are made under ‘Comments relating to site layout, consultations, design and deliverability’:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initial discussions have been held with the Eildon Housing Association who have confirmed support for the allocation on the basis of the delivery of between 6 and 8 affordable rented</li> </ul>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>houses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The layout provides for strong street frontages onto the two adjoining roads. Such a layout helps the site relate well to neighbouring existing residential development.</li> <li>• Larger houses are positioned to the west of the site, with driveways leading off the stopped-up road.</li> <li>• The Masterplan indicates ways in which appropriate definition of public and private space will be achieved within the development.</li> <li>• The site includes an area of green space at the northerly point of the site. Structured landscape planting and hedge planting have been provided to the south.</li> <li>• The majority of the existing trees to the east of the site would be retained.</li> </ul>		
Selkirk	Heather Mill (MSELK002)	Historic Environment Scotland	Notes (Battlefield)	The site is fully or partially within the Inventory Battlefield - Battle of Philiphaugh but the site requirements refer only to the need to consider the setting of the battlefield, rather than the necessity to	Comments are noted.  If the site was to be taken forward for inclusion in the Finalised Housing SG, an additional site requirement would be required, to read:	It is recommended that Heather Mill (MSELK002) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.  It is recommended that an additional site

				ensure that development is sensitive and appropriate to their location within the battlefield. The site requirements should be amended to require that developments must not have a negative impact on key landscape characteristics and special qualities of the battlefield.	<i>'The setting of the Battle of Philiphaugh Battlefield should be considered as part of the site design to ensure that development is sensitive and appropriate to its location within the battlefield and does not have a negative impact on its key landscape characteristics and special qualities'.</i>	requirement be included to read: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The setting of the Battle of Philiphaugh Battlefield should be considered as part of the site design to ensure that development is sensitive and appropriate to its location within the battlefield and does not have a negative impact on its key landscape characteristics and special qualities.</i></li> </ul>
Selkirk	Heather Mill (MSELK002)	SEPA	Notes (Flooding)	The contributor requires a modification to the development requirement to mention the Flood Protection Scheme. The contributor notes that the use of the site has been changed to mixed use. This proposed change to the land use is an increase in vulnerability and is reliant on the FPS to protect the site from the Ettrick Water. There is a residual risk from surface water ponding behind defences, structural failure and overtopping. Council should be mindful that allocating land for housing will increase the number of persons reliant on a FPS to	Comments are noted.  If the site was to be taken forward for inclusion within the Finalised Housing SG, an additional site requirement would be required, to read:  <i>'The site has been allocated for mixed use following completion of the Selkirk Flood Protection Scheme. Any development proposal coming forward on the site should address the risk of any potential surface water ponding behind flood defences'.</i>	It is recommended that Heather Mill (MSELK002) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.  It is recommended that an additional site requirement be included to read: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The site has been allocated for mixed use following completion of the Selkirk Flood Protection Scheme. Any development proposal coming forward on the site</i></li> </ul>

				<p>protect them from flooding. The contributor stresses that FPSs have a finite design life. The contributor would be more supportive of a land use type that is similar to the current land use. The Council should satisfy itself in respect of water resilient/resistant design and evacuation in the event of inundation. This also applies to other sites in the built up area.</p>		<p><i>should address the risk of any potential surface water ponding behind flood defences.</i></p>
Selkirk	Heather Mill (MSELK002)	Ferguson Planning on behalf of Roxburghe Estates	Objects (various)	<p>1. It should be noted that this site forms part of local safeguarded business and industrial allocation (BSELK003) and the implications of the loss of this employment land have not been determined within the assessment.</p> <p>2. Issues regarding potential flooding issues, heritage and biodiversity will also need to be assessed to understand the development constraints on this brownfield site.</p>	<p>1. Selkirk Riverside industrial estate is a large area of land with a number of empty and derelict buildings on it. Whilst it would be desirable to see all these buildings brought into business/ industrial use, the reality is the market could not accomplish this. It is therefore considered more beneficial to allow parts of this area to be redeveloped into other appropriate and positive uses. The principle of supporting mixed use development at this site is already established.</p> <p>2. Potential flooding, heritage and biodiversity issues have all been considered through the site assessment process and either do not require mitigation, or would be</p>	<p>It is recommended that Heather Mill (MSELK002) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.</p>

					mitigated through the requirements which would be attached to the allocation.	
Selkirk	Heather Mill (MSELK002)	Rob Elliot Sue Elliot Calum Sutherland	Objects (traffic levels)	The contributors are concerned about increased traffic levels on Riverside Road. As part of the flood defence works, Riverside Road was connected to Level Crossing Road, with the result that a percentage of road users go at great speed past the existing Riverside Road houses, where there are young children and animals. There are also many daily dog-walkers. 75 houses would certainly increase the traffic dangers many fold. The contributor has concerns too for the safety of children who would be resident in any houses on this site. There is a large volume of commercial traffic and machinery on the immediate boundaries of three sides of MSELK002; drivers are working and in a hurry – this is a dangerous place.	The capability of the local road network to accommodate further traffic was considered as part of the Council’s roads planning team’s assessment of the site. The local road network was considered capable of accommodating increased traffic levels in line with the scale of development that is proposed.	It is recommended that Heather Mill (MSELK002) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Selkirk	Heather Mill (MSELK002)	Steve Burrell	Objects (various)	The contributor feels there are many more suitable sites within the Borders that would serve the local community better. As the proposed site is within an area allocated for industrial use it would surely be more	Selkirk Riverside industrial estate is a large area of land with a number of empty and derelict buildings on it. Whilst it would be desirable to see all these buildings brought into business/ industrial use, the reality is	It is recommended that Heather Mill (MSELK002) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

				sensible for it to be used for job creation. There are limited employment opportunities as it is in and around the borders, and to remove a large site that in the future could provide much needed jobs seems a mistake.	the market could not accomplish this. It is therefore considered more beneficial to allow parts of this area to be redeveloped into other appropriate and positive uses.	
Selkirk	Heather Mill (MSELK002)	Rob Elliot Sue Elliot Calum Sutherland	Objects and propose alternative site	The contributors consider the site immediately across the Ettrick on the north east end of Bannerfield more appropriate.	The contributors appear to refer to site ESE10B (Linglie Road), which is located opposite site MSELK002 on the opposite side of the Ettrick Water. This site is already allocated for housing.	It is recommended that Heather Mill (MSELK002) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Selkirk	Heather Mill (MSELK002)	J Sutherland	Objects and proposes alternative site	A potential alternative site for housing could be the site (used as a storage compound by contractors during the flood protection works) on the opposite side of the river next to an existing housing estate.	The contributor appears to refer to site ESE10B (Linglie Road), which is located opposite site MSELK002 on the opposite side of the Ettrick Water. This site is already allocated for housing.	It is recommended that Heather Mill (MSELK002) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Selkirk	Heather Mill (MSELK002)	Rob Elliot Sue Elliot Calum Sutherland J Sutherland	Objects to use for housing	The contributors would prefer to see the site developed for industrial/commercial use and consider the site inappropriate for housing.	This site is covered by policy ED1 which seeks to ensure that adequate supplies of Business and Industrial Land are retained. However, policy ED1 does recognise that there may be extenuating circumstances which could allow consideration of other development uses.  The policy therefore	It is recommended that Heather Mill (MSELK002) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

					<p>identifies a hierarchy of sites split into 4no categories which state what uses could be allowed within each category. The site in question (LDP ref BSELK003) is listed within the lowest of the 4no categories which is entitled a 'local' designation. In essence this means 'local' designations have a lower priority need for protection of Business and Industrial use. Consequently alternative uses can be accepted on these sites and it should therefore be noted that in principle policy ED1 can allow mixed uses including housing on the site.</p> <p>The LDP settlement profile for Selkirk also acknowledges that the southern part of the Riverside area may allow for mixed use development and a site requirement accompanying the existing business and industrial site (BSELK003) states that "due to the location of this site adjacent to a mixed use area it is considered that this site would be appropriate for mixed use development". It is also</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

					noted that the provision of an element of employment land on part of the site is also a site requirement within the Supplementary Guidance.	
Selkirk	Heather Mill (MSELK002)	Rob Elliot Sue Elliot Calum Sutherland J Sutherland	Objects to use for housing	The completion of the Selkirk FPS is considered an opportunity to promote the site as a place for business/ job creation.	It is agreed that the completion of the Selkirk FPS offers the opportunity to encourage the reuse and development of this site, but it is considered that this need not be restricted to business use, and providing a wider range of possible acceptable uses would provide the best opportunity for redevelopment to be achieved.	It is recommended that Heather Mill (MSELK002) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Selkirk	Heather Mill (MSELK002)	Rob Elliot Sue Elliot Calum Sutherland	Objects to use for housing	Housing could risk it becoming a commuter estate for people travelling to work in Edinburgh.	The site is located within the Central Housing Market Area and Central Strategic Development Area. The site therefore benefits from good transport links and is within reach of a wide range of employment opportunities as well as the Border Railway stations at Tweedbank and Galashiels, which would enable access to an even wider range of employment opportunities. This is considered to be one of the advantages of this site.	It is recommended that Heather Mill (MSELK002) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Selkirk	Heather Mill (MSELK002)	John Handley Associates on	Support	1. The contributor confirms that this site is owned by	Support and comments are noted.	It is recommended that Heather Mill (MSELK002)



		<p>behalf of Equorium Property Company Ltd</p>		<p>their client, Equorium Property Company Ltd (formerly EWM Property Company Ltd) and they are fully supportive of this proposed allocation, and are willing to release the site for development, including housing. The contributor welcomes the identification of the site as a preferred site for mixed use development. The contributor's client supports the site's Stage 1 Site Assessment conclusions. The proposed allocation would allow the contributor's client's site to be redeveloped for a wider range of mixed uses and specifically residential use. This approach is consistent with the advice contained within the SPP and reflects the site's brownfield status; its relatively high profile location along the edge of the Ettrick Water; its accessibility; and the surrounding mix of uses.</p> <p>2. There are a collection of former mill buildings on the site, but none are in active use and are lying vacant and derelict. A separate area of extensive undeveloped land is situated to the east of the main Mill building. Whilst</p>		<p>is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>there is some heritage interest in the mill buildings, none of the buildings on the wider site are listed and all are in a very poor condition. They have been derelict for a number of years. None of the buildings are considered to have any intrinsic heritage or architectural value, and as they are not listed, or within a Conservation Area, could be demolished.</p> <p>3. The site is surrounded by a wide range of differing land uses, including housing; offices; commercial; storage; retail; tourism and leisure uses.</p> <p>4. The LDP confirms that the Council has an approved Flood Prevention Scheme for Selkirk and work on this is nearing completion. This scheme includes substantial mitigation measures along the Riverside Area. Flood risk issues are therefore being addressed and will remove any future flood risk associated with the redevelopment of this site. The Stage 1 Site Assessment also confirms that the Council is of the view that the Selkirk Flood Prevention Scheme will enable</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

				<p>development at this location, including housing.</p> <p>5. Being surrounded by roads on three sides, the site is highly accessible and further benefits from links to the adjacent riverside path and connections north of the Ettrick Water. The site is relatively well connected to the town centre and the A7, and existing bus stops are located along Dunsdale Road.</p> <p>6. As a result of its brownfield status; its relatively high profile location along the edge of the Ettrick Water; its accessibility; and the surrounding mix of uses, the contributor's client's site has the opportunity to be redeveloped for a wider range of mixed uses which would maximise job creation and economic development opportunities. In addition to the existing policy support for employment related uses, the contributor welcomes the Council's support for residential development on this site as set out in the Draft Supplementary Guidance. The proposed allocation of this site would</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				help to address the confirmed shortfall in the housing land supply; would contribute to the objectives of sustainable economic growth; and would allow the redevelopment of a vacant and derelict site for a high quality, sustainable development in an accessible location.		
Selkirk	Philiphaugh 2 (ASELK041)	Historic Environment Scotland	Comment (ASELK041)	This site is fully or partially within the Inventory Battlefield – Battle of Philiphaugh. However, the site requirements for this site refer only to the need to consider the setting of the battlefield, rather than the necessity to ensure that development is sensitive and appropriate to the location within the battlefield. The site requirements should be amended to require that development must not have a negative impact on key landscape characteristics and special qualities of the battlefield.	Comments noted. If the site (ASELK041) was to be taken forward for inclusion in the finalised Housing SG, the site requirement would be amended to read:  <i>‘Development must not have a negative impact upon the key landscape characteristics, special qualities and setting of the historic battlefield (Battle of Philiphaugh) and the adjacent SBC Garden and Designed Landscape’.</i>  However, due to an outstanding objection from SEPA on the grounds of flooding this site will not be carried forward for allocation.	It is recommended that Philiphaugh 2 (ASELK041) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Selkirk	Philiphaugh 2 (ASELK041)	SNH	Comments	The site requirements should be updated to make it clear that information will be required to support Habitats Regulations Appraisal and	Further to the advice of SNH it is recommended that the fourth site requirement be amended to read:	It is recommended that Philiphaugh 2 (ASELK041) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

				inform any mitigation that may be required.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Mitigation required to ensure no significant adverse effects on integrity of River Tweed Special Area of Conservation. information to support the Habitats Regulations Appraisal would be required to identify what mitigation, if any, is to be delivered.</i></li> </ul>	
Selkirk	Philiphaugh 2 (ASELK041)	Major Angus William Boag	Object to the inclusion of (ASELK041) of the Housing SG	Previous objections raised to the building of additional properties on Ettrickhaugh Road remain unchanged. It is not so many months ago that SEPA pointed out that house building intentions should be shelved. The reasons were quite clear, namely whilst they accepted that the flood prevention work had improved the situation, the area remains a flood plan and in extreme weather could flood. They did however agree to commercial premises on the proposed site. Once again, residents find themselves in limbo and would like this issue put to bed. Why state very recently that the Council accepts SEPA's view and in very short order go back on yourselves?	This site was included in the Draft Housing SG as an "alternative" site as discussions regarding flooding were ongoing with SEPA and it was thought that their objections may be overcome. However this has not happened. Consequently this site has been removed and will not be included within the Finalised Housing SG. However, it must be stated that the Senior Manager in charge of the multi million pound flood protection scheme for Selkirk strongly disagrees with SEPA's stance. This matter will be subject to further discussion between the parties in due course and will give reference to SEPA's recent consultation paper on Development Behind Flood	It is recommended that Philiphaugh 2 (ASELK041) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

					Defences. As long as SEPA continue to object to this site on the grounds of flood risk the Council will not formally allocate it for housing.	
Selkirk	Philiphaugh 2 (ASELK041)	Richard Wynn Jones	Object to the inclusion of (ASELK041) within the Housing SG	With the amount of abandoned mills in the area, the shortfall of 916 units could be best met by redevelopment. Selkirk has other areas that would benefit from such redevelopment. Proposal is a direct result of the flood defence programme, question its fairness in consideration. The site already suffers from extended traffic issues and parking problems. An additional 8 units would surely complicate the problems. What happened to the letter that outlined that specific area as unsuitable development, like the Battlefield to the west of Ettrickhaugh Road?	<p>During the process of this Housing SG, existing redevelopment sites were considered for possible housing allocation. Unfortunately, the redevelopment of existing properties can be cost prohibitive and the effectiveness of such sites is therefore undermined. Consequently the planning system cannot completely rely on brownfield sites to meet housing requirements and must therefore consider greenfield options.</p> <p>The site would be tested against a number of criteria, one of which is flooding.</p> <p>The Roads Planning Team has raised no objections to the allocation of the site for housing. Some minor widening to Ettrickhaugh Road will be required to mitigate the increase in traffic movements.</p> <p>Unfortunately it is unclear which letter is being</p>	It is recommended that Philiphaugh 2 (ASELK041) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

					<p>referred to. The site is located within the Inventory Battlefield – Battle of Philiphaugh. As advised by Historic Environment Scotland, care would be required in on order to ensure that development at this location would not have a negative impact upon the key landscape characteristics, special qualities and setting of the Battlefield.</p> <p>However, due to an outstanding objection from SEPA on the grounds of flooding this site will not be carried forward for allocation.</p>	
Selkirk	Philiphaugh 2 (ASELK041)	Fraser Dickey	Object to the inclusion of (ASELK041) within the Housing SG	<p>The flood prevention work has only recently been completed, this work has caused a huge amount of noise and disturbance over the last few years. More building work at this location would have further adverse effect on residents. Given the narrow width of the road and the already large volume of traffic from both the cricket and rugby club, the building work and increased number of vehicles would adversely affect highway safety and the convenience of road users. The proposal</p>	<p>Whilst it is acknowledged that the works undertaken during the Flood Protection Scheme would undoubtedly cause disruption to existing residents, the benefits of the Scheme are significant to the area.</p> <p>The Roads Planning Team has raised no objections to the allocation of the site for housing. Some minor widening to Ettrickhaugh Road will be required to mitigate the increase in traffic movements.</p>	<p>It is recommended that Philiphaugh 2 (ASELK041) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.</p>

				<p>would result in residents in Ettrickhaugh Cottages losing both their privacy and view looking southwards and would adversely affect the residential amenity of the area. New development would spoil the character of the neighbourhood, particularly from the new footpath which starts at the end of Ettrickhaugh Road and runs up to the salmon ladder.</p>	<p>Consideration would be given during the process of any future planning application to ensure privacy of existing properties is not compromised.</p> <p>There is no right to a view in planning law. It is considered that a sympathetic and well-planned development for the site in question would not have a detrimental impact upon the character of the area. These matters would be addressed during the process of any planning application submitted for the development of the site.</p> <p>However, due to an outstanding objection from SEPA on the grounds of flooding this site will not be carried forward for allocation.</p>	
Selkirk	Philiphaugh 2 (ASELK041)	John Lowrie	Object to the inclusion of (ASELK041) within the Housing SG	<p>Ettrickhaugh road is a cul-de-sac. The proposed 8 units could mean another 16 vehicles at least using what is a busy road at the moment. An access road between Ettrickhaugh and the Yarrow Road would be desirable though feared highly unlikely. After 2 years of traffic related to the Flood</p>	<p>The Roads Planning Team has raised no objections to the allocation of the site for housing. Some minor widening to Ettrickhaugh Road will be required to mitigate the increase in traffic movements.</p> <p>Any issues relating to noise would be dealt with by</p>	<p>It is recommended that Philiphaugh 2(ASELK041) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.</p>



				<p>Protection Scheme another lengthy period of building traffic is highly undesirable, in what is a relatively quiet cul-de-sac. Also the accompanying noise, dust and mess over a long build time is not merited for 8 units. Scottish Water are at the moment only just able to supply a reasonable water pressure in the street. Another requirement for more water would not help this situation.</p>	<p>Environmental Health through the process of any planning application and also during the process of development should issues arise. For construction projects of two or more dwellings, Environmental Health would require the developer to submit a Construction Method Statement (CMS). This would require to identify all potential adverse amenity and environmental impacts, including hours of work and site delivery times. The CMS would also need to specify remediation measures and allocate responsibility for implementing these to specific individuals/roles within the developer's organisation. Environmental Health would thereafter ask for a planning condition to be attached to any consent granted prohibiting all work that is not in accordance with the CMS, without the written consent of the Planning Authority. Noise Impact Assessments may be required for some renewables, such as air-source heat pumps, which can cause noise issues in</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

					<p>residential situations. Any issues arising relating to mess and dust would be addressed during any development, if necessary.</p> <p>Scottish Water has raised no objections to the proposed site.</p> <p>However, due to an outstanding objection from SEPA on the grounds of flooding this site will not be carried forward for allocation.</p>	
Selkirk	Philiphaugh 2 (ASELK041)	Ann Fernie	Object to the inclusion of (ASELK041) within the Housing SG	<p>Main concern is the width of the road which is single land and would not be able to cope with any further traffic. Etrickhaugh Road has seen increased traffic from the rugby club, football club and cricket club. There has only recently been a new walkway on the damside which has increased the cars in the street and also parked cars which make safe driving extremely challenging. There are frequently many cars at the beginning of the road which can make access difficult and it is only a matter of time before there is a collision. The flood protection works carried out as yet have not been tested and completed. The lack of</p>	<p>The Roads Planning Team has raised no objections to the allocation of the site for housing. Some minor widening to Etrickhaugh Road will be required to mitigate the increase in traffic movements.</p> <p>It is considered that the development of this site would be acceptable in principle, however, due to an outstanding objection from SEPA on the grounds of flooding this site will not be carried forward for allocation.</p>	<p>It is recommended that Philiphaugh 2 (ASELK041) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.</p>

				future housing in the town is understood, there may be other more appropriate sites.		
Selkirk	Philiphaugh 2 (ASELK041)	Mr & Mrs W J Hogarth	Object to the inclusion of (ASELK041) within the Housing SG	Site should not be allocated as it would impact upon views and outlooks. The Flood Protection Scheme has not yet been signed off and has yet to prove to work. The access road is not wide enough to accommodate excess number of traffic.	There is no right to a view in planning law. Any perceived impacts on existing residents would be assessed at the planning application stage should a proposal be submitted.  The Roads Planning Team has raised no objections to the allocation of the site for housing. Some minor widening to Ettrickhaugh Road will be required to mitigate the increase in traffic movements.  However, due to an outstanding objection from SEPA on the grounds of flooding this site will not be carried forward for allocation.	It is recommended that Philiphaugh 2 (ASELK041) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Selkirk	Philiphaugh 2 (ASELK041)	Nick Mill	Object to the inclusion of (ASELK041) within the Housing SG	The proposed land, Laurieston Racing Stables, is a working racehorse yard and stables, employs local people, has college placements, supports local feed suppliers, blacksmiths, farriers, farms and vets and also boasts one of the few outdoor riding schools in Selkirkshire. Even more astonishing is after having in excess of £23,000 spent on	Whilst the site is currently in use, the Local Planning Authority must assess its appropriateness, or otherwise, for residential development.  The Project Manager of the Selkirk Flood Protection Scheme has confirmed that the site in question is protected to a 1 in 200 year event level as a result of the	It is recommended that Philiphaugh 2 (ASELK041) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

				<p>the property to improve facilities in the last year, including the planting of trees and over 200,000 wild flowers, on land that was previously rejected for planning! Worthy of note is, this land still floods, no flood prevention works were directly done to this property and it has always been much lower than the actual road. Ettrickhaugh Road is a cul de sac, traffic is already a major issue and this road and the services are already wholly unsuitable for development, water pressure is an ongoing problem as is sewage. With a Rugby club, Football Club, Cricket Club, all weather pitch and function suites already present on the road, it is clearly evident the proposers of this lunacy are unaware just how busy this road already is. The entire street has suffered for almost the last three years from construction traffic with the flood prevention scheme and reinstatement works are still ongoing and will be for many months. Selkirk has several areas that would certainly benefit from development on land that is sitting idle and has been for some time, ASELK041 is</p>	<p>Scheme now in place.</p> <p>The Roads Planning Team has raised no objections to the allocation of the site for housing. Some minor widening to Ettrickhaugh Road will be required to mitigate the increase in traffic movements.</p> <p>It is considered that the development of this site would be acceptable in principle, however, due to an outstanding objection from SEPA on the grounds of flooding this site will not be carried forward for allocation.</p> <p>All potential sites in Selkirk considered as part of the Housing SG process must be assessed on their own merits.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				clearly not one of them.		
Selkirk	Philiphaugh 2 (ASELK041)	Valerie Mcgowan	Object to the inclusion of (ASELK041) within the Housing SG	With this road being a no through road and struggling to cope with the volume of traffic at the moment it would not be of benefit to add this allocation. There is also an immense amount of traffic from the rugby football and cricket fields which also have access off this road. With regard to services there have been a lot of problems with water pressure due to existing piping getting old and is liable to bursts. There has also been a lot of disruption due to flood prevention work and nobody wants to have another prolonged spell of disruption. The beauty of the area has already suffered, as have birds and wildlife.	The Roads Planning Team has raised no objections to the allocation of the site for housing. Some minor widening to Ettrickhaugh Road will be required to mitigate the increase in traffic movements.  However, due to an outstanding objection from SEPA on the grounds of flooding this site will not be carried forward for allocation.	It is recommended that Philiphaugh 2 (ASELK041) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Selkirk	Philiphaugh 2 (ASELK041)	Pamela Douglas	Object to the inclusion of (ASELK041) within the Housing SG	Concern regarding the increase in vehicle volume on Ettrickhaugh Road and as provided photographs of the road on a Saturday. There were 21 parked vehicles between the turn off on the main road to the entrance to the Cricket Field. It is certainly not uncommon for this amount of parked vehicles to be present and requires some navigating to get up or down the road when vehicles are	The Roads Planning Team has raised no objections to the allocation of the site for housing. Some minor widening to Ettrickhaugh Road will be required to mitigate the increase in traffic movements.  However, due to an outstanding objection from SEPA on the grounds of flooding this site will not be carried forward for allocation.	It is recommended that Philiphaugh 2 (ASELK041) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

				<p>approaching in the opposite direction. This difficulty is also increased when cricket/rugby or football matches are taking place. The prospect of increased volume of cars on Ettrickhaugh Road is of concern. Eight units could produce a further sixteen vehicles using an already contested area. Photos have been attached to this submission.</p>		
Selkirk	Philiphaugh 2 (ASELK041)	Ian Lang	Object to the inclusion of (ASELK041) within the Housing SG	<p>Objects to proposal for 8 units of two-storey housing. The road is too narrow to allow 8 access roads/drives without considerable inconvenience to existing occupiers opposite. Existing parking and access arrangements would be considerably inconvenienced. The existing access road is already very busy, particularly at weekends with the use of rugby, cricket, hockey and football games and practices. The proposed two-storey units would overlook existing properties and this cannot be fair even although they have had dormer conversions. It is expected that the housing would be of modern construction and this could be at variance with existing</p>	<p>It is unclear why two-storey units are being referred to. This has not been established at this stage.</p> <p>The Roads Planning Team has raised no objections to the allocation of the site for housing. Some minor widening to Ettrickhaugh Road will be required to mitigate the increase in traffic movements.</p> <p>However, due to an outstanding objection from SEPA on the grounds of flooding this site will not be carried forward for allocation.</p> <p>Consideration would be given during the process of any future planning application to ensure</p>	<p>It is recommended that Philiphaugh 2 (ASELK041) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.</p>

				housing fronting onto the road. A smaller development of four units might be reasonable with integrated access and a widening of the road.	privacy of existing properties is not compromised and that any development is in keeping with the character of the area.	
Selkirk	Philiphaugh 2 (ASELK041)	Scottish Environmental Protection Agency	Seek the removal of the site (Flooding)	Require the removal of this site from the Supplementary Guidance. SEPA provided a report with their response to the 'call for sites' consultation in summer 2016 which they would repeat in this representation. The site is entirely within the floodplain and has flooded in the past. It is recommended that (ASELK033) is included within the Finalised SG on housing.	This site was included in the Draft Housing SG as an "alternative" site as discussions regarding flooding were ongoing with SEPA and it was thought that their objections may be overcome. However this has not happened. Consequently this site has been removed and will not be included within the Finalised Housing SG. However, it must be stated that the Senior Manager in charge of the multi million pound flood protection scheme for Selkirk strongly disagrees with SEPA's stance. This matter will be subject to further discussion between the parties in due course and will give reference to SEPA's recent consultation paper on Development Behind Flood Defences. As long as SEPA continue to object to this site on the grounds of flood risk the Council will not formally allocate it for housing.	It is recommended that Philiphaugh 2 (ASELK041) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

Selkirk	Philiphaugh Mill (ASELK040)	Historic Environment Scotland	Comment (ASELK040)	This site is fully or partially within the Inventory Battlefield – Battle of Philiphaugh. However, the site requirements for this site refer only to the need to consider the setting of the battlefield, rather than the necessity to ensure that development is sensitive and appropriate to the location within the battlefield. The site requirements should be amended to require that development must not have a negative impact on key landscape characteristics and special qualities of the battlefield.	Comments noted. If the site (ASELK040) was to be taken forward for inclusion in the finalised Housing SG, the site requirement would be amended to read: ‘Development must not have a negative impact upon the <i>key landscape characteristics, special qualities and setting</i> of the historic battlefield (Battle of Philiphaugh) and the adjacent SBC Garden and Designed Landscape’.  However, due to an outstanding objection from SEPA on the grounds of flooding this site will not be carried forward for allocation.	It is recommended that Philiphaugh 2 (ASELK040) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Selkirk	Philiphaugh Mill (ASELK040)	Major Angus William Boag	Object to the inclusion of (ASELK040) within the Housing SG	Previous objections raised to the building of additional properties on Ettrickhaugh Road remain unchanged. It is not so many months ago that SEPA pointed out that house building intentions should be shelved. The reasons were quite clear, namely whilst they accepted that the flood prevention work had improved the situation, the area remains a flood plan and in extreme weather could flood. They did however agree to commercial premises on the	This site was included in the Draft Housing SG as an “alternative” site as discussions regarding flooding were ongoing with SEPA and it was thought that their objections may be overcome. However this has not happened. Consequently this site has been removed and will not be included within the Finalised Housing SG. However, it must be stated that the Senior Manager in charge of the multi million pound flood protection	It is recommended that Philiphaugh 2 (ASELK040) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.



				<p>proposed site. Once again, residents find themselves in limbo and would like this issue put to bed. Why state very recently that the Council accepts SEPA's view and in very short order go back on yourselves?</p>	<p>scheme for Selkirk strongly disagrees with SEPA's stance. This matter will be subject to further discussion between the parties in due course and will give reference to SEPA's recent consultation paper on Development Behind Flood Defences. As long as SEPA continue to object to this site on the grounds of flood risk the Council will not formally allocate it for housing.</p>	
Selkirk	Philiphaugh Mill (ASELK040)	Scottish Environmental Protection Agency	Seek the removal of the site (Flooding)	<p>Require the removal of this site from the Supplementary Guidance. SEPA provided a report with their response to the 'call for sites' consultation in summer 2016 which they would repeat in this representation. The site is entirely within the floodplain and has flooded in the past. It is recommended that (ASELK033) is included within the Finalised SG on housing.</p>	<p>This site was included in the Draft Housing SG as an "alternative" site as discussions regarding flooding were ongoing with SEPA and it was thought that their objections may be overcome. However this has not happened. Consequently this site has been removed and will not be included within the Finalised Housing SG. However, it must be stated that the Senior Manager in charge of the multi million pound flood protection scheme for Selkirk strongly disagrees with SEPA's stance. This matter will be subject to further discussion between the parties in due course and will give reference to SEPA's recent</p>	<p>It is recommended that Philiphaugh Mill (ASELK040) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.</p>

					consultation paper on Development Behind Flood Defences. As long as SEPA continue to object to this site on the grounds of flood risk the Council will not formally allocate it for housing.	
St Boswells	Charlesfield West (ACHAR003 & MCHAR002)	Savills on behalf of Charlesfield First LLP	Object	<p>The contributor objects to the non-inclusion of land at Charlesfield which was submitted as part of the Call for Sites process, of the Draft SG.</p> <p>An initial stage 1 RAG assessment was undertaken and the site was given an amber rating and was subject to consultation.</p> <p>The majority of consultation responses generally accepted that the site could be satisfactory developed, subject to appropriate mitigation methods. The main constraint to this site being allocated for residential development was the isolation from the towns of St Boswells or Newtown St Boswells and its location alongside Charlesfield Industrial Estate. Notwithstanding, it should be noted that Development Management assessed the proposals and consider that</p>	<p>Comments noted. A larger site at this location was assessed for mixed use as part of the Call for Sites process under site code MCHAR002. The new site submitted by the contributor has been coded as ACHAR003 and the proposed use is housing only.</p> <p>The site has been through the full site assessment process which concluded that the site is doubtful, primarily for reasons of the relationship with adjoining employment land uses and Countryside Around Towns (CAT) considerations. It is considered there are more appropriate sites within the Central SDA to meet the housing shortfall. However the site could be considered as part of a future Local Development Plan process. Please refer to the full site assessment contained within Appendix D – Stage 2</p>	It is recommended that Charlesfield West, Charlesfield (ACHAR003) is not included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

				<p>the northern most part of the site could accommodate housing.</p> <p>In line with these supportive comments, the contributor has included an updated masterplan showing a refined location for a more limited residential scheme with an approximate capacity of 50 units, which address the comments made by Development Management. An allocation of this level will allow for the development of a sustainable scheme to progress with limited access and utilities upgrades. This would help make a meaningful contribution to a range of sites to meet the identified shortfall in housing land supply. A small number of houses here would also help support the existing commercial activities at Charlesfield. The site code of the proposed new housing site is ACHAR003.</p>	Database Report (Update).	
Tweedbank	Lowood (MTWEE002)	Scottish Environment Protection Agency	Comment (MTWEE002)	Support the requirement for a FRA to assess the flood risk from the River Tweed and the requirement for the developer to demonstrate how the risk from surface water would be mitigated. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert	Support noted. The sixth site requirement should be amended to read: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Flood Risk Assessment is required as the site is at risk from a 1:200 year flood event from fluvial and</li> </ul>	It is recommended that Lowood (MTWEE002) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.  It is also recommended that the following site requirement be amended

				structures within and adjacent to the site. Require a modification to the developer requirement to investigate the possibility of deculverting.	surface water flooding. The FRA would require to assess the flood risk from the River Tweed and the developer to demonstrate how the risk from surface water would be mitigated. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site. The possibility of deculverting should be investigated.	to read: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>A Flood Risk Assessment is required as the site is at risk from a 1:200 year flood event from fluvial and surface water flooding. The FRA would require to assess the flood risk from the River Tweed and the developer to demonstrate how the risk from surface water would be mitigated. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site. The possibility of deculverting should be investigated.</i></li> </ul>
Tweedbank	Lowood (MTWEE002)	Scottish Government – Planning and Architectural Division and Transport Scotland	Comment (MTWEE002)	As a result of the positive collaboration between the Council and Transport Scotland in the preparation of the Supplementary Guidance, the SG has no comments. The SG looks forward to working with the Council in the future, particularly on the appraisal of this site, where involvement would be welcomed.	Comments are noted.	N/A
Tweedbank	Lowood (MTWEE002)	Scottish Natural Heritage	Comments (MTWEE002)	While recognising the visual containment and the proximity to the station of this site SNH also continue to		It is recommended that Lowood, Tweedbank (MTWEE002) is included within the Finalised

				<p>highlight the natural heritage attributes of this site. Given the scale, strategic location and the natural heritage sensitivities of this site (combined with the quantity of development to be allocated) we strongly suggest that further work is undertaken to identify specific spatial locations and requirements for development.</p> <p>We consider that, if the potential to create a high-quality development in this location is to be realised, then further spatial and site specific site requirements should be produced. For example, we highlight the placemaking opportunities with respect to the retention of existing site features such as stone walls, trees, and woodlands, as well as the opportunities for the promotion of access and active travel networks, sustainable solutions to the drainage issues and layouts of proposed development which make the most of site views and inherent character, as well as the opportunities for co-ordinated access and active travel through the site, including in relation to the</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>It is confirmed a masterplan is being prepared and SNH's comments will be sought. Furthermore, SNH will be consulted when planning application(s) are submitted for the development of the site.</p>	<p>Supplementary Guidance on Housing.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

				<p>River Tweed (SAC). We suggest more detailed site development principles and specific spatial requirements are needed and we would advise that should ideally be prepared by a multi-disciplinary team led by Scottish Borders Council rather than left to any future applicant. SNH would be happy to participate or assist SBC in achieving more detailed site requirements for this important site. Reference to the River Tweed SAC should be updated to clearly state the requirement for submission of information to support Habitats Regulations Appraisal. This will be required to identify what mitigation, if any, is to be delivered.</p> <p>The site's proximity to the Tweedbank Railway Station and the potential for extension of the Borders Railway should be made clearer in site requirements. This should include delivery of pedestrian and cycle links to the station as well as to Tweedbank and Galashiels, supporting this site as a place for sustainable living and working.</p>		
Tweedbank	Lowood (MTWEE002)	Holder Planning on	Object to the	Of the 652 units identified in	Please refer to response	It is recommended that

		behalf of CW Properties	deliverability/inclusion of (MTWEE002 ) within the Housing SG	the Central Area, nearly half are to be delivered at Lowood. Given the site assessment identifies a number of significant potential development constraints relating to flood risk, River Tweed SAC/SSSI, co-location, drainage, ecology, archaeology and road network issues it is not considered that this site should be identified as a preferred site for inclusion in the SG as it is unlikely to contribute to the effective housing land supply in the short – medium term.	above.	Lowood, Tweedbank (MTWEE002) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Tweedbank	Lowood (MTWEE002)	Ferguson Planning on behalf of Roxburghe Estates	Object to the deliverability/inclusion of (MTWEE002 ) within the Housing SG	Question the Council's decision to allocate this site for up to 300 dwellings when there are potential significant issues which require further investigation to determine whether development is feasible. Difficulty understanding the Council's reasoning for the identification of this site as a preferred option when it is unclear whether this will indeed represent an effective site within the 5 year housing land supply. Does not entirely disagree with the principle of development on the site, but questions the Council's assertion that 300 dwellings could be	Please refer to response above.	It is recommended that Lowood, Tweedbank (MTWEE002) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

				<p>accommodated on the site given the potential constraints that have been presented.</p> <p>The constraints associated with site MTWEE002 are potentially significant, including its location next to the sensitive designated SSSI and SAC River Tweed.</p> <p>With regards to the actual 300 unit allocation we are not against large allocations or Greenfield sites if they meet SEA criteria. However, we do question the deliverability of the full allocation over the local plan lifespan given the numerous site investigations still required and constraints such as:</p> <p><u>Landscape:</u> Significant landscape issue as built development would obstruct existing panoramic views from main road and adjoining properties including Nether Horsburgh House (listed). Development would change the character of this section of the Tweed Valley and could easily impair the qualities of the Special Landscape Area (SLA) by introducing an urban character. Further views would be restricted by</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--



				<p>mitigation measures to screen out 'lower amenity' buildings. Features such as a new roundabout, street lighting, pedestrian crossing etc. could not be screened from the road. The main road and river separate this site physically.</p> <p><u>Biodiversity</u> Moderate risk mature broad leaved woodland and parkland, as well as improved pasture and pond.</p> <p><u>Designated Sites</u> Adjacent to SSI and SAC, mitigation required to ensure no significant adverse effects on integrity of River Tweed SAC, existence of Protected Species and potential for presence of other protected species.</p> <p><u>Transport Assessment</u> A72 would effectively split the extended village in two. To satisfactorily serve the site from a vehicular aspect, a roundabout would be required at the main access to replace existing junction arrangement. Dealing with pedestrians and cyclists may be challenging, an underpass or an overbridge being the preferred solution, but difficult to achieve due to the lie of the land and physical</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>constraints.</p> <p><u>Archaeological Assessment</u> Landscape park across whole area and location of 'Bridgend' medieval settlement likely, as well as bridge footings and medieval road.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk Assessment</u> To assess risk from the River Tweed. SEPA flood map indicates there may be flooding issues within the site and may constrain level of development. Pond on site should also be protected. The site borders the River Tweed along a large part of its length so care must be taken to protect this sensitive water environment.</p> <p><u>Environmental Impact Assessment</u> Planning applications likely to require EIA.</p> <p><u>Drainage Impact Assessment</u> Foul water must be connected to the SW foul network, however this site is not currently within the sewer catchment.</p> <p><u>Core Path</u> Site is shared with Core path 01 along the riverside and is prone to flood damage. A guideline 10 metre buffer, in particular around the North West corner should be left to</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>accommodate the path and future possible damage due to bank erosion and should have a natural buffer of landscaping to allow the continued “countryside path “nature of the route.</p> <p><u>Education</u> Potential need to extend the primary school.</p> <p><u>Trees and Ecology</u> Significant woodland on site.</p> <p>We believe it would be more logical to allocate an element of these 300 units (e.g. 100 units) as the site’s capacity amounts to almost a third of the entire shortfall for the local plan period. This lower allocation would also have a lesser impact on the Countryside around Towns Area and on the sensitive River Tweed.</p>		
Tweedbank	Lowood (MTWEE002)	Ferguson Planning on behalf of Amcows 59 Ltd	Object to the deliverability/inclusion of (MTWEE002) within the Housing SG	<p>Question the deliverability of the full allocation over the local plan lifespan given the numerous site investigations still required and constraints on this site which is within the CAT area and next to the sensitive designated SSSI and SAC River Tweed. Believe the site is undeliverable in full and suggest at least 200 units require to be extracted from this allocation and reapportioned elsewhere.</p>	<p>The Scottish Government document entitled “Borders Railway - Maximising the Impact: A Blueprint for the Future” identifies the opportunities the railway corridor offers in terms of being a catalyst for new housing developments, businesses or visitor destinations. It supports the potential of the line in triggering significant economic benefits. The SG on Housing will become part</p>	<p>It is recommended that Lowood, Tweedbank (MTWEE002) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.</p>

					<p>of the statutory Development Plan and it is therefore a key document to ensure implementation of the Blueprint. Lowood is within a highly accessible and sustainable location given its location on land immediately to the north of the Tweedbank Railway terminus. The site is within the Central Borders Housing Market Area which has a proven record of housing market developer interest and consumer demand. The parkland and woodland setting and its proximity to the scenic River Tweed make the site a highly attractive development opportunity. Whilst it is acknowledged there are some site constraints to be addressed and overcome, none of these are identified as being insurmountable, and work on a masterplan has already commenced which increases the effectiveness, promotion and delivery of the site. This will investigate in close detail the constraints to be mitigated. It is contended that Lowood is a prime site with an extremely attractive setting for market interest and should be included</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>within the SG.</p> <p>The following was the conclusion of the assessment undertaken for the Draft Housing SG, this remains pertinent:</p> <p><i>The submission of a Flood Risk Assessment would be required to assess risk from the River Tweed as well as surface water flooding issues. Co-location issues include potential for odour from E Langlee landfill (Pollution, Prevention and Control) and WML (Waste Management Licensing) exempt composting site at Pavillion Farm. There is moderate risk to biodiversity and mitigation would be required to ensure no significant adverse effects on the integrity of the River Tweed SAC. Archaeological investigation would be required. This site is outwith the Tweedbank settlement boundary however it benefits from its close proximity to the station at Tweedbank and business and industrial sites as well as a range of services in Galashiels. The site is entirely enclosed by the River Tweed to the north</i></p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p><i>and by the existing settlement of Tweedbank to the south. The development of the site would not result in settlement coalescence. It is considered that the site offers a strategic opportunity due to its immediate proximity to the railway terminus and its location within the Central Borders. Internally there are a number of constraints which would require to be sensitively addressed. Although lacking in designations, the estate shows clear indications of being a 'designed landscape' with an attractive meandering driveway leading from the gatehouse through parkland to the main house and associated buildings. There is also a significant tree and woodland structure on the estate as well as a pond which is a notable feature. These issues will require careful consideration through the process of the aforesaid masterplan and a tree survey. A Transport Appraisal will be required, with the need for at least two key vehicular access points into the site and effective pedestrian/cycle</i></p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p><i>connectivity. Site access must take cognisance of the possible extension of the Borders Railway and of the potential for a replacement for Lowood Bridge as identified in the Local Access and Transport Strategy. Potential contamination would require investigation/mitigation. A full Drainage Impact Assessment would be required. There is currently no capacity at the Waste Water Treatment Works to accommodate development. The site, with its close proximity to the existing business and industrial uses at Tweedbank offers the opportunity for the extension of the Central Borders Business Park. A masterplan for the site is currently being prepared which will address relevant matters in more detail, including taking account of the existing planned landscape and the consideration of appropriate zoning and phasing.</i></p>	
Tweedbank	Lowood (MTWEE002)	Barry Templeton	Object to the inclusion of (MTWEE002) within the Housing SG	The implications of the proposals are huge for my business and my current residence. I took over the plant nursery at Lowood in 2008. It was derelict at that	Comments noted. It is clear that this is a well-established business within this site and the uncertainty brought to the owner(s) of the business is	It is recommended that Lowood, Tweedbank (MTWEE002) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

				<p>time and I have, since then, worked tirelessly to upgrade the infrastructure and to grow up an excellent range of plants/trees. It has been no mean feat to continue growing and expanding through a recession and through at least two severe winters. The business has established a good reputation for garden design, was commissioned to design and implement the new 'Queen's Garden in Bank Street, Galashiels and has also had considerable input into the community. The business has already suffered as a result of the potential development emerging. The Development Plan suggests that there will be housing located in the West field, immediately adjacent to the nursery. If the nursery were to be enabled to continue alongside this development, there would have to be significant security upgrade around the perimeter of the business. As it stands, this is a quiet and relatively quiet location. I am very concerned that all the effort and expense incurred in establishing my business at this location over the past nine years could now go to</p>	<p>acknowledged. It is understood that the business rents the property from the owner of the estate. This would be an issue to address with the owner in respect of the future of the business at this location.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--



				waste just when it is really getting going, especially in garden design. The future has suddenly become very unclear.		
Tweedbank	Lowood (MTWEE002)	AC & MS Stewart	Object to the inclusion of (MTWEE002) within the Housing SG	This site has so many constraints attached that it is unlikely to ever be developed, nor should it be.	Please refer to response above.	It is recommended that Lowood, Tweedbank (MTWEE002) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.
Tweedbank	Lowood (MTWEE002)	Save Scott's Countryside	Object to the inclusion of (MTWEE002) within the Housing SG	Clearly this provides an at-a-stroke way of delivering nearly half of the Central HMA contribution. In many ways it makes sense to use the other half of the 'island' between the Tweed and the A7/A68 linking main road. It is at low altitude and from most viewpoints would be quite well screened. From aerial viewpoints such as The Eildons it will really only be in-kind extension of the Tweedbank settlement. However, we have considerable concerns for a possible knock-on effect - that its existence and accesses might be used as a justification for building a new Tweed crossing to functionally replace the characterful Lowood Bridge. This would be much to the detriment of the charm of that portion of the Tweed. Whilst details will be worked	Comments noted. The Council's Local Transport Strategy (2007/08) and more recently the Main Issues Report relating to the forthcoming Local Access and Transport Strategy (July 2015) identify a potential new road configuration at Tweedbank which would include the provision of a new bridge at Lowood. This would improve connection between Tweedbank and Melrose Road (B6374) in Galashiels removing pressure on the trunk road network (A6091) and on Abbotsford Road (A7) into Galashiels. Lowood Bridge is a Category B listed building. Care would require to be given to conserve, protect, and enhance the character, integrity and setting of the listed building in line with Policy EP7 (Listed Buildings) of the Scottish Borders Local	It is recommended that Lowood, Tweedbank (MTWEE002) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

				out at the Masterplanning stage, we are pleased to see a commitment to conserving much-valued features such as the woodland and tree screens, along with footpaths such as the Four Abbeys Way and the Southern Upland Way.	Plan 2016.	
Tweedbank	Lowood (MTWEE002)	Bowden Village Committee	Object/ Comment to the inclusion of (MTWEE002) within the Housing SG	Concerns are expressed about the overloading of the transport network. The Borders Railway is already performing worse than expected and the notion that extra houses will guarantee better numbers cannot be assumed. Extra houses may give Scotrail a greater incentive to provide new rolling stock (and more of it) and improve the quality aspect of the line's performance but the single-track route has not been the commuter relief as some had hoped. There seems to be more freight on the A roads. If the prospective houses are constructed, we are going to be subjected to a long time of altering the roads to accommodate increased and ever-increasing traffic. Concern expressed over the suggestion that an extension to the primary school would potentially be required. Capacity is already being	Passenger numbers for the Borders Railway's first year were predicted to be around 650,000. This figure was far exceeded with passenger numbers over one million. There have been complaints in respect of the performance of the train service, this has already improved and is expected to improve further with the arrival of new rolling stock. Transport Scotland along with the Council's own Roads Planning Team have been consulted on the various sites proposed for inclusion in the Housing SG and have raised no objections in principle to those carried forward for inclusion. Issues relating to the capacity of the existing School would require to be considered, the Council's Education Officer has confirmed that an extension to the existing School would	It is recommended that Lowood, Tweedbank (MTWEE002) is included within the Finalised Supplementary Guidance on Housing.

				<p>stretched in the school sector so it would be inevitable that an extension is the very least required. Concern relating to potential negative impact upon wildlife e.g. heron.</p>	<p>require to be considered but has raised no objections in principle to the proposal. Scottish Natural Heritage and the Council's Ecology Officer have been consulted during the process of the Housing SG and will be heavily involved in any future planning application in order to ensure there is no detrimental impact upon wildlife.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

## Northern Housing Market Area

- **Broughton**
  - ABROU002: Page 1
- **Innerleithen**
  - MINNE001: Page 1 onwards
- **Lauder**
  - ALAUD007: Page 3
  - ALAUD008: Page 3
- **Peebles**
  - General comments: Page 4 onwards
  - APPEB045: Page 6 onwards
  - APPEB049: Page 8 onwards
  - APPEB050: Page 8 onwards
  - APPEB052: Page 10 onwards
  - MPPEB004: Page 10 onwards
  - MPPEB006: Page 11 onwards
  - MPPEB007: Page 17 onwards
- **West Linton**
  - AWEST016: Page 28
  - AWEST017: Page 29

SETTLEMENT	SITE NAME & SITE CODE	CONTRIBUTOR	COMMENT TYPE	SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATION	PROPOSED RESPONSE	RECOMMENDATION
Broughton	South West of Dreva Road (ABROU002)	Strutt & Parker	Object	The contributor wishes to see site ABROU002 allocated for Housing within the Supplementary Guidance on Housing. The contributor states that the site currently has planning consent which is due to lapse in April 2017. In the event that this permission is not renewed, the allocation of the land for housing would maintain its position in the established effective land supply and avoid the council suffering a 31 unit additional shortfall. Given that the LDP reporter amended the settlement boundary to include this site and whilst it would remain as white land within the settlement, it seems illogical for the site not to be allocated making reference to the extant planning application dating from 1972 and forming part of the established supply. The contributor notes that when considering that the Reporter in the Examination Report stated that " <i>development here would be well integrated with the form and fabric of the village</i> " and that the site received a top scoring as part of the Council's recent assessment of the sites suitable for allocation in the call for sites process, we believe that the inclusion of this site as an additional allocation is essential for the Council in maintaining a robust established housing supply.	It should be noted that the purpose of the SG on Housing is to take forward additional sites to meet the Housing Land Requirement as recommended by the LDP Examination Reporter. However, it should also be noted that the site has recently received planning consent; in addition the site is already included in the Housing Land Audit and has been for many years. Therefore the site already contributes to the Housing Land Supply. Allocating the site within the SG will not assist the Council in contributing to the additional requirement which is required to be met by the SG.  Therefore this objection is not accepted.	It is recommended that South West of Dreva Road (ABROU002) is not included within the Finalised SG on Housing.
Innerleithen	Caerlee Mill (MINNE001)	Farningham Planning Limited on behalf of Wemyss & March	Note	The contributor states that they have no objection to the identification of this site as a preferred allocation.	Comment noted.	It is recommended that Caerlee Mill (MINNE001) is included within the

		Estate				Finalised SG on Housing.
Innerleithen	Caerlee Mill (MINNE001)	Barton Willmore on behalf of AWG Property Ltd & Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd; Taylor Wimpey Ltd	Object	The contributors state that there are various constraints relating to the site that could limit its effectiveness, including constraints relating to flooding, contamination and listed buildings, in that preserving the setting and character of the listed building is likely to constrain development options on the site. In addition constraints relating from Scottish Water also exist.	<p>It is noted that various constraints are present in relation to the site. However it should be noted that the site requirements including any required infrastructure upgrades will require to be taken into consideration at the planning application stage. In addition, it is noted that the site has gone through an extensive consultation process where comments were received from various key agencies including Scottish Water and internal consultees. Where appropriate these comments have been included within the site requirements. Furthermore a Planning Brief was produced for the site which considered a number of options and identified the preferred way forward for the development of the site including identifying the buildings that could be removed as well as identifying an area where enabling development could take place.</p> <p>It is also noted that the site is in the ownership of a developer and works have already been undertaken to secure the listed building on the site, which involved partial demolition.</p> <p>Therefore this objection is not accepted.</p>	It is recommended that Caerlee Mill (MINNE001) is included within the Finalised SG on Housing.
Innerleithen	Caerlee Mill (MINNE001)	SEPA	Support / Note	SEPA support the statement that a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) may be required. As explained in their previous responses, SEPA state that should the agreed layout or development type differ from what was previously agreed in the context of planning application 14/00638/PPP, they would require an updated FRA which considers our previous responses. As this	Support and comments noted.	It is recommended that Caerlee Mill (MINNE001) is included within the Finalised SG on Housing.

				area of Innerleithen is at flood risk, it is essential that any new development will have a neutral impact on flood risk and the FRA will inform the area of redevelopment, type of development, finished floor levels and ensure that the development has a neutral impact on flood risk. Furthermore flood resilient and resistant materials may be incorporated. They also support the requirement to de-culvert.		
Innerleithen	Caerlee Mill (MINNE001)	Smith and Garratt on behalf of Millar Partnership and David Wilson Homes	Object	<p>The contributor states that the site is covered by existing development policies, therefore including the site within the SG does not increase the availability and choice of available sites.</p> <p>Objects to the inclusion of the site on the grounds that it is capable of being developed in accordance with existing planning policies and the inclusion within the Housing SG would not help the Council in meeting the requirements of the SG.</p>	<p>Appendix 2, as contained within the LDP, provides a windfall assumption, which is included within the overall potential contribution towards the housing requirement (up to 2025).</p> <p>The Scottish Borders is rural in character and a large proportion of the windfall assumption is provided for by housing in the countryside approvals.</p> <p>The LDP provides development opportunities within settlement boundaries, through housing, re-development and mixed use allocations. Therefore, the SG will continue to identify and provide development opportunities within settlement boundaries, as per the LDP, including brownfield opportunities.</p> <p>This objection is therefore rejected.</p>	It is recommended that Caerlee Mill (MINNE001) is included within the Finalised SG on Housing.
Lauder	Land to South East of Lauder (ALAUD007) & Maitland Park: Phase 2	Holder Planning on behalf of Edward Maitland-Carew Smith & Garratt on behalf of	Object	The contributor objects to the non-inclusion of the site ALAUD008 within the Supplementary Guidance on Housing. They state that the site is well suited for housing development and when the adjacent housing site was developed it was so with this site in consideration. The	<p>It is noted that the initial Stage 1 assessment stated that: <i>"The site contributes to the immediate setting of the settlement. Development at this location would also result in elongating the settlement."</i></p> <p><i>Lauder has already two allocated housing sites</i></p>	It is recommended that Land to South East of Lauder (ALAUD007) & Maitland Park: Phase 2 (ALAUD008) are not included

	(ALAUD008)	Edward Maitland-Carew		<p>site is not constrained by flood risk as stated within the Development and Landscape Capacity Study, a SUDS is already in place on the site which can accommodate this site. Lauder is well placed to benefit from the railway in Stow as well as easy connection to the A68 and the existing public transport services which operate along it. Development of the site will bring economic benefits to Lauder and increased population will assist in supporting, sustaining and enhancing community facilities. The site is an effective site that can be delivered within the LDP period. The Council states that Lauder does not require additional housing land as there are currently two allocated housing sites within the settlement however, most other settlements which have been identified as having a Preferred site within the Draft SG also have allocated housing sites. The submission also includes a critique on the Development Landscape Study 2008 as it relates to the contributors site. (Holder Planning on behalf of Edward Maitland-Carew).</p> <p>The contributor urges the council to include sites ALAUD007 / ALAUD008. (Smith &amp; Garratt on behalf of Edward Maitland-Carew).</p>	<p><i>with an indicative capacity of 130 units. Development has not commenced on either site. It is therefore considered that Lauder does not require additional housing land at this time.</i></p> <p><i>The Development and Landscape Capacity Study states that the area is severely constrained”.</i></p> <p>In addition, the initial assessment notes that the settlement has good public transport connections and is relatively close to the railway station at Stow. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that based on the SEPA Flood Risk Maps 2014, the site is not fully subject to flood risk and this too is noted within the Stage 1 assessment, nevertheless the Development and Landscape Study (which was produced in association with Scottish Natural Heritage) does state that this part of Lauder is subject to high sensitivity in respect to the sense of arrival which is created by the woodland which is at the junction with the B6362, and the woodland located in front of the new housing on arrival; and in respect to the immediate settlement edge which is defined by the generous woodland strip which effectively creates a ‘full stop’ to the village.</p> <p>Therefore this objection is not accepted.</p>	within the Finalised SG on Housing.
Peebles	Peebles (General comments)	Peebles Community Trust	Support / Note	<p>The contributor states that they are pleased with the moderate line that has been taken in respect of the scale of additional housing land for Peebles. In addition they are pleased that the principle of further development to the south of the town is contingent on the</p>	<p>Support and comments noted.</p> <p>In respect to comments regarding the need to balance the physical infrastructure, economic and social needs of the town with housing development, it should be noted that consultation is undertaken during the plan-</p>	No change.



				<p>construction of a second road bridge. The contributor supports the position of excluding sites south of the Tweed that have been presented for consideration under this SG.</p> <p>The contributor also highlights their continuing concerns with the need to strike a balance between housing development and the physical infrastructure, economic and social needs of the town. Three issues that are pertinent to the current SG are: unresolved and worsening road traffic congestion, unsatisfied need for more affordable housing and inadequate allocation of land to economic use coupled with the practice of transferring formerly economic land to housing.</p>	<p>making process with both internal and external consultees including Roads Planning, Economic Development, Housing Strategy and NHS to name a few, for their advice and input in the process. In respect to comments regarding the loss of formerly economic land to housing, it should be noted that the March Street Mills site is not protected under Policy ED1 Protection of Business and Industrial Land, however the site has been identified as a Mixed Use site which must provide a mix of uses including housing and employment.</p>	
Peebles	Peebles (General comments)	Peebles Community Council of the Royal Burgh of Peebles and District	Support / Note	<p>The Community Council are broadly supportive of the SG.</p> <p>They note that it is proposed to allocate 100 additional units within the Development Boundary. However, they note that the Peebles Civic Society identified a further 221 sites not included in the Housing Land Audit 2016 and does not identify further individual units also constructed in recent years.</p> <p>The Community Council supports the Council's assessment that any significant development south of the river must not be approved or undertaken prior to the construction of a second bridge.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>In relation to the Housing Land Audit comments, it should be noted that the 2016 HLA is a snapshot of the approvals and completions at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2016. When the HLA was drafted;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There were no completions at APEEB041: Violet Bank Phase II;</li> <li>- Allocation APEEB021: South of South Park was included within the HLA for 50 units;</li> <li>- Allocation MPEEB006; Rosetta Road was included within the HLA for 100 units and formed part of the larger site TP138;</li> <li>- Peebles Hydro was included within the HLA as a windfall site TP141 for 33 units;</li> <li>- Kingsmeadows was included within the HLA as a windfall site TP139 for 24 units, with 6 completions at the time of the</li> </ul>	No change.

					<p>audit.</p> <p>The 'Main Report' of the HLA only includes sites with an indicative site capacity of 5 units or more. The 'Small Sites Report', includes all sites with an indicative capacity up to 4 units. This includes an additional 27 units within Peebles, with 5 completions. 80% of all small sites within the HLA contribute towards the effective housing land supply. Therefore, the 221 units referred to within the submission are all accounted for within the established housing land supply already.</p> <p>However, in respect of the Housing SG, the 2014 HLA was the baseline and none of the sites referred to were included within that audit. However Violet Bank (Phase II) and South of South Park were allocated within the LDP and included within the contribution to the requirement. Rosetta Road was added by the Reporter at Examination to the LDP (APEEB044 &amp; MPEEB006) within an indicative capacity for 100 units and is also included within the contribution to the requirement. Peebles Hydro and Kingsmeadows are windfall sites within Peebles. There is already a windfall assumption included within the contribution to the requirement, which allows for such developments.</p> <p>In respect to comments regarding the need for a new bridge, it is noted that the requirement for a new bridge is set out in the site requirements for the longer term site identified within the Local Development Plan.</p>	
Peebles	Venlaw (APEEB045)	Andrew Bennie Planning Limited on behalf of	Object	The contributor objects to the non-inclusion of site APEEB045 – Venlaw within the Supplementary Guidance. The	It is noted that the Stage 1 Assessment highlights that the site has been considered previously through the Local Plan Amendment	It is recommended that Venlaw (APEEB045) is not

		S Carmichael Properties Ltd		<p>contributor notes that the site was discounted at stage 1 of the assessment process and so was not subject to detailed assessment by any suitably qualified professional parties, and therefore the conclusions of that assessment cannot be either reasonably or justifiably supported.</p> <p>These conclusions raise four areas of concern – landscape, archaeology, access and past promotional history.</p> <p>The contributor’s submission includes information which aims to address the issues noted above. In terms of landscape, the contributor states that the <i>“draft SG has failed to provide evidence, which would support the contention that development of the site, as proposed, would give rise to any demonstrably adverse landscape impacts”</i>. In respect of archaeology, the landscape assessment makes it clear that no development will take place within the area of the cultivation terraces, and that on a general matter of other potential archaeological features within the site, it is submitted that this is of relevance to development of any green field site. In respect to Access, the Reporters Report stated that a technical solution could be arrived at which would allow some development on the site. In respect to past promotional history, on the basis that any planning decision has to be made within the context of those considerations which are of relevance at the point in time when the decision requires to be made, the fact that this or indeed any other site, may not</p>	<p>and the Local Development Plan (LDP) Process. In addition it should be noted that the site was considered by the LDP Reporter who considered many of the issues raised by the contributor. However within his overall conclusions the Reporter stated: <i>“I conclude overall that the potential benefits of increasing the land supply by allocation of this site are outweighed by the likely significant adverse impact on the character and visual amenity of this sensitive settlement edge location.”</i></p> <p>Therefore, despite being aware of the shortfall in housing land, and having the opportunity to augment the supply, the Reporter did not consider this site suitable for development. Furthermore it is noted that the Council have received support for the exclusion of this site (see below) within the Supplementary Guidance.</p> <p>Therefore this objection is not accepted.</p>	included within the Finalised SG on Housing.
--	--	-----------------------------	--	---	--	--

				have been supported for development in the past, does not in and of itself present a for all time impediment to the potential future allocation and subsequent development of such sites. The contributor states that the site is an effective site.		
Peebles	Venlaw (APEEB045)	Peebles Civic Society; Peebles Community Trust; Peebles Community Council of the Royal Burgh of Peebles and District	Support the non-inclusion of the site	<p>The contributor supports the rejection of site APEEB045 – Venlaw on account of the severe impact on the landscape character of setting of Peebles in the Eddleston Water valley. (Peebles Civic Society)</p> <p>The contributor supports the rejection of site APEEB045 – Venlaw, the site is problematic and its development would adversely affect the visual impact of this key entrance gateway to the town. (Peebles Community Trust)</p> <p>The contributor supports the rejection of site APEEB045 – Venlaw in that its development would have a significant negative impact on the town landscape. (Peebles Community Council of the Royal Burgh of Peebles and District).</p>	Support noted.	It is recommended that Venlaw (APEEB045) is not included within the Finalised SG on Housing.
Peebles	South West of Whitehaugh (APEEB049) & (APEEB050)	Barton Willmore on behalf of Taylor Wimpey Ltd	Object	The contributor objects to the non-inclusion of the site APEEB049 / APEEB050 within the Supplementary Guidance. The site is currently identified as a longer term housing site within the LDP and should come forward in the short term. The contributor notes that there are a number of constraints identified in relation to the site and submits a revised layout that seeks to deal with those issues. The contributor states that a vehicular access link with Glen Road will not be required.	Whilst it is accepted that the site is subject to a number of constraints of which many can be overcome, it is considered that the main reasons for the exclusion of the site primarily relates around the need for a second bridge. However it should also be noted that in addition to a new bridge, the Council are also of the opinion that for the site to come forward, Glen Road would also require upgrading and the site relies on a vehicular linkage between the end of Glen Road and the roundabout at the southern end of Whitehaugh Park; Nevertheless, it is noted	It is recommended that South West of Whitehaugh (APEEB049 & APEEB050) are not included within the Finalised SG on Housing.

				<p>Vehicular access into the site can be achieved via the existing roundabout at the southern end of Whitehaugh Park. It is not considered that the site is constrained by existing transport links and road network. The contributor is of the opinion that the existing vehicular bridge of the River Tweed can comfortably accommodate additional trips associated with this development. Flooding is not an issue for the site and foul and storm water drainage together with SUDS treatment and if necessary storm water attenuation and be dealt with within the site. The ecological value of the site is low. The site benefits from good access to public transport, employment and services. It is considered that capacity already exists in relation to education provision, in addition ground conditions will not result in a constraint for the site. There is adequate capacity available to service the site in respect to electricity, gas, water and foul drainage.</p> <p>It is noted that other sites which have been identified as Preferred sites within the SG on Housing have constraints as identified within the Council's site assessment as this site. These constraints could ultimately affect housing delivery and by allocating site APEEB049 would assist in maintaining an effective 5 year housing land supply.</p>	<p>that this upgrading, and road link as well as the need for a new bridge are disputed by the contributor.</p> <p>In respect to the Roads Planning section, they state that for the site to come forward a new bridge would be required. The contributor will be aware of the raft of previous consultancy work that provided the background to the inclusion of the requirement for a new bridge within the LDP to help serve the town of Peebles. The issue was not just existing capacity on the old Tweed Bridge, but also environmental and pedestrian related safety concerns on Peebles High Street and the potential reduction of traffic speeds and volumes, allied to the concerns associated with the reliance on one bridge within the town which controls the movement of traffic between both sides of the river. In addition, the Roads Planning section question the assessment of Tweed Bridge traffic capacity and anticipated traffic flow on the bridge. With committed development in the current Local Development Plan and the proposed development in this submission this would result in the bridge operating just over capacity or at least close to it. This is at odds with 'Designing Streets' which promotes strong street connectivity. In terms of good street connectivity as per 'Designing Streets', and the proper planning of the town of Peebles any development of this site will require a vehicular link between the end of Glen Road and Kingsmeadows Road via the Whitehaugh land as is confirmed for this site in the current LDP.</p> <p>In addition, the contributor state that flooding</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					is also not an issue, however as noted within the site assessment, SEPA have stated that that a flood risk assessment would be required and the Council's flood team have stated that surface water would need to be considered.  Therefore this objection is not accepted.	
Peebles	South West of Peebles (APEEB052)	Farningham Planning Limited on behalf of Wemyss & March Estate	Note	The contributor acknowledges that their land is not appropriate to allocate at this time but wishes for the Council to retain the site on record for consideration in LDP2.	Comments noted.	It is recommended that South West of Peebles (APEEB052) is included within the Finalised SG on Housing.
Peebles	Land South East of Peebles (MPEEB004)  <i>The site is part of longer term mixed use site (SPEEB005) &amp; (MPEEB008)</i>	Barton Willmore on behalf of AWG Property Ltd & Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	Object	The contributor objects to the non-inclusion of the site MPEEB004 within the Supplementary Guidance. It is noted that the submission also includes an adjacent area for compensatory storage to the south east of the site. The contributor states that a number of studies have been undertaken for the site and that there are no constraints with regard to servicing, road access, traffic and accessibility, environmental constraints, economic viability – with each having an identified, appropriate mitigation measure and/or solution. Flood risk documentation has been prepared to outline measures to mitigate potential flood risk associated with development of the site. A technical note has been prepared in respect to the issue relating to the bridge capacity and that note indicates that there is sufficient capacity to accommodate the development. It is considered that any slight increase in traffic associated with the site would have a minimal impact on the town centre amenity but that	Whilst it is accepted that the site is subject to a number of constraints of which many can be overcome, it is considered that the main reasons for the exclusion of the site primarily relates around flood risk and the need for a second bridge. It is noted that the contributor is of the opinion that the flooding issue can be dealt with, and that there is no requirement for a new bridge. However, it should be noted that the submission from the contributor has been forwarded to SEPA, the Council's Flood Management section as well as the Council's Roads Planning section. SEPA have stated that they cannot support development at this location, and state: " <i>If formally consulted through the planning process on the proposed development we would <b>object in principle</b> on the grounds that it may place buildings and persons at flood risk contrary to Scottish Planning Policy based on the information supplied with this consultation.</i> " Whilst the Council's Flood Management section also state that they would not be able to accept this proposal for housing. In respect to the Roads Planning section, they	It is recommended that Land South East of Peebles (MPEEB004) is not included within the Finalised SG on Housing.

				<p>proportionate environmental mitigation measures could be introduced addressing this issue. A flood modelling report has been prepared and it confirms that an effective solution can be provided to resolve the flood risk issue. The contributor notes that it is considered that whilst the approach is unconventional, and may not allow for withdrawal of SEPA's objection, it would provide comprehensive mitigation for any potential flood risk within the site and the surrounding area – allowing for the Council to support residential development in this location. The site is effective and can deliver significant benefits including economic development, jobs, retain, expenditure, affordable housing provision etc. The site is deliverable for housing and within the short term/Plan period. It is noted that a Proposal of Application Notice has been submitted in relation to this site in June 2016. It is noted that other sites which have been identified as Preferred sites within the SG on Housing have similar constraints as identified within the Council's site assessment as this site. These constraints could ultimately affect housing delivery and by allocating site MPEEB004 would assist in maintaining an effective 5 year housing land supply.</p>	<p>state that for the site to come forward a new bridge would be required. The contributor will be aware of the raft of previous consultancy work that provided the background to the inclusion of the requirement for a new bridge within the LDP to help serve the town of Peebles. The issue was not just existing capacity on the old Tweed Bridge, but also environmental and pedestrian related safety concerns on Peebles High Street and the potential reduction of traffic speeds and volumes, allied to the concerns associated with the reliance on one bridge within the town which controls the movement of traffic between both sides of the river. In addition, the Roads Planning section question the assessment of Tweed Bridge traffic capacity and anticipated traffic flow on the bridge. With committed development in the current Local Development Plan and the proposed development in this submission this would result in the bridge operating just over capacity or at least close to it. This is at odds with 'Designing Streets' which promotes strong street connectivity.</p> <p>Therefore this objection is not accepted.</p>	
Peebles	Rosetta Road (MPEEB006)	Savills on behalf of Aberdeen Asset Management	Support / Object	<p>The contributor states that whilst they support the inclusion of the site within the Draft SG on Housing, they also identify a number of inconsistencies regarding the designation that need to be addressed. The contributor seeks that the site is allocated for Housing only and not mixed</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>However, it should be noted that this Mixed Use allocation was recommended for inclusion by the Examination Reporter. It is not for the SG on Housing to make changes to existing allocations but rather to identify sites</p>	<p>It is recommended that Rosetta Road (MPEEB006) is included within the Finalised SG on Housing.</p>

				<p>use.</p> <p>The contributor requests an increase in capacity from 30 units to 100 units. The contributor requests that the improved holiday park is identified as a separate leisure allocation.</p> <p>The contributor requests that the following text is removed from the fourth site requirement – “The housing development is dependent on a vehicular bridge link over the Eddleston Water to connect Rosetta Road with Edinburgh Road via Kingsland Road/Kingsland Square and Dalatho Street”.</p>	<p>to provide further housing. In respect to housing numbers, it is noted that numbers set out in both the SG on Housing and the Local Development Plan are indicative only, the exact number of units that a proposed development can accommodate can only be determined through the processing of a detailed planning application. In relation to the site requirements set out in the SG on Housing, and particularly the requirement in relation to the vehicular bridge link over the Eddleston Water; it should be noted that many of these requirements have come about through the planning application (13/00444/PPP) on site, and this includes the requirement for the bridge. In that respect it should be noted that the Reporter recommended the inclusion of a site requirement within the Plan stating that the proposed development proceed in accordance with application 13/00444/PPP. Therefore excluding the requirement for a new bridge, as requested by the contributor would be contrary to the Reporters recommendations as the proposed development would not be in line with that planning application.</p> <p>Therefore this objection is not accepted.</p>	
Peebles	Rosetta Road (MPEEB006)	Peebles Civic Society; Peebles Community Council of the Royal Burgh of Peebles & District	Support/Note	<p>The contributor supports the proposal to accommodate a further 30 units to the 100 units already in the LDP provided that the following issues are addressed: The education report states that both primary and secondary schools have limited capacity. This is to be taken into account in assessing the educational needs for Peebles as a whole.</p> <p>A full on site traffic impact study is to be carried out by the Scottish Borders Council</p>	<p>Support and comments noted.</p> <p>In relation to the comments also submitted. It should be noted that any proposed development on the site will be subject to a detailed planning application. In addition, Local Development Plan Policy IS2 Developer Contributions would apply. That policy requires developers to make full or partial contribution towards the cost of addressing deficiencies in infrastructure and services</p>	It is recommended that Rosetta Road (MPEEB006) is included within the Finalised SG on Housing.



				<p>and we suggest a condition be inserted that it is to be part funded by the developer prior to a detailed planning application being assessed. (Peebles Civic Society)</p> <p>It is noted that the site holds potential for significant impact on infrastructure in particular education and traffic. In addition the contributor notes comments in relation to the “Local impact an integration summary” of the site assessment for the site. They also state that they are in agreement with the site requirements in relation to that the site must provide a mix of uses including housing and an enhanced tourism offering, and that the housing development is dependent on a vehicular bridge link over the Eddleston water. However, the contributor would also like to see a requirement for any developer to fund an SBC physical assessment of current traffic patterns and likely future development impact in the north of Peebles prior to any planning approval. (Peebles Community Council of the Royal Burgh of Peebles and District).</p>	<p>which would include contributions towards the primary and secondary school. In respect to comments in relation to a full on site traffic impact study, it should be noted that the Roads Planning Section have been consulted and are of the opinion that the proposed development requires a new vehicular bridge link over the Eddleston Water, in addition a Transport Assessment would be required. Whilst the Transport Assessment is not undertaken by the Roads Planning section of the Council, they are involved in the scoping for the Assessment and respond to the findings of the Assessment. It is therefore considered that the issues raised by the contributor are addressed in the site requirements for the site.</p>	
Peebles	Rosetta Road (MPEEB006)	Scottish Natural Heritage	Note	<p>It is understood that this allocation is for the redevelopment of the existing caravan site for residential development. As the site is subject to a planning application, Scottish Natural Heritage have no further comment to make at this stage. Should that consent not be implemented, Scottish Natural Heritage would be happy to advise on natural heritage issues for the required planning brief.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>In the process of producing a planning brief for the site and the adjacent Housing site (APEEB044) allocated within the Local Development Plan, the Council would be content to involve Scottish Natural Heritage in the process.</p>	<p>It is recommended that Rosetta Road (MPEEB006) is included within the Finalised SG on Housing.</p>
Peebles	Rosetta Road	Farningham	Note	<p>The contributor states that they have no</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>	<p>It is recommended</p>

	(MPEEB006)	Planning Limited on behalf of Wemyss & March Estate		objection to the identification of this site as a Preferred allocation.		that Rosetta Road (MPEEB006) is included within the Finalised SG on Housing.
Peebles	Rosetta Road (MPEEB006)	Peebles Community Trust	Note	<p>The contributor states that the impact of an additional 30 units to this site is unclear. A Planning Permission in Principle has already been approved on the site, subject to conditions in respect of traffic, visual impact, and protection of heritage values and assets on the site.</p> <p>It is noted that the planning permission for this site is contingent on the construction of a vehicular bridge between Kingsland and Dalatho Street and will do nothing to mitigate the congestion affecting the area to the immediate south. The contributor states that they do not see how the addition of 30 further housing units to this site benefits Peebles in the slightest.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>It should be noted that the planning consent on the site has not yet been issued, the application (13/00444/PPP) was “minded to approve” by the Planning and Building Standards Committee. In respect to comments in relation to the statement that the new bridge across the Eddleston Water will do nothing to mitigate the congestion affecting the area to the immediate south and will only benefit the development itself; it should be noted that developer contributions can only be sought where they directly relate to the development being proposed and not to any existing deficiencies elsewhere in the town. It should also be noted that the 30 units are allocated to a Mixed Use site already allocated within the Local Development Plan (LDP), and the LDP does not set out an indicative housing capacity. In addition, it is also noted that the Examination Reporter recommended that in identifying additional sites, the longer term housing and mixed use sites identified in the plan will be considered first. Therefore, as a Mixed Use site with no housing capacity attributed to it, it is considered that this is an acceptable site to assist in meeting the requirement for additional housing.</p>	It is recommended that Rosetta Road (MPEEB006) is included within the Finalised SG on Housing.
Peebles	Rosetta Road (MPEEB006)	SEPA	Support/ Object	<p>Whilst SEPA support the requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment, as well as the statement that there should be no culverting for land gain.</p> <p>SEPA object to the site in that they would</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Objection accepted.</p> <p>The relevant site requirement should be amended to read:</p>	It is recommended that Rosetta Road (MPEEB006) is included within the Finalised SG on

				require a modification to the Supplementary Guidance to include an additional requirement for the developer to investigate the possibility of de-culverting.	“A Flood Risk Assessment will be required to inform the design and layout of the proposed development. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site which may exacerbate flood risk. There should be no culverting for land gain. In addition, investigation of the possibility for de-culverting should also be undertaken.”	Housing.  It is also recommended that the final site requirement should be amended to read:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>A Flood Risk Assessment will be required to inform the design and layout of the proposed development. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site which may exacerbate flood risk. There should be no culverting for land gain. In addition, investigation of the possibility for de-culverting should also be undertaken.</i></li> </ul>
Peebles	Rosetta Road (MPEEB006)	Barton Willmore on behalf of AWG Property Ltd & Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd &	Object	The following constraints relating to the site are likely to limit the effectiveness of the site, potentially reducing its capacity or deliver timescales, these relate to roads and access, landscape, flooding, ecology,	It should be noted that Mixed Use site MPEEB006 is an allocated Mixed Use site within the Local Development Plan (LDP). Furthermore the site was recommended for inclusion in the Plan by the Examination	It is recommended that Rosetta Road (MPEEB006) is included within the Finalised SG on

		Barton Willmore on behalf of Taylor Wimpey Ltd		archaeology and listed buildings.	Reporter in the knowledge that the site was subject to a number of constraints. However, it should be noted that the LDP does not set out an indicative capacity for the site. In addition, it should also be noted that the Examination Reporter recommended that in identifying additional sites, the longer term housing and mixed use sites identified in the plan will be considered first. Therefore, as a Mixed Use site with no housing capacity attributed to it, it is considered that this is an acceptable site to assist in meeting the requirement for additional housing. It is considered that 30 units is an appropriate figure for the site to assist in contributing to the housing requirement.  Therefore this objection is not accepted.	Housing.
Peebles	Rosetta Road (MPEEB006)	Douglas M Tait & Morris Anderson	Object	The contributor states that objections made previously regarding this site still remain. In respect to Water Supply, the contributor states that their property is served by mains water, however on occasions the supply is very low and at times of heavy usage none at all. They also state that they have been advised by Scottish Water that further demand on the water mains in the immediate area would cause problems. Therefore without upgrades, any additional properties will likely cause problems. In relation to access, any development of this site is naturally going to create a large volume of traffic, and there are existing issues on the road network. There are already around 100 new houses proposed for this site, with 20 planning conditions attached to the application and the applicant is slowly trying to dilute	It should be noted that the planning consent on the site was not issued, the application (13/004444/PPP) was “minded to approve” by the Planning and Building Standards Committee. However, it should also be noted that the site requirements set out in the SG on housing requires that a Water Impact Assessment is undertaken. Furthermore, Scottish Water has been consulted and has not raised any issues. Nevertheless it should also be noted that a Growth Project is planned for completion in 2018 which would accommodate this development. In respect to comments regarding the road network, the Roads Planning Section have been consulted and are of the opinion that the proposed development requires a new vehicular bridge link over the Eddleston Water, in addition a Transport Assessment would be required, these requirements have	It is recommended that Rosetta Road (MPEEB006) is included within the Finalised SG on Housing.

				<p>these conditions, no concessions should be made. If another 30 units are considered for this site then all original conditions should be strictly enforced. The infrastructure of Peebles is unable to cope with the current population, if additional development is approved then a massive investment is required which is unlikely to come due to the economic climate. (Douglas M Tait)</p> <p>The contributor states that development at this location may result in an adverse bearing on their water pressure, so if the proposed allocation is to proceed then a full investigation and if necessary relevant improvements will be essential. It is considered that even with the construction of a new bridge at Dalatho, additional housing units will impact on both Rosetta Road and March Street making the situation intolerable and indeed dangerous.</p> <p>In relation to the site requirement for a pedestrian/cycle link, it is not clear why such a link would be necessary, but if it is, it should be on the lower most easterly section of the minor road and no further up than the existing garages. Geographically this would make sense, however it is noted that any increase in access and usage without corresponding liability would unfairly increase maintenance burdens on the owner of which the contributor is one. (Morris Anderson).</p>	<p>also been set out in the SG on Housing. In respect to comments regarding the pedestrian/cycle link, the exact location of the link has not yet been determined, but it is noted that its purpose is to ensure safe access from the site for pedestrians and cyclists. The location of the link will likely be determined through the planning application process. Based on the above, it is therefore considered that these objections are not accepted.</p>	
Peebles	March Street Mill (MPEEB007)	SEPA	Support	We support the requirement to consider surface water flooding for any new development.	Support noted.	It is recommended that March Street Mill (MPEEB007) is

						included within the Finalised SG on Housing.
Peebles	March Street Mill (MPEEB007)	Peebles Civic Society	Support	<p>We support the proposal to accommodate 70 units on this site and the site requirement that the site must provide a mix of uses including employment and potentially commercial and community use.</p> <p>The education report states that both primary and secondary schools have limited capacity. This is to be taken into account in assessing the educational needs for Peebles as a whole.</p> <p>A full on site traffic impact study is to be carried out by the Scottish Borders Council. We suggest a condition be inserted that it is to be part funded by the developer prior to a detailed planning application being assessed.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>In relation to comments regarding education and a traffic impact study; it should be noted that Development Plan Policy IS2 Developer Contributions would apply. That policy requires developers to make full or partial contribution towards the cost of addressing deficiencies in infrastructure and services which would include contributions towards the primary and secondary school. It should be noted that the Education section of the Council have not objected to the site. In respect to comments in relation to a full on site traffic impact study, it should be noted that the Roads Planning Section have been consulted and are of the opinion that the vehicular access will be from March Street and from Dovecot Road with two further optional vehicular links to Ballantyne Place to be explored, in addition a Transport Assessment would be required. Whilst the Transport Assessment is not undertaken by the Roads Planning section of the Council, they are involved in the scoping for the Assessment and respond to the findings of the Assessment. It is therefore considered that the issues raised by the contributor are addressed in the site requirements for the site.</p>	It is recommended that March Street Mill (MPEEB007) is included within the Finalised SG on Housing.
Peebles	March Street Mill (MPEEB007)	Turley on behalf of Moorbrook Textiles Limited	Support	The contributor supports the identification of the Former March Street Mill as a suitable location for housing. The contributor notes that a planning application has been submitted for the site and set out how they have sought to bring forward a development in line with	Support noted.	It is recommended that March Street Mill (MPEEB007) is included within the Finalised SG on Housing.

				the site requirements set out within the Draft SG. The contributor states that the site is an effective and viable site, which is sustainably located, makes best use of the land resource, and its development will allow for the significant heritage buildings on the site to make a more positive contribution to the Conservation Area.		
Peebles	March Street Mill (MPEEB007)	Farningham Planning Limited on behalf of Wemyss & March Estate	Note	The contributor states that they have no objection to the identification of this site as a Preferred allocation.	Comment noted.	It is recommended that March Street Mill (MPEEB007) is included within the Finalised SG on Housing.
Peebles	March Street Mill (MPEEB007)	John Denholm	Note	The contributor states that the height on the buildings looking onto March Street (ex offices) are kept to the same height as the present, with slate roof and grey harling. That the walls, railings and pillars (pillars – if this is an access road) are kept as it is, to blend with the old.	Comments noted. In respect to comments regarding the detailed design of the site, it should be noted that the exact details of the proposed development of the site has not yet been determined, however it will be subject to a detailed planning application.  Nevertheless it is acknowledged that the site is located within the Peebles Conservation Area and as a result of that a site requirement has been included within the SG on Housing to reflect that. That requirement notes that the retention of some buildings will be required. In addition the requirement states: <i>“The overall scale and height of any new build will require to respect the Conservation Area. Where any buildings are to be removed, as far as possible their materials should be reused within the site”</i> .	It is recommended that March Street Mill (MPEEB007) is included within the Finalised SG on Housing.
Peebles	March Street Mill (MPEEB007)	Scottish Natural Heritage	Note	The site is adjacent to Key Greenspace GSPEEB008 (Rosetta Road Allotments). Redevelopment of this site should not obstruct existing or planned footpath and cycle route access to this site and the	Comments noted. It is noted that a site requirement for the site seeks amenity access within the site, and links to Ballantyne Place and to Rosetta Road.	It is recommended that March Street Mill (MPEEB007) is included within the Finalised SG on

				development itself should be linked to and beyond via this key greenspace. Scottish Natural Heritage welcomes the requirement that links to the footpath network are created, maintained and enhanced.		Housing.
Peebles	March Street Mill (MPEEB007)	Peebles Community Council of the Royal Burgh of Peebles and District	Note / Object	<p>It is noted that 70 units may be achievable but would require significant conditions applied to any approval. The contributor notes Policy ED1 Protection of Business and Industrial Land. However, proposals put forward by the site owners did little to include retirement, commercial and other community use. Should SBC wish to see 70 units on the site and still hold adherence to Policy ED1, it may be possible through conditions that any approval would include at least 50% of the units to be affordable and be 1-2 bed units for rent. This would go some way to meeting the shortfall identified in the Housing Strategy and Strategic Housing Investment Plan. A further condition should be to reserve a significant proportion of the site for Employment Use although this could be partially met by proposals for community co-production, shared work space and training facilities.</p> <p>The unrestricted inclusion of this site for 70 Units would undermine the wide range of employment, social and community uses presented by this unique once in a generation town centre site.</p> <p>It is noted that the site holds potential for significant impact on infrastructure in particular education and traffic.</p>	<p>Comments noted. However, it should be noted that Policy ED1: Protection of Business and Industrial Land does not identify the March Street Mills site as business and industrial site; therefore Policy ED1 will not apply to this site. Nevertheless, the site requirements set out in the SG on Housing states that <i>"The site must provide a mix of uses including housing, employment, and potentially commercial and community use"</i>. It should be noted that the planning application on the site is for Planning Permission in Principle and not a detailed application. The site capacity included within the SG on Housing is an indicative capacity and the exact housing numbers on the site can only be determined through the processing of a detailed planning application. However, it is considered that the 70 units is a realistic number for the site taking into consideration the need to include a mix of uses on the site.</p> <p>In respect to affordable housing, Policy HD1 requires a standard 25% of affordable housing on all sites although this figure can be re-affirmed at the detailed planning application stage, it should also be noted that paragraph 129 of Scottish Planning Policy states that affordable housing contribution within a market site should generally be no more than 25% of the total number of houses.</p> <p>In relation to comments regarding education and traffic; it should be noted that</p>	It is recommended that March Street Mill (MPEEB007) is included within the Finalised SG on Housing.



					Development Plan Policy IS2 Developer Contributions would apply. That policy requires developers to make full or partial contribution towards the cost of addressing deficiencies in infrastructure and services which would include contributions towards the primary and secondary school. In addition, a requirement for a Transport Assessment is included. It is therefore considered that the issues raised by the contributor are addressed in the site requirements for the site. Based on the above, it is therefore considered that the objection is not accepted.	
Peebles	March Street Mill (MPEEB007)	Peebles Community Trust	Object	<p>The site requirements for the former March Street Mill site fail to recognise and uphold the significance of the site as a key economic asset for the town. The contributor states that they are of the view that the site requirements need to be strengthened to achieve at least an even split between social and economic use, and development of housing. A clearer direction is needed on the disposition of land-use across the site. In addition, the contributor states that the area around this site is subject to increasing traffic congestion arising from raised car ownership.</p> <p>It is noted that the planning permission for the Rosetta Road site development is contingent on the construction of a vehicular bridge between Kingsland and Dalatho Street and will do nothing to mitigate the congestion affecting the area to the immediate south, around this site. The contributor states that in relation to the sites future development, the design, employment and residential accommodation on the site should be</p>	<p>It should be noted that the March Street Mill site is not a protected business or industrial site. The site requirements for the site set out that <i>"The site must provide a mix of uses including housing, employment, and potentially commercial and community use"</i>. Furthermore, it should be noted that the site could have come forward for development even without the SG on Housing. It should also be noted that the Council do not allocate sites for affordable and/or for local needs/people. However, it should be noted that Local Development Plan policy, HD1: Affordable and Special Needs Housing will apply.</p> <p>In respect to comments regarding increasing traffic congestion, it should be noted that the Roads Planning Section have been consulted and are of the view that the development can be accommodated. They have requested that the vehicular access be from March Street and from Dovecot Road with two further optional vehicular links to Ballantyne Place to be explored. In addition, it should be noted that a requirement for a Transport Assessment is included within the list of site requirements</p>	It is recommended that March Street Mill (MPEEB007) is included within the Finalised SG on Housing.

				<p>directed at people who live and work locally. This can be achieved by allocating a significant proportion to economic use, and designing any housing element to small units with raised allocations to affordable housing which would be supported by existing planning policies in respect of Protection of Business and Industrial land (ED1), Sustainability (PMD1), Town Centre Development (ED3), Quality Standards (PMD2) and Affordable Housing (HD1).</p> <p>In addition, the allotment site should be retained as allotments.</p> <p>In relation to the heritage value of the site, it is considered that this would be best achieved through the retention of a significant proportion of the site for economic and community use. In terms of built heritage the contributor states that they do not believe that the retention of the Engine Room/Boiler House is in itself a necessary or representative emblem of this important site. It is considered that incorporating some of the design features and materials of the buildings on the site, most notably the wooden clad tenting sheds, but also the boiler house and engineering sheds and the repeating forms of the weaving sheds would be appropriate.</p>	<p>for the site.</p> <p>In respect to comments regarding the detailed design of the site, it should be noted that the exact details of the proposed development have not yet been determined, however it will be subject to a detailed planning application. Whilst it is acknowledged that the site is located within the Peebles Conservation Area, it is noted that elements such as the tenting shed, weaving shed could influence the design of the new development. However, it is important to ensure that additional restrictions are not placed on the site that could hinder its development from coming forward. In that respect it is noted that the Council's Heritage and Design Officer has advised that any new development must seek to ensure the retention and reuse of at least the Engine House and the Lodge House, and this has been included within the site requirements for the site. In addition the requirement states: <i>"The overall scale and height of any new build will require to respect the Conservation Area. Where any buildings are to be removed, as far as possible their materials should be reused within the site"</i>. Based on the above, it is therefore considered that the objection is not accepted.</p>	
Peebles	March Street Mill (MPEEB007)	Barton Willmore on behalf of AWG Property Ltd and Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd & Barton Willmore on behalf of Taylor Wimpey	Object	<p>The following constraints are considered to potentially constrain the March Street Mill site's effectiveness, capacity and deliverability for housing; these relate to roads and access, heritage and design, and flooding and ecology could prove problematic. In addition, the requirement to provide mixed use development, and</p>	<p>It is noted that various constraints are present in relation to the site. However it should be noted that any site requirements including any required infrastructure upgrades will require to be taken into consideration at the planning application stage. In addition, it is noted that the site has gone through an extensive consultation process where</p>	<p>It is recommended that March Street Mill (MPEEB007) is included within the Finalised SG on Housing.</p>

		Ltd		concentrate on office and industrial uses could further reduce residential capacities on this site.	<p>comments were received from various key agencies including SEPA and internal consultees. Where appropriate these comments have been included within the site requirements.</p> <p>The site capacity included within the SG on Housing is an indicative capacity and the exact housing numbers on the site can only be determined through the processing of a detailed planning application. However, it is considered that the 70 units is a realistic number for the site taking into consideration the need to include a mix of uses on the site. Therefore this objection is not accepted.</p>	
Peebles	March Street Mill (MPEEB007)	Dorothy & Dunbar Henderson; Alan Foster; Keith McDonald	Object	<p>The contributors express concern in relation to the allocation of the site. The site shares a boundary with their fence, with their garden and property being at what could be a main entrance into the mixed use site. They express concern that they could have two storey buildings constructed within metres from their property, and state that in the time that they have lived at their property they have not had issues regarding disruptive traffic, neighbourhood noise or privacy. The contributors state that they have viewed proposals for this site by the local community and a building company and neither provided clarity. However, the contributors note that the Housing SG provides clarity that the Allotments are to remain.</p> <p>The contributors state that the adjacent Tesco supermarket has strict regulations regarding noise and movement within the neighbourhood, and they would therefore expect that any community building would have stricter noise regulations as</p>	<p>Any proposed development will require detailed planning consent. It should be noted that in that respect, Local Development Plan Policy HD3: Protection of Residential Amenity will apply. That policy aims to protect the amenity of both existing established residential areas and proposed new housing developments. Issues such as overlooking, loss of privacy, generation of traffic or noise as well as the scale, form and type of development in terms of its fit within a residential area will be considered.</p> <p>In respect to any new uses on the site, these too would be considered in any planning application for the site and the above policy will be relevant, so issues such as potential noise would be dealt with as part of that process. It should be noted that the application process would be undertaken in consultation with Environmental Health who oversees such issues as noise.</p> <p>In relation to the allotments on the site, as noted within the Draft Supplementary Guidance on Housing – the allotments are protected in line with Local Development Plan</p>	It is recommended that March Street Mill (MPEEB007) is included within the Finalised SG on Housing.

			<p>the building would be within closer proximity to housing than Tesco is. (Dorothy &amp; Dunbar Henderson)</p> <p>The contributor objects to the relocation of the allotments in that development at that location will affect the amenity of their property. If the allotments were to remain in their existing location the development need not affect any existing properties. Moving the allotments is a cost saving exercise. The contributor also objects to the demolition of the office building as they are an integral part of the look of March Street. The contributor also makes other comments regarding development within the town boundaries and over development. (Alan Foster)</p> <p>The contributor notes that they do not object to the recommendation for housing within the site. However the contributor does express concerns in relation to road safety issues and the impact that the development will have on the Administration Office. The contributor notes that the developer at a public meeting stated that this building would be retained for community use. This issue is not included within the site requirements and the retention of the building would be more in line to a conservation street than new build. (Keith McDonald)</p>	<p>Policy EP11 – Protection of Greenspace. In that respect, it should be noted that although the allotments are protected, there is still the potential for the allotments to be relocated in line with the policy. However, this would be something that would be dealt with as part of any subsequent planning application for the site.</p> <p>In respect to comments regarding road safety, it should be noted that the Roads Planning Section have been consulted and are of the view that the development can be accommodated. They have requested that the vehicular access be from March Street and from Dovecot Road with two further optional vehicular links to Ballantyne Place to be explored. In addition, it should be noted that a requirement for a Transport Assessment is included within the list of site requirements for the site.</p> <p>In respect to comments regarding development within the town boundaries, it should be noted that new development will require to be assessed against the policies contained within the Local Development Plan, and particularly Policy PMD2: Quality Standards which aims to ensure that all new development is of a high standard and respects the environment in which it is contained.</p> <p>In regards to comments that the building fronting onto March Street should be retained for community use, it should be noted that the SG on Housing states that the site must provide a mix of uses including housing, employment, and potentially commercial and community use. Therefore community uses on the site are not mandatory.</p> <p>Whilst it is acknowledged that the site is</p>	
--	--	--	---	---	--

					<p>located within the Peebles Conservation Area, the Council's Heritage and Design Officer has advised that any new development must seek to ensure the retention and reuse of at least the Engine House and the Lodge House, and this has been included within the site requirements for the site.</p> <p>In addition the requirement states: <i>"The overall scale and height of any new build will require to respect the Conservation Area. Where any buildings are to be removed, as far as possible their materials should be reused within the site"</i>.</p> <p>Based on the above, it is therefore considered that these objections are not accepted.</p>	
Peebles	March Street Mill (MPEEB007)	Rachel & Gary Smith, Mr & Mrs B Crooks, James McKenzie, J Maben, Matthew & Angela MacDonald, Caitland O'Donnell & David Paton, Rachel Clarke, Brian Hill	Object	<p>The contributors state that they object to developing on the allotment site but are not opposed to developing on the pre-existing buildings. However, developing the old mill site should be done in a way that is sensitive to the surrounding environment, and should not exceed the existing building heights. The contributors state that they see the need for development but they also see the need to protect historic, social, green, open spaces such as the allotment. They also state that developing on the allotments is against Scottish Government Planning Policy, in addition the site is used by protected species for foraging, and developing at this location would increase the likelihood of flooding by removing the natural flood protection the allotments provide.</p> <p>Where development takes place local authority funding must be directed to improving local services and infrastructure.</p>	<p>It should be noted that whilst the allotments are protected under Local Development Plan Policy EP11: Protection of Greenspace, there is still the potential for the allotments to be relocated in line with this policy. However, this would be something that would be dealt with as part of any detailed planning application for the site. That policy states that that decision would require to be made based on consultation with user groups and advice from relevant agencies. In respect to that policy, it should be noted that it is in line with Scottish Planning Policy.</p> <p>In respect to comments regarding the detailed design of the site, it should be noted that the exact details of the proposed development of the site have not yet been determined; however it will be subject to a detailed planning application. Nevertheless it is acknowledged that the site is located within the Peebles Conservation Area and as a result of that a site requirement has been included within the SG on Housing to reflect that. That requirement notes that the retention of some</p>	It is recommended that March Street Mill (MPEEB007) is included within the Finalised SG on Housing.

					<p>buildings will be required. In addition the requirement states: <i>“The overall scale and height of any new build will require to respect the Conservation Area. Where any buildings are to be removed, as far as possible their materials should be reused within the site”</i>.</p> <p>In relation to comments regarding protected species, the site requirements set out in the SG on Housing state that an assessment of ecology impacts and provision of mitigation as appropriate will be required; and a further requirement is also included in respect to surface water flooding. In that respect it should be noted that SEPA have been consulted and have not objected to the principle of development of the site.</p> <p>In relation to comments regarding local services and infrastructure; it should be noted that Development Plan Policy IS2 Developer Contributions would apply. That policy requires developers to make full or partial contribution towards the cost of addressing deficiencies in infrastructure and services which would include contributions towards the primary and secondary school. In addition, a requirement for a Transport Assessment is included. It is therefore considered that the issues raised by the contributor are addressed in the site requirements for the site.</p> <p>Based on the above, it is therefore considered that the objection is not accepted.</p>	
Peebles	March Street Mill (MPEEB007)	Rachel & Gary Smith, Mr & Mrs B Crooks, James McKenzie, J Maben, Matthew & Angela	Object	The contributors state that they object to developing on the allotment site but are not opposed to developing on the pre-existing buildings. However, developing the old mill site should be done in a way that is sensitive to the surrounding environment, and should not exceed the existing building heights. The contributors	It should be noted that whilst the allotments are protected under Local Development Plan Policy EP11: Protection of Greenspace, there is still the potential for the allotments to be relocated in line with this policy. However, this would be something that would be dealt with as part of any detailed planning application for the site. That policy states that	It is recommended that March Street Mill (MPEEB007) is included within the Finalised SG on Housing.

		<p>MacDonald, Caitland O'Donnell &amp; David Paton, Rachel Clarke, Brian Hill</p>		<p>state that they see the need for development but they also see the need to protect historic, social, green, open spaces such as the allotment. They also state that developing on the allotments is against Scottish Government Planning Policy, in addition the site is used by protected species for foraging, and developing at this location would increase the likelihood of flooding by removing the natural flood protection the allotments provide.</p> <p>Where development takes place local authority funding must be directed to improving local services and infrastructure.</p>	<p>that decision would require to be made based on consultation with user groups and advice from relevant agencies. In respect to that policy, it should be noted that it is in line with Scottish Planning Policy.</p> <p>In respect to comments regarding the detailed design of the site, it should be noted that the exact details of the proposed development of the site have not yet been determined; however it will be subject to a detailed planning application. Nevertheless it is acknowledged that the site is located within the Peebles Conservation Area and as a result of that a site requirement has been included within the SG on Housing to reflect that. That requirement notes that the retention of some buildings will be required. In addition the requirement states: <i>"The overall scale and height of any new build will require to respect the Conservation Area. Where any buildings are to be removed, as far as possible their materials should be reused within the site"</i>.</p> <p>In relation to comments regarding protected species, the site requirements set out in the SG on Housing state that an assessment of ecology impacts and provision of mitigation as appropriate will be required; and a further requirement is also included in respect to surface water flooding. In that respect it should be noted that SEPA have been consulted and have not objected to the principle of development of the site.</p> <p>In relation to comments regarding local services and infrastructure; it should be noted that Development Plan Policy IS2 Developer Contributions would apply. That policy requires developers to make full or partial contribution towards the cost of addressing deficiencies in infrastructure and services</p>	
--	--	---	--	--	--	--

					which would include contributions towards the primary and secondary school. In addition, a requirement for a Transport Assessment is included. It is therefore considered that the issues raised by the contributor are addressed in the site requirements for the site. Based on the above, it is therefore considered that the objection is not accepted.	
Peebles	March Street Mill (MPEEB007)	Smith & Garratt on behalf of Millar Partnership and David Wilson Homes	Object to the inclusion of MPEEB007 within the Housing SG, stating that it is covered by existing development policies	<p>The contributor states that the site is covered by existing development policies, therefore including the site within the SG does not increase the availability and choice of available sites.</p> <p>Objects to the inclusion of the site on the grounds that it is capable of being developed in accordance with existing planning policies and the inclusion within the Housing SG would not help the Council in meeting the requirements of the SG.</p>	<p>Appendix 2, as contained within the LDP, provides a windfall assumption, which is included within the overall potential contribution towards the housing requirement (up to 2025).</p> <p>The Scottish Borders is rural in character and a large proportion of the windfall assumption is provided for by housing in the countryside approvals.</p> <p>The LDP provides development opportunities within settlement boundaries, through housing, re-development and mixed use allocations. Therefore, the SG will continue to identify and provide development opportunities within settlement boundaries, as per the LDP, including brownfield opportunities.</p>	It is recommended that March Street Mill (MPEEB007) is included within the Finalised SG on Housing.
West Linton	Land to East of The Loan (AWEST016)	Clarendon Planning and Development on behalf of The Lintonbank Country Estate	Object	<p>The contributor objects to the non-inclusion of site AWEST016 within the Draft SG. They state the SG fails to allocate sufficient housing sites within the Northern Housing Market Area. The site is deliverable in the short term. The site can be accessed through the neighbouring site – AWEST018 which is promoted separately via a new roundabout on the A702, the submission states that the costs of this would be borne by the developer. Pedestrian and cycle access can be</p>	<p>It should be noted that the Reporter who recommended that the Council produce a SG on Housing, did not specify where the extra housing should be located. It is also considered that at this time West Linton has sufficient housing land already allocated. A stage 1 assessment was undertaken for the site, and that assessment concluded that <i>“The site submitted is in the region of 8.5 ha, and seems to require access through the neighbouring land also submitted AWEST018 (13ha) which collectively could potentially</i></p>	It is recommended that Land to East of The Loan (AWEST016) is not included within the Finalised SG on Housing.



				<p>provided via The Loan. Suitable landscape design can mitigate any development impact including retention of significant existing tree belts and enhancement via new planting. Existing sites do not provide sufficient short term provision to meet demand, given West Linton is the most marketable location for new housing within the Borders. The contributor has also set out an assessment of their site in line with the Council's stage 1 assessment criteria. In addition, West Linton is a marketable location, existing allocated sites within the settlement only provide a short term provision whilst Lintonbank is capable of providing both short and longer term provision. The proposed site will not negatively impact on the wider Special Landscape Area.</p>	<p><i>increase the settlement by at least one third. The site has been submitted with the potential for 100 units. However, it is known that there are issues in relation to the Private Road – The Loan. In addition, the majority of site is constrained within the D&amp;LC Study. West Linton currently has a number of allocated housing sites within the Plan and at this time it is not considered appropriate to bring forward additional land.</i></p> <p>Furthermore, it is noted that the exclusion of the adjacent site AWEST018 has not been objected to, and this site relies on it for vehicular access.</p> <p>Based on the above, this objection is rejected.</p>	
West Linton	South of Robinsland Farm (AWEST017)	Springfield Properties PLC	Object	<p>The contributor states that they are actively involved in developing the Robinsland allocation and to date have delivered a number of private and affordable housing through Eildon Housing Association. Based on this success of delivery and the needs of the village the contributor states that Eildon Housing Association are keen to develop further homes, therefore this site would facilitate this. It is noted that the contributor has submitted a Landscape and Visual Appraisal in support of their submission, and has undertaken a stage 1 site assessment and has included it as part of their submission. The contributor notes the summary of the assessment undertaken by the Council and state that the two allocated sites within the settlement are under construction or will</p>	<p>As stated within the site assessment summary the site is <i>“considerably constrained particularly in relation to Roads Access as well as Landscape”</i>. Furthermore as also noted, numerous sites at this location have been considered previously through the Local Plan and Local Development Plan process including at the recent LDP Examination prior to the adoption of the current LDP. In addition the assessment summary notes that even for a reduced site roads access through to Station Road would still be required, and it is noted that the applicant have stated that the required land for access is outwith their control. It is further noted that the required land has not been submitted for consideration through the Housing SG process.</p> <p>In respect to the three allocated housing sites set out in the LDP, two have commenced; and the third does not have planning permission</p>	<p>It is recommended that South of Robinsland Farm (AWEST017) is not included within the Finalised SG on Housing.</p>

				<p>soon be. Whilst the full extent of a new road link is not within the control of the contributor, there is still the potential for additional development to be accessed directly from the site currently under construction. This future connection is also shown within the Planning Brief produced for the Robinsland site. In addition, there are multiple access points that exist including Deanfoot Road and Broomlee Crescent, these can be used to provide connectivity into the heart of the village until such time as a link road may be required. Through a masterplan led approach there is an opportunity to create a new logical defensible boundary for West Linton. Without sight of the full RAG assessment it is unclear how the site failed to progress through to stage 2.</p>	<p>as yet.</p> <p>The contributor makes reference to the approved Planning Brief for Robinsland, in that respect it is noted that the Planning Brief has been produced for the existing allocated Robinsland site only. The shown link referred to by the contributor in their submission was shown to ensure that the site was designed in a way that would allow for connectivity in future if required. Internal consultation with Roads Planning colleagues has confirmed that they would only support additional development if there was full connectivity with Station Road as well as improvements along the main street.</p> <p>The Council commissioned a Development and Landscape Capacity Study in association with Scottish Natural Heritage which concluded that the majority of the site submitted is constrained in Landscape terms. Based on the above, this objection is rejected.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

## General Comments

- Coal Authority (Contaminated Land): Page 1
- Sports Scotland (Provision of Outdoor Sports Facilities): Page 2
- Historic Environment Scotland (Historic Environment): Page 3
- Scottish Government (Flood Risk & Transport): Page 3
- East Lothian Council (General): Page 4
- SEPA (Flood Risk): Page 4
- Various Contributors (Distribution of Housing within the Scottish Borders): Page 5
- Felsham Planning & Development (Housing Market Areas & Housing Land Supply): Page 6
- Turley (Policy HD4 Presumption in Favour of Sustainability): Page 9
- Various Contributors (Over-weighting of Housing Allocation to the Lowood site): Page 9
- Save Scott's Countryside (Distribution of Housing Sites within Proximity to Abbotsford House and Scott's Managed Landscape): Page 10

SETTLEMENT/ SITE NAME OR CODE/TOPIC	CONTRIBUTOR	COMMENT TYPE	SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATION	PROPOSED RESPONSE	RECOMMENDATION
Contaminated Land (General)	The Coal Authority	Note	<p>The Coal Authority is pleased to see that adopted LDP Policy IS13: Contaminated Land, although not explicit in the title, also relates to unstable land. Para 1.6 of this document clearly states that the policy covers unstable land arising from mining activities which affects part of the Borders.</p> <p>The Draft Housing SG identifies sites which have been subject to Stage 1 RAG and Stage 2 assessments. It is noted that as part of the considerations 'Site Requirements' have been identified and in some cases these include notification of contamination issues which require further investigation and mitigation. It is not clear if this identification of 'contamination' on relevant sites includes consideration of unstable land.</p> <p>The Coal Authority would expect all potential sites to have been assessed against the most up to date coal mining data in order to ensure that any sites which may contain mine entries or other coal related hazards that require remediation or stabilisation prior to development are identified.</p> <p>However, they emphasise that former mining activities and related hazards are certainly not a strict constraint on development; indeed it would be far preferable for appropriate development to take place in order to remove these public liabilities on the general tax payer. The Coal</p>	<p>Comments are noted.</p> <p>All preferred and alternative sites contained within the Draft Housing SG, were subject to a Stage 2 site assessment. This included a desktop spatial constraint check for minerals and coal, using the up to date shapefile layer.</p> <p>It should be noted that no preferred or alternative Housing SG sites sit within the Coal Authority's Coal Mining Reporting Area which identifies former mine entries and coal related hazards.</p>	N/A

			Authority would therefore not wish to suggest that any potential sites should be excluded from the assessment on the grounds of former mining legacy issues.		
Provision of Outdoor Sports Facilities (General)	Sports Scotland	Note	<p>Should a planning application be submitted on a site which Sports Scotland are a statutory consultee, we would base our response against the provisions of Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) paragraph 226. This which states that outdoor sports facilities should be safeguarded from development except where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed development is ancillary to the principal use of the site as an outdoor sports facility;</li> <li>• The proposed development involves only a minor part of the outdoor sports facility and would not affect its use and potential for sport and training;</li> <li>• The outdoor sports facility which would be lost would be replaced either by a new facility or comparable or greater benefit for sport in a location for users, or by the upgrading of an existing outdoor sports facility to provide a facility of better quality on the same site or at another location that is convenient for users and maintains or improves the overall playing capacity in the area, or</li> <li>• The relevant strategy and consultation with Sportscotland show that there is a clear excess of provision to meet current and anticipated demand in the area, and that the site would be</li> </ul>	Comments are noted.	N/A

			developed without detriment to the overall quality of provision.		
Historic Environment	Historic Environment Scotland	Note	<p>HES have looked at all the sites, concentrating on scheduled monuments and their setting, listed buildings, the setting of A listed buildings, gardens and designed landscapes and battlefields appearing in their respective Inventories, and Conservation Areas.</p> <p>Many of the proposed development sites have the potential for direct or indirect impacts on heritage assets. However, we consider that in all these cases, robust application of national and appropriate local policies should be able to mitigate adverse impacts, and do not have any specific comments to offer. For those sites which are carried forward to the adopted Housing SG, early engagement with HES on development proposals which raise complex or significant issues will be key to avoiding adverse impacts and optimising positive outcomes for the historic environment.</p>	Comments are noted.	N/A
Flood Risk & Transport	Scottish Government	Note	<p><b>Planning &amp; Architecture Division</b> Highlight the Scottish Government position set out in SPP paragraph 255 that the planning system should promote flood avoidance, by locating development away from functional flood plains and medium to high risk areas. They note sites are included in the guidance which have previously received objections from SEPA through the development plan preparation process on the grounds of flood risk.</p> <p>Medium to high risk areas (where there is an annual probability of coastal or watercourse flooding is greater than 0.5% (1:200 years))</p>	<p><b>Planning &amp; Architecture Division</b> 3 no. sites were included as “alternative” options Huddersfield Street (AGALA033), Philiphaugh Mill (ASELK040) and Philiphaugh Mill 2 (ASELK041) although it was acknowledged that there were SEPA objections regarding them. They were included as it was considered further discussions with SEPA may resolve their concerns. However, this has not happened. Consequently these sites have been removed and there are no sites proposed within the SG which SEPA have objected to. However, it must be stated that the Senior Manager in charge of the multi million pound flood protection scheme for Selkirk strongly disagrees with SEPA’s stance. This matter will be subject to further discussion between the parties in due course and will</p>	It is recommended that these three sites, Huddersfield Street (AGALA033), Philiphaugh Mill (ASELK040) & Philiphaugh Mill 2 (ASELK041) are not included within the Finalised SG on Housing.

			<p>may be suitable for residential development within built up areas, provided flood protection measures to the appropriate standard already exist and are maintained, are under construction, or are a planned measures in a flood risk management plan.</p> <p><b>Transport Scotland</b> As a result of the positive collaboration between the Council and Transport Scotland in the preparation of the Supplementary Guidance, we have no comments to make. We look forward to working with the Council in the future, particularly on the appraisal of the Tweedbank site Lowood, (MTWEE002), which we could welcome involvement.</p>	<p>give reference to SEPA's recent consultation paper on Development Behind Flood Defences. As long as SEPA continue to object to sites on the grounds of flood risk the Council will not allocate these sites in the Plan.</p> <p><b>Transport Scotland</b> Comments noted.</p>	
General	East Lothian Council	Note	The amber and green sites in Table 6 page 19 total 54 but the stage 2 assessment, paragraph 5.13 refers to 53 amber and green sites.	Comments are noted.	The Finalised SG on Housing will be updated accordingly, to reflect the total number of sites assessed.
Flood Risk – 'Section 7: Consideration for all Sites '	SEPA	Note	<p>SEPA request an addition to Section 7 of the Housing SG: Considerations for all sites, of an additional paragraph (7.7), related to the protection and enhancement of the water environment.</p> <p>The development should help contribute to the objectives of the Water Framework Directive (WFD) and your associated duties as a responsible authority under the Water Environment and Water Services (Scotland) Act 2003 to ensure compliance with the WFD and River Basin Planning process in carrying out your statutory functions. Development should not add any further morphological pressures to the water bodies</p>	<p>The comments from SEPA have been taken on board and the finalised Housing SG will include an additional paragraph in section 4 (4.7), in respect of flooding. The following wording to be inserted;</p> <p>'In respect of the protection and enhancement of the water environment, proposals must be assessed against Policy IS8: Flooding, as contained within the LDP. The policy aims to discourage development from taking place in areas which are, or may become, subject to flood risk. Development should ensure it helps contribute to the objectives of the Water Framework Directive (WFD) and the associated duties of the Local Authority under the Water Environment and Water Services (Scotland) Act 2003 to ensure compliance with the WFD and River Basin Planning process in carrying</p>	The Finalised SG on Housing will be updated accordingly to include the additional paragraph 4.7.

			or result in any deterioration in status. Any opportunities to improve modified habitat should also be harnessed.	out statutory functions. Development should not add any further morphological pressures to the water bodies or result in any deterioration in status. Any opportunities to improve modified habitat should also be harnessed’.	
Distribution of Housing within the Scottish Borders (General Approach)	<p>1. Holder Planning, on behalf of Edward Maitland-Carew;</p> <p>2. Clarendon Planning &amp; Development Ltd, on behalf of The Lintonbank Country Estate;</p> <p>3. Springfield Properties PLC</p>	Object	<p><b>Edward Maitland - Carew</b></p> <p>The contributor notes the approach undertaken by the Council in terms of the distribution of housing sites throughout the Scottish Borders in line with the population projections. However, they state that whilst they understand the theory underpinning this approach, they consider it an overly simplistic approach which fails to take account of the marketability of the respective Housing Market Areas and likely demand within individual settlements.</p> <p>The contributor questions the appropriateness of directing significant housing allocations to settlements within the Berwickshire HMA (e.g. Coldstream), which are less attractive to developers and, as such, less likely to come forward within reasonable timescales to assist in meeting the housing shortfall/maintaining a 5 year effective housing land supply. Rather settlements in the Northern HMA where there is a proven track record of delivery such as in Lauder should be identified for further development.</p> <p>It is considered appropriate to reconsider the SG’s strategy for distributing the housing requirement, with a greater focus placed on settlements such as Lauder that will generate stronger developer interest and maximise the prospect of housing delivery within the necessary timescales.</p>	<p>The Draft Housing SG seeks to identify an additional 916 housing units, to meet the identified shortfall. It was considered that in order to distribute the shortfall of housing, broadly within the SDA’s and surrounding area, the population projections for each SDA and surrounding areas were assessed. However, it should be noted that the LDP does not specify a distribution for the additional 916 units within SDA’s or HMA’s.</p> <p>Policy HD4, as contained within the LDP, states that <i>‘The longer term housing and mixed use sites identified in the plan will be considered first, but that will not preclude looking beyond those in the event that the shortfall cannot be met from those sites’</i>. The preferred site referred to within Coldstream forms part of an identified longer term site within the LDP, which was considered acceptable for housing.</p> <p>It should be noted that no other appropriate sites were identified through the assessment process within the Northern HMA, which could have been taken forward within the Draft SG.</p> <p>As noted within the Draft SG, there are a number of infrastructure constraints within the Northern HMA, which limits the availability of effective land for housing, therefore no alternative options were presented within the Northern HMA. This is an issue which will need to be looked at and assessed as part of the next LDP. It should be noted that in relation specifically to West Linton, there are a number of allocated housing sites within the LDP. At this time, it is not considered appropriate to bring forward additional land within West Linton.</p>	N/A



			<p><b>The Lintonbank Country Estate</b> The SG notes that the housing shortfall has been distributed in accordance with the population projections for each SDA and indicates that 20% of the units i.e. 183 units should be provided within the Northern HMA however, the sites identified within the SG identifies only 135 units. It is therefore considered that there is still a shortfall within the Northern HMA and that additional sites should be allocated within this area. Specifically West Linton has a strong housing market and associated housing demand.</p> <p><b>Springfield Properties PLC</b> The contributor notes that the SG only identifies three preferred sites within the Northern HMA and no alternative sites. Whilst they state it is not their intention to critically assess the sites in detail, they point out that all three sites have many challenges, should any of these sites not deliver in providing homes, there is no fall-back position. The contributor also states that there is a lack of alternative sites and that this issue will be considered during the next LDP. However, the contributor states that this issue should be considered during the SG process and not through the LDP.</p>		
Housing Market Areas & Housing Land Supply (General Approach)	Felsham Planning & Development, on behalf of Rural Renaissance Ltd	Object	<p><b>Housing Market Areas</b> Agree that the Central Area is a key focus for growth, however it is wrong to imply that all towns within it are equally capable of growth. There are quite distinct and localised markets within the LDP, and demand in towns such as Jedburgh and Hawick is markedly weaker than in the</p>	<p><b>Housing Market Areas</b> The comments are noted. The Council cannot review the housing market areas through the preparation of the Housing SG. The SG is merely concerned with identifying additional sites to meet the housing land shortfall identified within the LDP.</p> <p>It was considered that in order to distribute the</p>	N/A

			<p>stronger settlements such as Melrose.</p> <p>Consider the Central Borders Housing Market Area is too large and needs to be reconsidered. There is a need to breakdown the Central Borders HMA to give an accurate analysis of the likely demand arising in each of the main towns, rather than assuming that demand arising from in Central Borders HMA will be met anywhere across the HMA. The location of the sites in the SPG to meet the Reporter’s requirement needs to be related to this analysis. The Council has already, in the LDP, allocated more land in weak market areas than the market can sustain. Housing targets need to be based on housing market areas and reflect actual demand and activity not the perception of the planners of what they wish to see. Functional housing markets need to be realistic both in terms of their definition and the locations within the housing market areas where development is directed.</p> <p><b>Adequacy of Housing Land Supply</b> The Reporter’s requirement must be met, but the Council is not constrained to identify sites for 916 units and no more. The Council could identify more sites to allow for flexibility. Their clients believe that the housing land supply has been understated and have previously advocated that the preferred strategy should be to plan for economic recovery but with a flexibility allowance of a further 30%, this means that further consideration needs to be given to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall housing land supply targets;</li> <li>• Appropriate location for</li> </ul>	<p>shortfall of housing, broadly within the SDA’s and surrounding area, the population projections for each SDA and surrounding areas were assessed. However, it should be noted that the LDP does not specify a distribution for the additional 916 units within the SDA’s or HMA’s.</p> <p><b>Adequacy of Housing Land Supply</b> Comments are noted.</p> <p>Generosity was subject to the Reporter’s Examination (Issue 80). The Reporter concluded that it was not appropriate to recommend that a further allowance for generosity be added to the housing land requirement. Therefore, the Reporter recommended that the preparation of a Housing SG be prepared to identify an additional 916 units, to meet the housing shortfall.</p> <p>It is noted that there are sites contained within the HLA which have been included for a number of years. The Council cannot remove allocated sites from the LDP as part of the Housing SG process. However, there will be a review undertaken for existing allocations, as part of LDP2.</p> <p>The comments in relation to the HLA methodology are noted.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

			<p>development;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Criteria for selecting and assessing alternative sites to ensure a mechanism to allow additional land to come forward without requiring a review of the CDP;</li> <li>• Need to support and expand the rural economy and to ensure that housing policy identifies land supply in all the countryside, beyond agricultural need.</li> </ul> <p>The latest Housing Land Audit contains a substantial number of sites which have been in the audit since 2006 (i.e) 2 cycles of the Development Plan and remain undeveloped. Where such sites are identified as effective there must be doubts whether they will come forward. The Council needs to interrogate these sites carefully to justify their continued inclusion. In addition, there are an equally large number of sites recorded as 'developer' with no house builder attached. Whilst such sites are identified as effective there must be doubts whether they will come forward. The Council needs to interrogate these sites carefully to justify their continued inclusion.</p> <p>Sites should not remain in the audit for more than 5 years without clear signs of activity. This requires a rolling review with sites being regularly removed if there is no evidence of delivery being likely within a reasonable period of time. This will result in a larger number of sites being removed from the audit than has been the case and supports the submissions they have made for a 30% flexibility allowance in the</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>development to allow for the proper choice and to ensure, as far as possible, that there is development plan support for the majority of the housing land supply.</p> <p>Therefore, it is important that the Housing Land Strategy has a clear recognition of the sites that are effective and the location of those sites so that the basis for determining allocation of the housing land supply starts from a realistic understanding of what sites are available and where they are located.</p> <p>Our client supports the adoption of a common set of measures to address the obvious housing land supply shortfall but believes that the Council should go further than is required by the Reporter and ensure that sufficient sites are allocated to actually deliver the 916 unit shortfall. This requires recognition that not all sites will come forward, which justifies an over allocation to allow for this shortfall. It also requires a rigorous review of the Housing Land Audit and identifying the majority of the new sites in areas where there is proven demand.</p>		
Policy HD4/ Presumption in favour of sustainability (General Approach)	Turley on behalf of Amber Real Estate Investments Ltd	Object	The contributor states that given the accepted shortfall in effective housing land supply, SPP's presumption in favour of sustainable development which contributes to meeting an effective five year housing land supply, is a significant material consideration in the consideration of planning applications.	<p>It is not considered that the proposed site should be assessed against Policy PMD4, for the purposes of the Housing SG.</p> <p>Policy HD4 sets out the requirement for the Housing SG, to address the housing shortfall for the LDP period. Therefore, there is a mechanism in place, to identify the required housing shortfall for the plan period.</p>	N/A
Over-weighting of housing allocation to the site at Lowood, Tweedbank	Edwin Thompson on behalf of several land owners;	Object	The site at Lowood, Tweedbank covers approximately 32% of the SG allocation for the entire region. The SG would appear to give an over-weighting of allocations to the site at Lowood, Tweedbank.	The Scottish Government document entitled 'Borders Railway – Maximising the Impact: A Blueprint to the Future' identifies the opportunities the railway corridor offers in terms of being a catalyst for new housing developments, businesses or visitor destinations. It	N/A

	<p>1.RH &amp; DH Hall</p> <p>2.Miles Browne</p> <p>3.G W Thomson and Sons</p>			<p>supports the potential of the line in triggering significant economic benefits. The SG on Housing will become part of the statutory Development Plan and it is therefore a key document to ensure implementation of the Blueprint. Lowood is within a highly accessible and sustainable location given its location on land immediately to the north of the Tweedbank Railway terminus. The site is within the Central Borders Housing Market Area which has a proven record of housing market developer interest and consumer demand. The parkland and woodland setting and its proximity to the scenic River Tweed make the site a highly attractive development opportunity. Whilst it is acknowledged there are some site constraints to be addressed and overcome, none of these are identified as being insurmountable, and work on a masterplan has already commenced which increases the effectiveness, promotion and delivery of the site. This will investigate in close detail the constraints to be mitigated. It is contended that Lowood is a prime site with an extremely attractive setting for market interest and should be included within the SG.</p>	
<p>Distribution of housing sites within proximity to Abbotsford House and Scott's Managed Landscape</p>	<p>Save Scott's Countryside</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Note concerns that 50% of the preferred sites within the Housing SG are within five miles of Abbotsford House and Scott's Managed Landscape; and nearly 40% are no more than 2 miles distant.</p>	<p>The distribution of the housing sites for the SG took on board where market demand is greater and this included the Central Borders. It is considered justification that a substantial number of units can be allocated in this area and it is not considered these allocations will have a detrimental impact on Abbotsford House or Scott's Managed Landscape.</p>	<p>N/A</p>

## **Internal Consultation Responses**

- Roads Planning Officer

SETTLEMENT	SITE NAME & SITE CODE	CONTRIBUTOR	COMMENT TYPE	SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATION	PROPOSED RESPONSE	RECOMMENDATION
Galashiels	Former Castle Warehouse Site (AGALA037)	Roads Planning Officer	Note	Replace the existing site requirement, requesting a Transport Assessment with the requirement for a Transport Statement.	<p>Comments are noted.</p> <p>If the site (AGALA037) is taken forward for inclusion in the finalised Housing SG, amend the existing site requirement to read;</p> <p><i>'A Transport Statement will be required to address sustainable travel and street connectivity'.</i></p>	<p>It is recommended that Former Castle Warehouse Site (AGALA037) is included within the Finalised SG on Housing.</p> <p>It is recommended that site requirement (bullet point 7) be amended to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Transport Statement will be required to address sustainable travel and street connectivity</li> </ul>
Newstead	Newstead North (ANEWS006)	Roads Planning Officer	Note	Replace the existing site requirement, requesting a Transport Assessment with the requirement for a Transport Statement.	<p>Comments are noted.</p> <p>If the site (ANEWS006) is taken forward for inclusion in the finalised Housing SG, amend the existing site requirement to read;</p> <p><i>'A Transport Statement will be required'.</i></p> <p>However, it should be noted that the site is not proposed for inclusion within the Finalised Housing SG.</p>	<p>It is recommended that Newstead North (ANEWS006) is not included within the Finalised SG on Housing.</p>