

APPENDIX 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD AND PROPOSED RESPONSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

CONTRIBUTOR	COMMENT TYPE	SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATION	PROPOSED RESPONSE	RECOMMENDATION
Transport Scotland	Comments	In relation to the SPZ and the transport implications of any future development, we consider the Transport Statement accompanying the SPZ should include reference to the assessment of the trunk road network, specifically the A9061(T)/B6360/Tweedbank Drive roundabout as well as the local road junctions mentioned on page 64. For any SPZ considered adjacent to or near a trunk road junction, we require to understand the potential transport implications of the development sites that would be permitted under the SPZ. This can either been undertaken cumulatively or individually as developments come forward.	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The document will be updated to include reference to the assessment of the trunk network, specifically the A9061(T)/B6360/Tweedbank Drive roundabout as well as the local road junctions mentioned on page 64.</p> <p>Transport Scotland require to be made aware of any development that would have potential transport implications for any development adjacent or near a trunk road junction. The Council would ensure that Transport Scotland is informed of development which is permitted under the SPZ on a rolling basis.</p>	It is recommended that the SPZ is updated to include these requirements and that Transport Scotland is routinely notified of development permitted under the SPZ.
Scottish Environment Protection Agency	Comments	<p><u>(1) SEPA's regulatory regimes:</u></p> <p>If any development within this zone was likely to be any type of process/activity that would require an authorisation from SEPA</p>	<p><u>(1) SEPA's regulatory regimes:</u> The requirement for authorisation from SEPA is a separate process not linked to the planning application process. There is therefore no requirement</p>	(1) No changes proposed.

APPENDIX 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD AND PROPOSED RESPONSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

		<p>(e.g. class 5 -General industry activities) then we would need an opportunity to find out about this and comment accordingly to ensure that a regulatory remit is followed. It is unclear how this could be accommodated under a simplified planning zone scheme as the number of proposed uses under the use classes outlined in this SPG are wide ranging. We note there is reference to the need for applicants to contact SEPA if they plan to do anything that would require our permission, however there is no guarantee that this would happen.</p> <p>SEPA's issue with the simplified planning approach would be for something that would clearly be unconsentable under one of SEPA's regulatory regimes to get planning permission. SEPA would not want these types of developments to be agreed by planning through</p>	<p>for the Council to notify SEPA of such proposals. It is made clear within the SPZ that the applicant must consult SEPA concerning proposed development and it is recommended that this is undertaken at an early stage.</p>	
--	--	---	--	--

APPENDIX 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD AND PROPOSED RESPONSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

		<p>this process only for there to be problems in addressing the relevant regulatory regimes. It should be noted that it would be the applicant's commercial risk if this outcome were to happen.</p> <p>SEPA recommends that further consideration needs to be given to how this potential scenario is prevented.</p> <p><u>(2) Flood Risk:</u> Latest SEPA Flood Maps indicate that zEL39 and MTWEE001 are located within the 1:200 year surface water flood map. The risk identified at these sites is from surface water flooding only. Review of the Draft Supplementary guidance, SPZ Conditions, states that surface water flood risk must be assessed before any development takes place. We agree with this and also recommend that contact is made with the Flood Prevention Officers within</p>	<p><u>(2) Flood Risk:</u> The Council's Flood Protection Officer would be consulted on any pre-development notification for development within Zones D and E in line with the requirements of Condition no 15 which requires that surface water flood risk is assessed and precise details of surface water disposal have been submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority.</p>	<p>(2) No changes proposed.</p>
--	--	---	---	---------------------------------

APPENDIX 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD AND PROPOSED RESPONSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

		<p>Scottish Borders Council to glean any information/local knowledge that they may possess.</p> <p>The Draft Supplementary Guidance notes that “Any issues relating to surface water flooding would require to be considered and addressed”. Hence, we are satisfied with the requirements included within this guidance.</p> <p><u>(3) Site drainage:</u> If the development sites are likely to be office/retail type units then we would require appropriate levels of SUDs for surface water and connection to the public foul sewer for the foul drainage. This would depend on the proposed use type. Provided that this would be the case we are satisfied that they could be covered by a simplified planning zone scheme.</p> <p><u>(4) Sustainable waste management:</u> Scottish Planning Policy</p>	<p><u>(3) Site drainage:</u> Comments noted. Condition no 16 of the SPZ requires that surface water disposal is in accordance with Sustainable Urban Drainage principles.</p> <p><u>(4) Sustainable waste management:</u> Comments agreed. It is considered that</p>	<p>(3)No changes proposed.</p> <p>(4)It is recommended that condition no 4 detailed on page 42 shall be amended to</p>
--	--	---	--	--

APPENDIX 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD AND PROPOSED RESPONSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

		<p>Paragraph 190 states that “All new development including residential, commercial and industrial properties should include provision for waste separation and collection to meet the requirements of the Waste (Scotland) Regulations.” In accordance with this policy, the relevant Local Development Plan and the Scottish Government Planning and Waste Management Advice, space should be designated within the planning application site layout to allow for the separation and collection of waste, consistent with the type of development proposed. This includes provision to separate and store different types of waste, kerbside collection and centralised facilities for the public to deposit waste for recycling or recovery ("bring systems"). It is recommended that the Council's waste management team is</p>	<p>condition no 4 on page 42 of the SPZ should be amended to read: <i>‘All new development must include provision for waste separation and collection to meet the requirements of the Waste (Scotland) Regulations. Site Waste Management Plans shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before development is commenced and shall be implemented in full and in the approved manner’.</i></p>	<p>read: <i>‘All new development must include provision for waste separation and collection to meet the requirements of the Waste (Scotland) Regulations. Site Waste Management Plans shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before development is commenced and shall be implemented in full and in the approved manner’.</i></p>
--	--	---	--	--

APPENDIX 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD AND PROPOSED RESPONSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

		<p>consulted to determine what space requirements are required within the application site layout. Scottish Planning Policy (Paragraph 192) states that planning authorities should consider requiring the preparation of sites management plans for construction sites. In the interests of seeking best practice and meeting the requirements of Scottish Planning Policy, we recommend that a site waste management plan (SWMP) is submitted, showing which waste materials are going to be generated and how they are going to be treated and disposed.</p> <p><u>(5) Energy Statement:</u> We support the intention to introduce a district heating system (as stated in page 19 of the SG).</p> <p>The development must enable connection to a heat network or heat producer, unless it can be</p>	<p><u>(5) Energy Statement:</u> Support noted. The matters referred to would require to be addressed via the Building Standards procedures. This has been added to bullet point no 3 of the 'Sustainability' section of Appendix 1 (Design and Landscape Framework) on</p>	<p>(5) It is recommended that bullet point no 3 of the 'Sustainability' section of Appendix 1 (Design and Landscape Framework) on page 51 also states the following: <i>'this would be addressed further via the Building Standards process.'</i></p>
--	--	--	--	---

APPENDIX 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD AND PROPOSED RESPONSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

		<p>demonstrated to your authority that this would not be feasible. An Energy Statement informed by a Feasibility Study should be provided for assessment by your authority demonstrating how the proposal will meet the requirements for providing district heating onsite. This should be prepared in line with the <u>Scottish Government's online planning advice Planning and Heat</u> and assess the technical feasibility and financial viability of heat network/district heating for this site, identifying any available existing or proposed sources of heat (within or outwith the site) and other factors such as where land will be safeguarded for future district heating infrastructure.</p> <p>Please note that we will not audit Energy Statements or Feasibility Studies as the responsibility for this lies</p>	<p>page 51, as follows: <i>'this would be addressed further via the Building Standards process.'</i></p>	
--	--	---	--	--

APPENDIX 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD AND PROPOSED RESPONSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

		<p>with your authority.</p> <p>However we expect them to be undertaken to demonstrate full consideration of how the proposed development can contribute towards Scotland’s climate change targets in line with our Public Body Duties under the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 to act “in the way best calculated to help deliver the emissions reduction targets and the statutory Adaptation Programme” and” in a way we consider is most sustainable.”</p> <p>Applicants should provide evidence of how the national heat map and/or relevant local authority heat maps (where available) have been used to maximise potential connections / co-location between heat providers and high heat demand users when considering site selection for developments involving heat/power.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

APPENDIX 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD AND PROPOSED RESPONSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

		<p>Consideration of heat mapping should maximise opportunities for the co-location of ‘high heat demand’ developments with heat supply sources, like energy from waste facilities, to maximise the provision of energy efficient and low carbon heat networks and district heating installations.</p> <p>Heat Maps clearly show where there are areas of heat use and heat generation, and can therefore be used as locational criteria for new heat providers, or for new development sites which could utilise the heat being generated. Heat maps are intended for a number of uses, including in planning new developments, and identifying heat network feasibility. They also identify existing heat providers, particularly those that produce heat as “excess” or “waste” who can connect to heat networks, utilising heat that was previously</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

APPENDIX 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD AND PROPOSED RESPONSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

		<p>“wasted”.</p> <p>A Design and Access statement which demonstrates how the findings of the Energy Statement have been incorporated into the design and layout of the proposed development should be provided. Where new developments are located adjacent to existing heat networks or district heating, the connection should be an integral part of the design to enable connection to take place at time of construction, unless it would not be viable or feasible to do so (the burden of proof is placed on the developer). Ensuring users can be connected to district heating networks is an essential part of delivering the Government’s targets towards renewable and low-carbon heat. There are also significant opportunities within Scotland to make use of heat that is currently waste or excess, in particular</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

APPENDIX 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD AND PROPOSED RESPONSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

		<p>from industrial facilities.</p> <p>Where connections are intended to be made to proposed heat sources in the future, the design of new developments should incorporate space to 'safeguard' the future provision of pipework, energy hubs or other associated heat infrastructure to ensure that the subsequent connection to a proposed district heating network can be undertaken (if not already proposed within the original design) without causing disturbance to buildings or infrastructure. This applies to all new significant/anchor development (i.e. developments with a significant heat load or demand). Consideration should be given to potential barriers or restrictions on making district heating connections, for example when planning new key infrastructure such as bypass roads which may interrupt</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

APPENDIX 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD AND PROPOSED RESPONSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

		<p>the route of district heating pipeworks.</p> <p>Creating links between heat producers and heat users is essential to create heat networks and accords with guidance in SPP. In order to deliver the Scottish Government's targets for 40,000 homes to be heated through heat networks, new developments need to be designed to incorporate district heating. Where substantial new developments are planned, the opportunity arises for providing a heat network within the site and for this to be required and designed in at the earliest stages.</p> <p><u>(6) Contaminated Land:</u> Advice on land contamination issues should be sought from the local authority contaminated land specialists because the local authority is the lead authority on these matters under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection</p>	<p><u>(6) Contaminated Land:</u> The Council's Contaminated Land Officer has been involved in the preparation of the documents. Condition no. 8 requires that any potential</p>	<p>(6) No changes proposed.</p>
--	--	--	---	---------------------------------

APPENDIX 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD AND PROPOSED RESPONSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

		Act 1990 except for matters relating to radioactively contaminated land or special sites.	risk to human health/water contamination is adequately addressed. The Contamination Officer would be consulted on any pre-development notification for development where necessary.	
Historic Environment Scotland	Comment	HES has considered these documents for historic environment interests, and welcome that they recognise the historic environment assets in the vicinity and have made appropriate provision for their protection.	Support noted.	No changes proposed.
Network Rail	Comments	(1) Crucially, the document recognises the potential extension to Carlisle, should the Government decide this is something it wishes to proceed with. The brief recognises the route and makes specific mention to this. Having considered it in greater detail as to the actual logistics of development within the Proposed Simplified Planning Zone I thought it would be helpful for it to advise the SPZ designation does not	(1) Comments noted. It is suggested that a condition be added to the Schedule of conditions requiring that no development impinges upon the line of any future railway extension to highlight that this area is safeguarded in line with Policy IS4 of the Scottish Borders Local Development Plan 2016. SG Plan 2 shows an indicative line of any future railway extension at this location which is considered to be sufficient.	(1) It is recommended that a further condition be added to the Schedule of Conditions requiring that no development impinges upon the line of any future railway extension.

APPENDIX 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD AND PROPOSED RESPONSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

		<p>apply for development on the protected line and it would be helpful if Plan 2 was revised to highlight this visually. Really, all we are seeking to do is to ensure anyone respects this future proofing, given it wouldn't be controlled through a planning application.</p> <p>(2) In terms of the comments and drawing in relation to the possible need to 'reconfigure parking and potential additional parking tier' it is to highlight that Network Rail has no programme or budget for any future work. Therefore, if there was a demand, new funding would be required for this. It would not be provided through any current funding streams and would need to be found from outside sources. As part of the SPG it mentions Developer Contributions. Developer Contributions is a way to fund future infrastructure works and has been clearly set out within</p>	<p>(2) The Council would not seek developer contributions for development within Classes 4, 5 and/or 6. Network Rail would be required to provide additional parking in the future if there was found to be a need.</p>	<p>(2) No changes proposed.</p>
--	--	--	---	---------------------------------

APPENDIX 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD AND PROPOSED RESPONSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

		<p>SESplan to group contributions and also East Lothian Council now has a LDP Developer Contributions Framework, which requires developers to provide funding for future rail projects, based on location and a formula. The Council has the opportunity to seek funding to future proof any possible requirements for the car park at the station.</p> <p>(3)The SPZ appears to have dropped the mention of car/bike hire form the terminal. This is a retrograde step and is a use which should be encouraged in a spatial and tourism context. Likewise we had requested the SPG further on the tourism front to allow flexibility in business and tourism use to see if the area around the present station couldn't be focused for more tourist facilities with café, gallery or other uses which compliment, but clearly aren't a duplication to the tapestry building. It's not</p>	<p>(3) The opportunity for a car/bike hire facility within the vicinity of the railway terminus is referred to within the Transport and Access section of the Draft Supplementary Guidance (page 21). The SPZ does allow for the provision of shop uses (Use Class 1) of a limited floorspace within Zone C which would potentially allow for a car/bike hire facility.</p>	<p>(3)No changes proposed.</p>
--	--	--	---	--------------------------------

APPENDIX 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD AND PROPOSED RESPONSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

		one we have any firm view on but good to see as many business and employment opportunities as possible.		
Scottish Enterprise	Comments	<p><u>Part 1: Draft SPG:</u></p> <p>a. The report does not provide market commentary on CBBP.</p> <p>b. The references to substandard business stock link to legislation introduced in September 2016 requiring owners of non-domestic buildings to assess and improve energy efficiency and reduce greenhouse gas emissions associated with their buildings. The Section 63 regulation applies to the sale or let of buildings which are larger than 1000m². SME's can be assisted through this process by Zero Waste Scotland.</p> <p>c. As a predominantly industrial development adjacent to Lowood</p>	<p>a. Market commentary on the CBBP is not appropriate to Supplementary Guidance/SPZ.</p> <p>b. Comments noted. These matters are procedures outwith the remit of the SG/SPZ.</p> <p>c. It is expected that the Council will produce a Masterplan/Supplemen</p>	<p>a. No changes proposed.</p> <p>b. No changes proposed.</p> <p>c. No changes proposed.</p>

APPENDIX 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD AND PROPOSED RESPONSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

		<p>Estate, an area which may be developed for housing, it would be helpful if further information on the wider development context is available as part of the SPG, providing greater certainty on anticipated locations of specific land uses, infrastructure, pedestrian and vehicular access routes, and identification of an indicative location for the proposed Road Bridge to Lowood. This would enable developers to make a more informed assessment of the development potential of options at CBBP, and proceed with greater certainty, particularly in relation to mixed use proposals which may be supported by adjoining residential development.</p>	<p>tary Guidance relating to the Lowood site in 2018. This would refer to the relationship between the Central Borders Business Park and Lowood itself and include a full public consultation procedure.</p>	
		<p>d. To exploit the economic opportunities offered by</p>	<p>d. Whilst these issues will require to be addressed</p>	<p>d. No changes proposed.</p>

APPENDIX 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD AND PROPOSED RESPONSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

		<p>SBR and Tweedbank Station, recognising the multiplicity of ownerships within the site and to complement the SG and SPZ, CBBP will require investment in site infrastructure, servicing and public realm, potentially supported by an associated land requisition programme. It would be of assistance if the anticipated scope of public investment proposals is identified, together with those elements to be delivered by property owners and developers.</p>	<p>via other procedures, it is not considered appropriate to include this within the SG/SPZ.</p>	
		<p>e. Reference to the 'Gateway' into the business park; is this referring to the shared surface/plaza area, rather than the Gateway feature on SG plan 2?</p>	<p>e. This relates to the gateway feature from the roundabout into Tweedbank Drive which will be the main entrance into the CBBP.</p>	<p>e. No changes proposed.</p>
		<p>f. It would be useful to identify the southern part of the estate road,</p>	<p>f. It would be the Council's aspiration to adopt the southern part</p>	<p>f. No changes proposed.</p>

APPENDIX 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD AND PROPOSED RESPONSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

		<p>to be brought up to adoptable standard.</p> <p>g. Where does the future access link indicated on SG Plan 2 link to?</p> <p>h. A future extension of the railway would impact on access links within and outwith the business park, and may involve evaluation of a wide range of options, including the Mott McDonald scheme.</p> <p><u>Part 2: Draft SPZ Scheme:</u></p> <p>i. SPZ PLAN 1 – SPZ Area differs from SG PLAN 2 – Development vision for the Central Borders Business Park, in that it omits the former tapestry site, which is indicated outwith the SPZ boundary.</p>	<p>of the estate road referred to though it is not considered necessary to illustrate this within the SG/SPZ.</p> <p>g. Potential future development within Lowood Estate.</p> <p>h. Comments noted, these matters will be addressed as circumstances develop.</p> <p>i. SPZ Plan 1 excludes the former tapestry site as this is outwith the site boundaries of the business and industrial allocation at Tweedbank. The site is effectively 'white land' which cannot be incorporated into the SPZ. The site is, however, shown as an opportunity within the SG.</p>	<p>g. No changes proposed.</p> <p>h. No changes proposed.</p> <p>i. No changes proposed.</p>
--	--	---	---	--

APPENDIX 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD AND PROPOSED RESPONSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

		<p>j. STAGE 1 – Zone C; should this include the former Tapestry site?</p> <p>k. Under SPZ Table 2 – Development Parameters, DPG9 Class 10 Non-residential institutions, should a crèche be considered as a permissible use, or is there existing provision within the local area?</p>	<p>j. See above.</p> <p>k. It is accepted that a crèche may be an appropriate ancillary use within the Business Park. However, in permitting Use Class 10 uses there would be the danger that other uses, which would not be appropriate to the function of the overall business park would be permitted. It is therefore considered that Class 10 uses are excluded from the SPZ but there would be an opportunity</p>	<p>j. No changes proposed.</p> <p>k. No changes proposed.</p>
Contaminated Land Officer	Comments	<p>Page 43</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The presented condition appears to contain a typographical error in the opening sentence as underlined here“.....<i>potential contamination on site has been submitted to and <u>environment, property and ecological systems arising from</u></i> 	Comments noted. Condition no. 8 on page 43 amended as required.	It is recommended that condition no 8 is amended in accordance with the suggestion.

APPENDIX 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD AND PROPOSED RESPONSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

		<p><i>any identified land agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and".</i></p> <p>The above additional text appears to have been cut from the 'Reason' section -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reason states <i>"To Ensure that the potential risk to human health, the water contamination have been adequately addressed."</i> It would be recommended revised wording was employed e.g. To ensure that the potential risks to human health, the water environment, property, and, ecological systems arising from any identified land contamination have been adequately addressed." 		
Scottish Natural Heritage	Comments	<p><u>Part I – Draft SG</u></p> <p><u>(1) Site Opportunities and Constraints</u></p> <p>Pages 13 to 15 provide a comprehensive overview of the site's context and how</p>	<p>(1) It is not proposed that the suggested changes are made to the document. The Lowood site requires further work to develop the</p>	<p>(1) No changes proposed.</p>

APPENDIX 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD AND PROPOSED RESPONSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

		<p>the assets on and around the site will influence its development. However, we consider that it would be beneficial to accompany this detailed information with annotated maps and photographs of the site, for example, by showing key viewpoints as described in this section.</p> <p>(2) Welcome the inclusion of the Borders Strategic Green Network and the proposals to improve pedestrian and cycling routes, as set out in the site opportunities. The constraints note that increased demand through redevelopment of the Business Park may lead to further demand at the already over-subscribed parking at the railway terminus. Pedestrian and cycling links would help to mitigate these effects if direct, clearly legible routes are provided. This would also align with the aim to create a sustainable, low carbon place related to the</p>	<p>Masterplan to be put out for public consultation, comments from SNH would be welcomed as part of this process.</p> <p>(2) Support noted.</p>	<p>(2) Support noted.</p>
--	--	---	---	---------------------------

APPENDIX 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD AND PROPOSED RESPONSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

		<p>rail transport opportunities, as discussed elsewhere in the draft supplementary guidance. In general, and acknowledging the favourable density of paths in the area, we advise that a planned network hierarchy of paths that are clearly waymarked, including from local centres and the rail station, should be the objective for the site and its wider environs.</p> <p>(3) The inclusion of the adjacent regionally important Special Landscape Area (SLA) and the nationally important Eildon and Leaderfoot National Scenic Area (NSA) provides a clear direction on likely requirements for assessment of proposals. We suggest that it should be made clear that appropriate design responses will also be required to ensure that the special qualities of these sites are to be unaffected by development at this site. For example while key</p>	<p>(3) Add a further bullet point to 'Other Considerations' on page 21 of the SG to highlight the need for sympathetic design adjacent to the SLA and NSA.</p> <p>It is reaffirmed that the Lowood site requires further work to develop the Masterplan to be put out for public consultation, comments from SNH would be welcomed as part of this process.</p>	<p>(3) It is recommended that a further bullet point is added to 'Other Considerations' on page 21 of the SG.</p>
--	--	---	---	---

APPENDIX 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD AND PROPOSED RESPONSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

		<p>prominent 3 storey buildings could be successfully accommodated adjacent to the NSA, it will be useful to emphasise, the need for appropriate design responses to this important context.</p> <p>(4) In terms of guidance, we advise that along with tree protection, boundary treatment, landscaping and general aspects of building height and design the control and co-ordination of signage and advertising associated with such buildings will be necessary.</p> <p>(5) Furthermore, in relation to all site development we would suggest that the SPZ brief should emphasise control of light pollution in line with Scottish Government guidance.</p>	<p>(4)As stated on page 40 of the SPZ, proposals for signs and advertisements, unless having deemed consent, would require approval under the terms of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (Scotland) Regulations 1984 (as amended) or its replacement.</p> <p>(5)Comments agreed. It is considered that the second bullet point under 'Layout' on page 51 should be amended to include lighting. It is also considered that condition no 13 on page 44 should read: 'External lighting shall be provided in accordance with BS.5489,1977 and in accordance with Scottish</p>	<p>(4) No changes proposed.</p> <p>(5) It is recommended that the second bullet point under 'Layout' on page 51 should be amended to include lighting. It is also recommended that condition no 13 on page 44 should read: 'External lighting shall be provided in accordance with BS.5489,1977 and in accordance with Scottish</p>
--	--	--	---	---

APPENDIX 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD AND PROPOSED RESPONSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

		<p>(6) SNH also advise that the roof materials for new buildings should be of a visually recessive colour in order to reduce landscape and visual impacts from elevated areas within the NSA.</p> <p><u>(7) Development Vision for the Central Borders Business Park:</u> Note that key principle F includes the option of provision of a further tier at the existing Tweedbank rail terminus car parking. This particular solution is likely to have landscape and visual impacts that will require assessment. This principle is also in conflict with key</p>	<p>Government Guidance Note entitled 'Controlling Light Pollution and Reducing Light Energy Consumption' (March 2007)'. (6) Comments noted. The Design Framework will require to be adhered to. It is considered that a further bullet point should be added to the 'Building Design' section on page 52 stating: 'The roof materials for new buildings should be of a visually recessive colour in order to reduce landscape and visual impacts from elevated areas within the National Scenic Area'.</p> <p>(7) This is outwith the remit of the SPZ and would require to be the subject of a planning application.</p>	<p>Government Guidance Note entitled 'Controlling Light Pollution and Reducing Light Energy Consumption' (March 2007)'. (6) It is recommended that a bullet point be added to the 'Building Design' section on page 52 stating: 'The roof materials for new buildings should be of a visually recessive colour in order to reduce landscape and visual impacts from elevated areas within the National Scenic Area'.</p> <p>(7) No changes proposed.</p>
--	--	---	--	---

APPENDIX 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD AND PROPOSED RESPONSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

		<p>principle B which aims to <i>“create a people focused public space ... which is not car focused.”</i></p> <p>(8) SNH welcome key principle H, that a high quality landscape framework is to be maintained. In relation to securing the long term success of the existing landscape framework, we suggest that management intervention, in the form of tree thinning and selective replanting, is likely to be necessary. In this regard an up to date management plan for the site, which clarifies developer or rental contributions, would be of clear benefit.</p> <p>(9) Submission Requirements: In general we agree with the submission requirements for those instances where planning consent will be required. However, we suggest that <i>“ecology assessment”</i> is expanded to require <i>“ecology assessment</i></p>	<p>(8) It is certainly an aspiration to see the landscape framework maintained. It would, however, be inappropriate to charge a developer contribution for existing planting to be maintained which is under varying ownerships.</p> <p>(9) Comments noted. The submission requirements have been amended in line with this suggestion.</p>	<p>(8) No changes proposed.</p> <p>(9) It is recommended that <i>“ecology assessment”</i> on page 24 is expanded with <i>“ecology assessment plus species management plan where necessary.</i></p>
--	--	---	---	--

APPENDIX 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD AND PROPOSED RESPONSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

		<p><i>plus species management plan where necessary". This would provide greater clarity to developers and should contribute towards fewer delays in the planning process.</i></p> <p><u>Part II – Draft SPZ Scheme</u></p> <p><u>Stage 1 – What types of development are permitted?</u></p> <p>(10) Stage 1 (page 34) discusses the need for appropriate screening along the southern boundary of Zone E due to proximity to the adjacent Special Landscape Area. We recommend that similar requirements are set out for Zone B due to the proximity of the eastern part of the site to the Eildon & Leaderfoot Hills National Scenic Area.</p> <p>(11) SNH welcome the inclusion of pathways/cycleways and cycle parking as infrastructure that supports the functioning of the</p>	<p>(10) It is considered that the existing vegetation along the southern boundary of Zone B this boundary is significant without the need for further screening.</p> <p>(11) Comments noted.</p>	<p>(10) No changes proposed.</p> <p>(11) Comments noted.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

APPENDIX 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD AND PROPOSED RESPONSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

		<p>Business Park (page 39).</p> <p><u>Stage 2 – Conditions and informatives</u></p> <p>(12) The informatives clearly set out the requirement for developer obligations with regards to protected species. We welcome this addition to the guidance.</p> <p><u>Appendix 1 – Design and Landscape Framework</u></p> <p>(13) The Placemaking & Design principles for Layout (page 52) state that new developments will “<i>where possible</i>” connect with sustainable and active travel routes. Given the overarching sustainability principles set out in the guidance and the general presumption that roads will be delivered, we recommend that ‘where possible’ is removed. This would also align more clearly with policy set out at paragraphs 273 and 287 of Scottish Planning Policy and with the Design Hierarchy set out on page 56 of the</p>	<p>(12) Comments noted.</p> <p>(13) Comments noted. It is agreed that ‘where possible’ should be removed.</p>	<p>(12) Comments noted.</p> <p>(13) It is recommended that ‘where possible’ be removed from the aforementioned bullet point on page 52.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

APPENDIX 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD AND PROPOSED RESPONSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

		<p>supplementary guidance.</p> <p>(14) The principle that “<i>key prominent buildings</i>” at the entrances to the industrial estate (page 52, Building Design) “<i>could be up to three storeys, up to a maximum of 10 metres in height</i>” represents a potentially significant change in character. At present, buildings at or near these locations are one to two storeys in height and therefore well-contained by landform and existing woodland. Given the site’s proximity to landscapes designated for their national, regional and local importance, we recommend that allowances for ‘key prominent buildings’ are reviewed.</p> <p><u>Appendix 2 – Design and Landscape Framework</u></p> <p>(15) The Landscape Framework on page 53 recognises the role of the existing trees and woodland in establishing the area’s</p>	<p>(14) It is considered that 3-storey buildings at this location would be well concealed from view. There are existing properties within Tweedbank which are up to 3-storeys in height which are not visually intrusive. It is considered that this text should remain within the document unchanged.</p> <p>(15) There is the danger that this would encourage vehicles to use the west end of Zone A as the main route into the Business Park, as</p>	<p>(14) No changes proposed.</p> <p>(15) No changes proposed.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

APPENDIX 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD AND PROPOSED RESPONSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

		<p>current and potential character. There is also recognition of the need to establish and reinforce gateways at the site entrances. We note, however, that these gateways are largely aligned around road junctions and recommend that a gateway entrance is also established at the west end of Zone A where the site abuts the Tweedbank railway station terminus. There is further opportunity to establish a gateway at the north-eastern boundary of Zone B where a number of strategic and long-distance pedestrian and cycle routes enter and run alongside the site.</p> <p><u>Appendix 2 – Transport Design Guidance</u></p> <p>(16) SHN welcome the principles set out in the User Hierarchy on page 56. However, SPZ Plan 4 (Hierarchy of Streets, page 57) omits several of the user groups. We recommend that this plan is reviewed to show</p>	<p>opposed to the quickest and safest route along the trunk road. It is therefore considered that this text should remain within the document unchanged.</p> <p>(16) It is considered that the hierarchy is clear and covers the necessary user groups and it is not considered necessary to reinforce this on the plan which involves some subjectivity.</p>	<p>(16) No changes proposed.</p>
--	--	---	---	----------------------------------

APPENDIX 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD AND PROPOSED RESPONSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

		<p>the overarching principles of the hierarchy more clearly. The information on street widths on page 58 is focused on the roadway rather than the full width of the carriageway, which would include provisions for pedestrians and cyclists. We recommend that clearer requirements on widths for pathways and cycleways are included. This should either be replicated as a summary of paragraphs 7.1 to 7.5 (page 62) or as a reference to those paragraphs.</p> <p><u>Appendix 3 – Transport Statement</u></p> <p>(17) The key recommendations in this Appendix are set out in line with the recommended transport hierarchy, setting clear requirements that will secure and enhance sense of place and character at the Business Park. There are likely to be benefits to long-distance recreational routes that run through this area as a result of these</p>	(17) Comments noted.	(17) Comments noted.
--	--	--	----------------------	----------------------

APPENDIX 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD AND PROPOSED RESPONSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

		requirements and we welcome the overall approach.		
Phil Pritchett on behalf of Manor Place Developments Ltd	Comments	(1) Manor Place Developments Ltd (MPDL) has purchased the land which was owned by B&Q PLC at Tweedbank which extends to 5.7 acres. The land is situated in the eastern section of the Central Borders Business Park and is bounded to the south by the A6091 and to the east by Tweedbank Drive. The purchase of the land is part of a long established focus of business in concentrating on land with untapped potential for development and job creation. MPDL has purchased the land at Tweedbank with a view to creating new development which will complement both the existing business park and to help maximise the economic impact of the recently opened Borders railway. MPDL wishes to work with the Council and other stakeholders to bring	(1) Comments noted.	(1) No changes proposed.

APPENDIX 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD AND PROPOSED RESPONSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

		<p>the vacant land in this strategic location back into productive use which will be to the wider benefit of the Business Park and community as a whole.</p> <p>{MPDL requested further time to provide full comments on the documents and whilst this was agreed, no further submissions have been received}. Their initial general comments are as follows:</p> <p><u>Opportunities/Constraints:</u></p> <p>(2) The market analysis undertaken by both B&Q and MPDL has indicated that a major drawback of the business/industrial park is its overall lack of visibility from the main through road network. The draft guidance suggests that the business park is highly visible from the A6091 enhancing the marketable profile of the site.</p>	<p>(2) The Central Borders Business park provides important business and industrial land to the wider area. The location is sensitive, however, due to its location adjacent to the Special Landscape Area and National Scenic Area. The site is prominent from the A6091 in that there are views into the site. It is, however, considered that the existing boundary planting is important to</p>	<p>(2) No proposed changes.</p>
--	--	---	---	---------------------------------

APPENDIX 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD AND PROPOSED RESPONSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

		<p>retain existing screening. It is suggested that gateway features at the entrance to the park would be a positive way of raising awareness of the park.</p>	
	<p>(3) It is pleasing to note that the Council recognises that there are transport links to nearby tourist attractions. It is considered that the guidance should expand on why such links provide site opportunities. There should be more emphasis on the tourism potential created through the opening of the new railway and its potential enhanced relationship with places of interest.</p>	<p>(3) Comments noted. This is not considered necessary given the focus of this document is on business and industrial land provision.</p>	<p>(3) No proposed changes.</p>
	<p>(4) Market investigations undertaken by the landowner suggests that the structure planting is considered to be a significant constraint of the site. There should be a positive aim to seek to enhance views from the main road network towards the railway and through the site encouraging</p>	<p>(4) This is not considered appropriate given the sensitive location of the site adjacent to the Special Landscape Area and National Scenic Area. It is not considered that the peripheral planting should be reduced in a way that the existing screening of the business park is</p>	<p>(4) No proposed changes.</p>

APPENDIX 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD AND PROPOSED RESPONSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

		<p>visible and physical connections from the A6091 towards Tweedbank station.</p> <p>It is welcomed that the Tree Preservation Order will be reviewed and/or amended. This is crucial to provide a new impetus to development in the area. It will be important to consider a possible revised vehicular access strategy which will help to make the estate more marketable and accessible from the surrounding road network. MDPL would wish to liaise with relevant officers to assess all available options for enhancing the marketability of the area. It will be imperative to agree reduced peripheral planting within an overall new approach to landscaped setting to bolster the chances of encouraging new occupiers and businesses to locate in the area and to take full advantage of the new and existing transport infrastructure.</p>	<p>compromised. It is considered that there may be scope in some areas to remove existing trees but this will be established by a review of the existing TPO.</p>	
--	--	---	---	--

APPENDIX 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD AND PROPOSED RESPONSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

		<p>(5) It is noted that more car parking for the railway may be required and as such the land around the railway should be safeguarded for such purposes rather than suggesting other forms of commercial use immediately adjacent to the station.</p>	<p>(5) Network Rail would be required to provide additional parking in the future if there was found to be a need. It is not considered that the need for additional parking should compromise the development of the mixed use site.</p>	<p>(5) No proposed changes.</p>
		<p>(6) Tweedbank village offers a limited range of facilities but these are located some distance from the business park. MPDL have been considering other older industrial and business parks throughout Scotland to assess the types of new uses and support services that can enhance the overall amenity of the business park environment. This is ongoing and further information on this issue will be provided. Such development can act as a catalyst for future investment as the overall impression of the park is enhanced.</p>	<p>(6) Comments noted. No further information has been submitted. The Supplementary Guidance and Simplified Planning Zone Scheme support ancillary uses within the park.</p>	<p>(6) No proposed changes.</p>

APPENDIX 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD AND PROPOSED RESPONSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

		<p>(7) Acknowledge concern that the business park is in a variety of different ownerships, but MPDL are in a unique position of being a significant land owner with development aspirations. MPDL are therefore willing to work with the Council to bring together all major tenants and owners to agree a long term vision for the park which would be to the benefit of all. This could include rebranding, advertising and working together to provide general physical and economic enhancements throughout the area.</p> <p><u>Development Vision:</u></p> <p>(8) The vision is too narrowly focused on the railway terminus. Market analysis suggests that for new development and uses to be attracted to this area there must be a strong physical and visual link to the main road network as well as improved links to the railway</p>	<p>(7) Comments noted. The Council is content to discuss any such matters with land owners with a view to improving the image and function of the Business Park.</p> <p>(8) It is considered that the visual link can be improved with gateway features at the eastern entrance. The site is located within a sensitive landscape setting which is highly important to safeguard. The business park is important to the wider area in terms of</p>	<p>(7) No proposed changes.</p> <p>(8) No proposed changes.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

APPENDIX 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD AND PROPOSED RESPONSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

		<p>terminus. The vision should be focused on providing renewed development opportunities throughout the area which help to link the railway terminus to the strategic road network and to provide not just a gateway feature on the roundabout entrance at the Tweedbank Road/A6091 junction, but new gateway development and uses which will have a positive impact on railway use. The vision should be more flexible and enabling rather than prescriptive in defining certain uses for defined areas within the site.</p> <p>(9) MPDL welcome the introduction of the SG/SPZ and is focused on delivery of a positive development scenario which will create new opportunities and help maximise the use of the railway for all. Whilst the business park will over time benefit from the proximity of the railway, there are other forms of use more related to the wider Borders</p>	<p>offering business and industrial land. This should not be compromised by allowing more flexibility in terms of uses.</p> <p>(9) Support noted. The business park is important to the wider area in terms of offering business and industrial land. This should not be compromised by allowing more flexibility in terms of uses which would dilute its fundamental purpose as a business and industrial park. There are other areas in the immediate vicinity around the railway</p>	<p>(9) Support noted.</p>
--	--	--	---	---------------------------

APPENDIX 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD AND PROPOSED RESPONSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

		<p>attractions and tourism in particular which could be developed in early course and which would benefit the business community as well.</p> <p>(10) MPDL intend to provide more comprehensive comments within a month of the consultation period closing date.</p>	<p>terminal which can accommodate tourist related facilities.</p> <p>(10) No further comments received.</p>	<p>(10) No proposed changes.</p>
Tempest Brewery	Comments	<p>Tempest Brewery would like to confirm their ambition to build a state of the art brewery production facility with adjoining taproom, visitor centre / retail shop, event / conference space, with later addition of bistro and gardens. In addition to brewing beer, packaging, warehousing (storage) and distribution of our products are all part of our core business. These activities all need to be carried out from the same premises. The preferred location for our new premises is the prominent 0.5 HA Eildon Mill site that is diagonally opposite the current Borders Railway Terminus. The Draft</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Council is aware of the ambition of Tempest Brewery to expand and fully supports this. It is possible that, depending upon the final layout and uses incorporated within the proposed new brewery, this would comply with the requirements of the SPZ for the Eildon Mill site. The Department is happy to discuss this further with Tempest Brewery in due course.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

APPENDIX 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD AND PROPOSED RESPONSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

		<p>Simplified Planning Zone Scheme (SPZ Plan 2) identifies our target site as Zone C. The Development Parameters given in the SPZ Table 1 (p35) are for Class 1 (Shops) and Class 4 (Business including light industrial under which Brewing should fall). However, activities falling under Class 3 (Food & Drink) and Class 6 (Storage or Distribution) are not permitted in Zone C by the draft SPZ scheme. Class 6 - the Storage and Distribution of our products are both vital parts of the day to day running our business and must be on the same site as production and packaging. Class 3 - the provision of Food & Drink is a key element of our proposed Taproom and Bistro/Gardens. Throughout the Draft Supplementary Guidance document regarding the development of the Central Borders Business Park Tweedbank, it is clear that there is a vision for this to be a flagship</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

APPENDIX 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD AND PROPOSED RESPONSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

		<p>development for the Central Borders with the placement of 'signature' buildings at key locations. Tempest Brewery would be an architectural designed showcase building. Further, page 14 of this document states that there is an opportunity for “a limited level of retail provision at the ‘gateway’ into the business park to serve both visitors to the area and user of the business park”. The addition of an incorporated Tempest Brewery Taproom, Retail shop and Visitor Centre opposite the current Borders Railway Terminus would sit perfectly with this vision on many levels. However, in order for this to happen, we need to have prior approval to carry out the Storage and Distribution of our products from our brewery premises, and to provide Food & Drink. Note: Our brewery is currently housed in Block 11, Units 1 & 2 of Tweedbank Industrial Estate. Under the proposed SPZ Scheme, this</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

APPENDIX 2 – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION PERIOD AND PROPOSED RESPONSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

		site is listed as Zone E however I understand that it is currently Zone D.		
--	--	--	--	--