

Appendix B:

Extracts of Site Assessment Database for all sites considered as part of the MIR process

Summary Table

Report 1: Preferred and Alternative Sites

Report 2: Excluded Sites

Report 3: Redevelopment Sites

Report 4: Sites to be Removed from LDP

Report 5: Sites to be Retained within LDP2

Report 6: Proposed Settlement Boundary

All sites considered – MIR Site Status

Settlement name	Site reference	MIR Site Status	Site name
Allanton	AALLA001	Excluded	West of Blackadder Drive
Allanton	AALLA002	Excluded	Land south of Allanton I
Allanton	AALLA003	Excluded	Land south of Allanton II
Ancrum	AANCR002	Alternative	Dick's Croft II
Auchencrow	AAUCH001	Excluded	Land to west of Auchencrow
Auchencrow	AAUCH002	Excluded	Land to east of Auchencrow
Auchencrow	AAUCH003	Excluded	Land to north of Auchencrow
Ayton	AAYTO004	Retain LDP Site	Land north of High Street
Birgham	ABIRG005	Excluded	Land south east of Treaty Park
Broughton	ABROU002	Excluded	South west of Dreva Road
Broughton	ABROU003	Excluded	Old Kirkyard Field
Broughton	ABROU004	Excluded	Village Park Site
Broughton	ABROU005	Excluded	Land adjacent to Broughton Cemetery
Burnmouth	ABURN005	Excluded	Land to west of Lyall Terrace
Cardrona	ACARD001	Excluded	South of B7062
Cardrona	SCARD002	Preferred	Land at Nether Horsburgh
Charlesfield	ACHAR004	Excluded	Charlesfield West II
Chesters	RC2B	Remove LDP Site	Roundabout Farm
Clovenfords	ACLOV004	Excluded	Land west of Bowland Road
Cockburnspath	ACOPA006	Excluded	Land west of Callander Place
Cockburnspath	MCOPA002	Excluded	Land opposite Dunglass Park
Coldingham	ACOLH005	Excluded	Land north west of Creel House
Coldingham	ACOLH006	Excluded	Land to west of Reston Road
Coldingham	ACOLH007	Excluded	Land to south east of Homefield Cottage
Coldingham	ACOLH008	Excluded	Land to south east of Law House
Coldstream	ACOLD012	Excluded	Land to south of Former Cottage Hospital
Coldstream	ACOLD013	Excluded	Hillview North II
Coldstream	ACOLD014	Alternative	Hillview North 1 (Phase 2)
Coldstream	BCS3A	Retain LDP Site	Guards Road
Crailing	ACRAI004	Alternative	Crailing Toll (Larger Site)
Darnick	ADARN003	Excluded	Bankhead
Darnick	ADARN005	Preferred	Land south of Darnlee
Denholm	ADENH006	Preferred	Land south east of Thorncroft
Dolphinton	ADOLP004	Preferred	Land to north of Dolphinton
Duns	ADUNS024	Excluded	Land North of Peelrig Farm
Duns	ADUNS027	Excluded	Land north of Preston Road
Duns	MDUNS003	Excluded	Land South of Earlsmeadow

Duns	MDUNS004	Excluded	South of Earlsmeadow
Duns	MDUNS005	Alternative	South of Earlsmeadow (Phase 1)
Earlston	EEA12B	Remove LDP Site	Earlston Glebe
Earlston	MEARL004	Excluded	Georgefield & East Turrford
Eckford	AECKF002	Alternative	Land at the Black Barn
Eckford	RECKF002	Excluded	Easter Wooden Steading
Eddleston	AEDDL006	Excluded	Temple Hill East
Eddleston	AEDDL007	Excluded	North of Bellfield II
Eddleston	AEDDL008	Alternative	Land West of Elibank Park
Eddleston	AEDDL009	Alternative	Land South of Cemetery
Eddleston	SEDDL001	Preferred	North of Bellfield II
Ednam	AEDNA011	Alternative	Cliftonhill (v)
Ednam	AEDNA012	Excluded	Land east of Keleden
Ednam	AEDNA013	Alternative	Land north of Primary School
Eildon	AEILD002	Retain LDP Site	West Eildon
Eshiels	MESHI001	Preferred	Land at Eshiels I
Eshiels	MESHI002	Preferred	Land at Eshiels II
Eyemouth	AEYEM001	Excluded	Land West of Eyemouth
Eyemouth	BEY1	Remove LDP Site	Barefoots
Eyemouth	MEYEM002	Excluded	Land to North West of Eyemouth
Eyemouth	REYEM007	Redevelopment	Former Town Hall
Galashiels	AGALA029	Alternative	Netherbarns
Galashiels	AGALA038	Excluded	Easter Langlee Mains II
Galashiels	AGALA039	Excluded	Land at Winston Road
Galashiels	BGALA005	Excluded	Easter Langlee Renewable Park
Galashiels	BGALA006	Preferred	Land at Winston Road I
Galashiels	EGL17B	Retain LDP Site	Buckholm Corner
Galashiels	EGL200	Retain LDP Site	North Ryehaugh
Galashiels	EGL32B	Retain LDP Site	Ryehaugh
Galashiels	EGL41	Retain LDP Site	Buckholm North
Galashiels	RGALA007	Excluded	St John's Manse
Gattonside	AGATT013	Excluded	Gateside Meadow/Castlefield
Gattonside	AGATT016	Excluded	Lower Gateside
Gattonside	EGT10B	Retain LDP Site	Orchard
Gordon	AGORD004	Preferred	Land at Eden Road
Gordon	AGORD005	Excluded	Land to west of Station Road
Grantshouse	AGRAN004	Preferred	Land north of Mansefield
Greenlaw	AGREE006	Retain LDP Site	Marchmont Road II
Greenlaw	AGREE008	Alternative	Halliburton Road
Greenlaw	AGREE009	Preferred	Poultry Farm
Greenlaw	BG200	Retain LDP Site	Marchmont Road
Greenlaw	BGREE005	Preferred	Land South of Edinburgh Road

Greenlaw	MGREE004	Excluded	Poultry Farm
Greenlaw	SBGRE001	Excluded	Greenlaw Development Boundary Amendment
Hawick	AHAWI019	Excluded	Land west of Crumhaugh House Hospital
Hawick	AHAWI024	Excluded	Former Stonefield Quarry
Hawick	AHAWI027	Preferred	Burnfoot (Phase 1)
Hawick	AHAWI028	Excluded	Land at West Lees
Hawick	AHAWI029	Excluded	Land at Appletreehall
Hawick	AHAWI030	Excluded	Land at Former Allotments, Braid Road
Hawick	BHAWI003	Preferred	Gala Law II
Hawick	BHAWI004	Preferred	Land to South of Burnhead
Hawick	RHA12B	Retain LDP Site	Summerfield 1
Hawick	RHA13B	Retain LDP Site	Summerfield 2
Hawick	RHAWI017	Redevelopment	Former Peter Scott Building
Hawick	RHAWI018	Redevelopment	Buccleuch Mill
Heiton	AHEIT003	Excluded	Sunlaws (Phase 2)
Heiton	RHE2B	Retain LDP Site	Heiton Mains
Heiton	RHE3B	Retain LDP Site	Ladyrig
Hutton	AHUTT003	Excluded	Land East of Hutton
Hutton	AHUTT004	Excluded	Land to South of Hutton
Innerleithen	AINNE004	Retain LDP Site	Kirklands/Willowbank II
Innerleithen	AINNE008	Excluded	South of Peebles Road
Innerleithen	AINNE009	Excluded	Kirklands II
Innerleithen	AINNE010	Excluded	Upper Kirklands
Innerleithen	MINNE002	Excluded	Traquair Road East
Innerleithen	MINNE003	Preferred	Land West of Innerleithen
Innerleithen	RINNE003	Excluded	St Ronans Terrace/Hall Street
Innerleithen	TI200	Retain LDP Site	Kirklands
Jedburgh	AJEDB017	Excluded	Land east of Howdenburn Court
Jedburgh	AJEDB018	Preferred	Land east of Howdenburn Court II
Jedburgh	MJEDB002	Excluded	Land east of Hartrigge Park
Jedburgh	RJ27D	Retain LDP Site	Wildcat Cleuch
Jedburgh	RJ2B	Retain LDP Site	Lochend
Jedburgh	RJ7B	Retain LDP Site	Annefield
Jedburgh	RJEDB003	Redevelopment	Howdenburn Primary School
Jedburgh	RJEDB004	Redevelopment	Parkside Primary School
Jedburgh	RJEDB005	Redevelopment	Former Tennis Court/Ski Slope
Jedburgh	RJEDB006	Redevelopment	Jedburgh Grammar School
Jedburgh	RJEDB007	Retain LDP Site	The Anna II
Kelso	AKELS024	Excluded	Land adjacent to Harrietfield Cottages

Kelso	AKELS029	Retain LDP Site	Nethershot (Phases 1 & 2)
Kelso	RKE12B	Retain LDP Site	Rosebank 2
Kirkhope (Nr Ettrickbridge)	RKIRK001	Excluded	Site at Old Kirkhope Steading
Lanton	ALANT002	Excluded	Land east of Lanton Village
Lauder	ALAUD008	Excluded	Maitland Park (Phase 2)
Lauder	RLAUD002	Retain LDP Site	Burnmill
Lilliesleaf	ELI6B	Retain LDP Site	Muselie Drive
Maxton	AMAXT003	Excluded	Land and buildings at East End Farm
Melrose	AMELR008	Excluded	Land at Dingleton Mains
Melrose	AMELR012	Excluded	Bleachfield
Melrose	AMELR013	Alternative	Harmony Hall Gardens
Midlem	AMIDL003	Excluded	Townhead
Midlem	AMIDL004	Excluded	West of Springfield
Morebattle	AMORE002	Excluded	Land west of Primary School
Nether Blainslie	ANETH002	Excluded	Nether Blainslie East
Newcastleton	ANEWC004	Excluded	North of Station House
Newcastleton	ANEWC012	Excluded	Land north of Copshaw Place
Newmill (Nr Hawick)	RNEWM001	Excluded	Site at Newmill Steading
Newstead	ANEWS005	Retain LDP Site	The Orchard
Newstead	ANEWS007	Excluded	Newstead East
Newstead	ANEWS008	Excluded	Newstead North I
Newtown St Boswells	ANEWT010	Retain LDP Site	Newtown Expansion III
Nisbet	ANISB002	Excluded	East of Nisbet
Oxnam	AOXNA002	Excluded	Land to west of Oxnam Road
Oxnam	SBOXN001	Not Applicable	Oxnam Development Boundary
Oxton	AOXTO009	Excluded	South west of Oxton
Oxton	AOXTO010	Preferred	Nether Howden
Peebles	APEEB038	Excluded	Langside Farm
Peebles	APEEB044	Retain LDP Site	Rosetta Road
Peebles	APEEB045	Excluded	Venlaw
Peebles	APEEB047	Excluded	South west of Edderston Road
Peebles	APEEB049	Excluded	South west of Whitehaugh
Peebles	APEEB052	Excluded	South west of Peebles
Peebles	APEEB053	Excluded	Rosetta Road II
Peebles	APEEB054	Excluded	East of Kittlegairy View
Peebles	APEEB055	Excluded	Standalane
Peebles	APEEB056	Preferred	Land South of Chapelhill Farm
Peebles	MPEEB006	Retain LDP Site	Rosetta Road Mixed Use
Peebles	SBPEE001	Excluded	Peebles Development Boundary Amendment
Peebles	SPEEB007	Excluded	Land East of Cademuir Hill

Peebles	SPEEB008	Preferred	Land West of Edderston Ridge
Peebles	SPEEB009	Preferred	East of Cademuir Hill
Preston	APRES004	Excluded	Land north east of Preston
Preston	APRES005	Excluded	Land north of Preston
Preston	zRO16	Remove LDP Site	Preston Farm
Reston	AREST005	Alternative	Land east of West Reston
Selkirk	ASELK030	Excluded	Land to west of Calton Cottage
Selkirk	ASELK031	Excluded	Land north of Bannerfield
Selkirk	ASELK032	Excluded	Philiphaugh Nursery
Selkirk	ASELK033	Retain LDP Site	Angles Field
Selkirk	ASELK040	Alternative	Philiphaugh Mill
Selkirk	ASELK042	Retain LDP Site	Philiphaugh Steading II
Selkirk	MSELK002	Retain LDP Site	Heather Mill
Selkirk	MSELK003	Excluded	Land west of Heather Mill
Selkirk	MSELK004	Excluded	Land and buildings at Whinfield Mill
Smailholm	ASMAI001	Excluded	Land adjacent to Village Hall
Smailholm	ASMAI002	Preferred	Land at West Third
Sprouston	RSP2B	Retain LDP Site	Church Field
St Abbs	ASTAB001	Excluded	Land to east of Northfield Farm Buildings
St Abbs	ASTAB002	Excluded	Land to west of St Abbs
St Abbs	ASTAB003	Excluded	Land to south of St Abbs
St Abbs	RSTAB001	Excluded	Northfield Farm Buildings
St Boswells	MSTBO001	Excluded	Land north west of Garage
St Boswells	RSTBO001	Excluded	Garage Site
Stichill	ASTIC003	Excluded	Land north west of Eildon View
Stow	ASTOW029	Excluded	West of Crunzie Burn
Swinton	ASWIN002	Excluded	Land north east of Main Street
Swinton	BSW2B	Retain LDP Site	Well Field
Tweedbank	MTWEE003	Excluded	Lowood II
West Linton	AWEST019	Excluded	North East of Robinsland Farm
West Linton	AWEST020	Excluded	Deanfoot Road
West Linton	AWEST021	Excluded	North of West Linton
West Linton	AWEST022	Excluded	The Loan
West Linton	BWEST003	Preferred	Deanfoot Road North
Westruther	AWESR002	Preferred	Edgar Road
Westruther	AWESR009	Excluded	Land to south east of Kirkpark
Westruther	AWESR010	Excluded	Land to north of Westruther
Westruther	AWESR011	Excluded	Land to south of Mansefield House
Westruther	AWESR012	Excluded	Land to north of Westertown
Westruther	BWESR001	Preferred	Land south west of Mansefield House
Whitsome	AWHIT003	Excluded	Herriot Bank Farm

Whitsome	AWHIT004	Excluded	Land at Whitsomehill
Yetholm	BYETH001	Excluded	NW of Deanfield Place
Yetholm	RY1B	Retain LDP Site	Deanfield Court

Report 1: Extract of Site Assessment Database - Preferred and Alternative Sites

Berwickshire HMA

Coldstream

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR status
ACOLD014	Hillview North 1 (Phase 2)	Coldstream	Rest of Borders	Housing	100	6.5	Alternative

Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designations. The site is currently identified for longer term housing potential within the LDP. The site directly to the south was brought forward as part of the Housing SG (ACOLD011), for 100 units.

SEPA: Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. In addition, the surface water flood map indicates a potential flow path which can indicate a potential small watercourse. Review of Scottish Water information and historic maps does not indicate the presence of a small watercourse. This should be explored further during site investigations.

There is the potential that development on this site could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard within the site.

Foul drainage from the development must be connected to the existing SW foul sewer network. Std comments for SUDS.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with the fluvial (river) 1 in 200 year flood extents but there are small pockets of potential surface water impacts on the Eastern side of the site at a 1 in 200 year flood event.

I would have no objections on the grounds of flood risk. However, I would require that due to surface water risk and the capacity of the development that surface water flooding is considered and it is ensured that any water would be routed around the housing.

Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	On/Adjacent to site	Greenfield	Local Development Plan: This forms part of an area identified for longer term housing (SCOLD001) Housing SG: The entire longer term site was considered (ACOLD009) and was not identified within the Housing SG Housing SG: Half of the currently proposed site was considered (ACOLD011) and allocated for housing within the Housing SG. It should be noted that (ACOLD013) is also under consideration as part of this process. (ACOLD013) includes the already allocated southern part of the site and omits a northern section of this site

Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport

Good

Access to employment

Good

Access to services

Good

Wider biodiversity impacts

Minor

Site aspect

Not applicable

Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Low biodiversity impact. Site appears to be an arable field hedgerow and on part of the boundary. No obvious connectivity to River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including badger and breeding birds. SEPA CAR construction site licence required.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the north of Coldstream and the area directly to the south is already allocated for housing, as part of the Housing SG. Coldstream has adequate services and employment opportunities. The settlement is also relatively close to Berwick-Upon-Tweed and Kelso, which provide further opportunities. There is public transport which links Coldstream with Berwick-Upon-Tweed, where a railway station is present.

Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area

Not applicable

Open space

Not applicable

Listed buildings

Not applicable

Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

Archaeology

Adjacent to site

Garden and designed

Not applicable

Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE AND DESIGN: No specific issues, need to consider a common approach to boundary treatments etc with the site to the south.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: This response relates to the consultation for site (ACOLD013), which is also under consideration. There is some potential within the site, archaeological investigation may be required.

Landscape assessment

NSA

Not applicable

SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

Wild Land

Not applicable

Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: Our previous advice on this site (in response to the Housing SG): 'This site lies outwith the current settlement boundary as shown in the LDP but is included as a longer term safeguard (SCOLD001). This would form a significant addition to the existing settlement and would therefore need to ensure measures to deliver natural heritage mitigation and enhancement as part of any future site development'. Expanding on this earlier advice, we recommend that:

- New structure planting/ landscaping, should be planned to improve the setting of the site and to establish a framework for delivery of the remainder of the long-term safeguard site (SCOLD001);
- Existing shelter belts should be retained and enhanced with additional planting. Suitability of locating active travel routes along these linear features should also be considered due to their potential role in providing setting and shelter for users; and
- Open space should provide multiple benefits and be linked into wider habitat and active travel networks.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: Site has an arbitrary SW boundary not related to any landscape feature. It is effectively an extension of ACOLD13 and should not be developed until after ACOLD13 or it would be isolated and potentially intrusive. 20m wide structure planting belt is desirable along the NE and NW boundaries to form a new settlement edge to Coldstream. Otherwise no major concerns.

Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: No response received.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: Good opportunity for vehicular access and pedestrian/cycle linkage exists. I am therefore able to offer my support for housing on this site. Two main vehicular links are available; one via the existing industrial site served off the A6112 (though there is intervening land between the industrial development and this site) and another via Hill View. A further more minor link is possible via the westerly end of Priory Bank. Development of this site should not take place until such a time as the intervening area of land between the site and Hill View is developed. Allowance would have to be made for future street connectivity and a Transport Assessment will be required as a prerequisite for the development of this site.

PASSNEGER TRANSPORT: No response received.

Right of way

Adjacent to site

TPOs

Not applicable

Contaminated land

Not applicable

Water supply

Yes

Sewerage

Yes

Gas Supply

Yes

Education provision

Good

Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No problem in principle with allocating this site. However, the current 2016 LDP shows the vast majority of this site as part of an existing allocation, and shows most of this site as a proposed structure landscaping area. The level of landscaping proposed did appear to me to be excessive. However, it was shown, and justifiable in part. The new allocation should still show/indicate some degree of landscaping to the boundary of the site, unless structure landscaping is no longer being indicated?

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): There is sufficient capacity at Coldstream WWTW. A Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): There is sufficient capacity at Rawburn WTW. A Water Impact Assessment (WIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Improved path/cycle links into town and the wider path network are recommended.

CONTAMINATED LAND: There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received. However, they were consulted on site (ACOLD013) which is also under consideration and raised no objections.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: I believe we previously responded to (ACOLD011) that the landscape separating strip between this site and the Coldstream Business Park should be split between the two sites rather than all be contained within the business park site to ensure sufficient separation, splitting the cost, and allowing this to be implemented early on, depending on which development commences first.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

Overall assessment

MIR status

Alternative

Overall assessment

Acceptable

Site capacity

100

Conclusions

The site is currently identified as longer term housing land within the LDP (SCOLD001). The site immediately to the south was allocated for housing within the Housing SG (ACOLD011) for 100 units.

The site would integrate well into the settlement, respect the existing settlement pattern and would have good connectivity with the adjacent allocations. The site would represent a natural extension to the

existing settlement pattern of Coldstream. The site itself is well contained and development of the site will have little adverse impact upon the wider landscape. Further to consultation, the following constraints and mitigation were highlighted;

- Investigation of potential flood risk and surface water runoff and mitigation where required;
- The site is located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Site lies within the 'Lennel' SBC Designed Landscape;
- Protect and enhance existing boundary features (hedgerows and trees) where possible;
- Mitigation for protected species;
- Consideration given to a common approach in respect of the boundary treatments, with the allocated site to the south (ACOLD011). New structure planting/landscaping should be planned to improve the setting of the site and to establish a framework for delivery of the remainder of the longer term site (SCOLD001). Structure planting should be provided along the north east and south west boundaries, which would provide a settlement edge;
- Existing shelter belts should be retained and enhanced with additional planting;
- Open space should provide multiple benefits and be linked into the wider habitat and active travel networks;
- Potential archaeology within the site;
- There are 2 main vehicular links into this site, 1 via the existing industrial estate served off the A6112 and another via Hillview. Allowance should be made for future street connectivity;
- Drainage Impact Assessment required in respect of the water network capacity & Water Impact Assessment required, in respect of the waste network capacity; and
- Improved path/cycle links into the town and the wider path network are recommended.

Although the site to the south was recently allocated, it is considered that there are advantages to developing this site and the existing allocation (ACOLD011) as one. This would allow the development of the 2 sites to be considered together, in respect of any masterplanning/layout and connectivity, preventing the piecemeal development of the wider site. However, it is acknowledged that (ACOLD011) is a recent allocation for 100 units and there are also 3 existing housing allocations within Coldstream. Therefore, there is a question as to whether Coldstream needs an additional allocation for the LDP2 at this point in time. However, on balance taking into consideration the above comments regarding the 2 sites being considered together in terms of layout and connectivity, this site is proposed as an alternative option within the MIR.

Duns

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR status
MDUNS005	South of Earlismeadow (Phase 1)	Duns	Eastern	Mixed Use	100	9.4	Alternative

Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designation constraint.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the potentially culverted small watercourse which is identified as being located along the northern boundary. We do not support development over culverts that are to remain active. We would note that the OS Map identifies this area as boggy which may constrain development. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues at this site or immediately adjacent. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. There is the potential that development of this site could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There are also identified surface water hazard within the site.

Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network however for a development of this scale it is likely that the foul network and STW will require upgrading. SW should confirm. There appears to be a marshy area in the northern corner of the site which may be drained to culverts under the site. Any such culverts should be removed as part of any development. Confirmation should be made that this is not a Groundwater Dependant Terrestrial Ecosystem.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The site is within the surface water 1 in 200 year flood extent. I would have no objection to the proposal on the grounds of flood risk. I would however ask that due to the size of the development that surface water flooding is considered and it is ensured that water would be routed around housing. DIA/SUDS.

Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	On/Adjacent to site	Greenfield	Local Development Plan: (SDUNS001) - identified within the LDP as a potential longer term mixed use site Housing SG: (MDUNS005) - exact same site boundary considered as part of the Housing SG

Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Good	Good	Good	Moderate	Not applicable

Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response to date. However, the Ecology Officer was consulted on this site as part of the Housing SG and offered the following comments. 'Arable field and improved pastures.

Hedgerow and occasional boundary tree. Wetland area at north of the site, need to safeguard as identified in the LDP (real extent of wetland varies from LDP policy map). Moderate biodiversity impact'.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is acceptable in terms of access to services and public transport. It is relatively close to the centre of Duns and has good employment potential. There are regular buses to Berwick Upon Tweed where there is a main train line to Edinburgh and Newcastle upon Tyne. There are employment opportunities within Duns and within nearby settlements. The site might provide habitats for biodiversity. There is an area of marshy grassland/wet meadow which runs from the park across towards the new high school.

Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area	Open space	Listed buildings	Scheduled Monument	Ancient woodland inventory	Archaeology	Garden and designed
Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	On/adjacent to site	Not applicable

Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE AND DESIGN: Boundary treatment, phasing and external colours will be important issues as well as physical and visual connections to Duns.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding development on this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: There is cropmark evidence of an archaeological site within the LDP area. This increases the potential of the site overall. Archaeological investigation is likely. Preservation in situ of the known site is preferred.

Landscape assessment

NSA	SLA	Over 200 metres? <input type="checkbox"/>	Over 12 degree slope <input type="checkbox"/>	Wild Land
Not applicable	Not applicable			Not applicable

Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: As part of the longer term safeguarded site (SDUNS001), this site should be subject to the same consideration. If you are minded to support development of this site during the current plan period, further detailed assessment and a site brief will be required.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: Significant issue with this one because it includes a large area of semi natural wetland on the north side. This should be excluded and the boundary re-drawn, possibly with a small separate area of developable land by the Earlsmeadow garages.

No major concerns about developing the arable land to the south other than loss to agriculture but site is also isolated and would require significant road infrastructure which might also create environmental issues! If this area is to be developed then 'permeable' structure planting (i.e. planting with gaps for views) should be provided along the western boundary.

Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity	Near a trunk road? <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	--

NETWORK MANAGER: Access to main road?

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: This area is currently identified as an area for longer term development within the current Local Development Plan. I have no objection to this land being allocated for mixed use development, the main vehicular access being from the A6015 via the existing allocated site to the north west (ADUNS023). A minor access link is possible via the A6112 and Station Avenue. Good pedestrian and cycle linkage is critical in terms of sustainable transport. Allowance must be made for future street connectivity beyond this development and the possibility of a distributor/relief road linking the A6105 and the A6112 south of Cheeklaw needs to be considered for the longer term expansion of the town. A Transport Assessment will be a prerequisite for the development of this site.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Bus infrastructure required.

Right of way

On/adjacent to site

TPOs

Not applicable

Contaminated land

Not applicable

Water supply

Limited

Sewerage

Limited

Gas Supply

Yes

Education provision

Good

Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Logical direction of development given the recent housing developments in Duns, along with overlapping MDUNS003 and MDUNS005, would require master planning, to ascertain best areas for different uses, strong landscaping framework needed and would be appropriate.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Duns WWTW has sufficient capacity and a Drainage Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Rawburn WTW has sufficient capacity and a Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Vehicular access to the site needs further consideration with potential upgrading of the road network at Clockmill or potentially through the industrial estate required. The existing access path to the school and public park has recently been upgraded and therefore would provide good non-vehicular access to the site. The area is prone to flooding. (2016 HSG Consultation).

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: We have no objections but would appreciate some clarification of what is proposed as mixed use, beyond the planned events space, and the location and area proposed for non-housing use.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

Overall assessment**MIR status****Alternative****Overall assessment**

Acceptable

Site capacity

100

Conclusions

The site is currently identified within the LDP, as part of the longer term mixed use site (SDUNS001). The entire longer term mixed use site is also being considered as part of this process (MDUNS004) and (MDUNS003) which occupies an area to the west. It should be noted that all 3 of these sites were recently considered for inclusion within the Housing SG and none were taken forward as part of that process.

The site has good access to public services, employment and public transport. Furthermore, the site would result in minimal visual impact from the entrance to Duns. The site has good integration and connectivity with the existing settlement. The following constraints and mitigation would need to be considered as part of any development;

- Flood Risk Assessment would be required;
- There is an existing wetland area to the north east corner of the site, there would be a requirement to safeguard this;
- The Landscape Officer suggests removing the wetland area from any formal allocation;
- The site is located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Drainage Impact Assessment (WWTW) & Water Impact Assessment (WTW);
- Potential archaeology within the site and appropriate mitigation would be likely;
- Transport Assessment would be required;
- Structure planting and landscaping would be required in order to mitigate any visual impacts as a result of the development;
- There is a requirement for an events area to facilitate tourism events within this site and the larger mixed use longer term site;
- There is adequate access via the A6015 through the existing housing allocation (ADUNS023) and also a minor access through Station Avenue to the east. Access for this site would be required through the allocations (ADUNS023) and (ADUNS010);

- Minor drainage issues which would need to be addressed; and
- The development must respect the area of greenspace adjacent to the site, 'Duns Park'.

It is acknowledged that there are currently 330 established housing units within the Duns land supply (2017 HLA), 151 of these are considered to be effective, while the remainder are programmed post year 7. However, there is a lack of mixed use allocations currently within the LDP. Therefore, this has the potential to provide an opportunity for a mixture of uses within Duns. Taking the above into consideration, it is considered that this site should be included within the MIR as an alternative option, which could come forward if required. It should be noted that the site must accommodate an element of business land, this will be attached as a site requirement to any allocation. Should the site come forward, the southern part of the longer term mixed use site would be retained for future mixed use development.

Gordon

Site reference AGORD004	Site name Land at Eden Road	Settlement Gordon	RGA Rest of Borders	Proposed Use Housing	Indicative Capacity 25	Ha 1.5	MIR status Preferred
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-----------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	--------------------------------

Initial assessment

Floodrisk Not applicable	SAC Not applicable	SPA Not applicable	SSSI Not applicable	Ramsar Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any identified International/National designation constraint.

SEPA: The site is next to Gordon STW. May be likely to give rise to odour issues. Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. Due to the size of the development I'd recommend surface water runoff be considered.

Background information

Minerals and coal Not applicable	NNR Not applicable	Prime Quality Agricultural Land On/Adjacent to site	Current use/s Greenfield	Planning history references Local Plan: (BGO11D) - southern part of the site currently under consideration Housing SG: (AGORD004) - exact same site boundary as currently under consideration
--	------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--

Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport Good	Access to employment Good	Access to services Good	Wider biodiversity impacts Minor	Site aspect Not applicable
---	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------

Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Site is improved grassland tree-lined boundary and drystone dykes on boundary. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds. Low biodiversity impact.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the east of the settlement boundary and the proposed access is from Eden Road to the south. There is good access to public transport, employment and service within Gordon. These are limited within Gordon itself, however the site is well connected to the settlement and within walking distance of the local amenities within Gordon. Furthermore, Gordon is located close to Kelso (8 miles away), Earlston (6 miles away) and Duns (12 miles away), where there is a wider range of local services and employment opportunities available. Gordon has a bus service which runs to Berwick-Upon-Tweed and Galashiels.

Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area

Not applicable

Open space

Adjacent to site

Listed buildings

Not applicable

Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

Archaeology

Adjacent to site

Garden and designed

Not applicable

Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: No known archaeological issues.

Landscape assessment

NSA

Not applicable

SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

Wild Land

Not applicable

Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to the size and location.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: The site links well with the village. Footpath connections required. Protect existing trees on verge/fence line. Adequate space between for access. Existing blocks of trees provide containment and backdrop for new houses. Additional tree planting and hedges within the site will assist in integrating the development into the location. 25no units with continuation of village streetscape along Eden Road. Protect street trees.

Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: New junction onto A6105 but should not be any issues.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I have no objection to this land being zoned for housing. This is a logical extension to the settlement and would provide an opportunity for a strong street frontage onto the A6105 which would enhance the sense of arrival into the village and help reinforce the 30mph speed limit. The existing footway infrastructure will have to be extended along the frontage of the site to tie in with existing and any layout should allow for future street connectivity. A Transport Statement would be required.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Bus stop infrastructure required.

Right of way

Not applicable

TPOs

Not applicable

Contaminated land

Not applicable

Water supply

Yes

Sewerage

Limited

Gas Supply

No

Education provision

Good

Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Prime Quality Agricultural Land; if units are required in Gordon, this looks to be a strong site; we would need to be very careful with the frontage to the south; a hard edge, with housing onto pavement/roadside (no front gardens) would be desirable and landscaping to the north and particularly to the east would be needed.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns to the development of this site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. Please note that there is an rising sewer within the site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Howden WTW has sufficient capacity and sufficient capacity in the network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No capacity issues.

NHS: No response received.

Overall assessment

MIR status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Preferred	Acceptable	25

Conclusions

This site was recently assessed as part of the Housing SG and was not taken forward for inclusion within the Housing SG, primarily as it was considered there were more appropriate sites options at that time. Only an initial stage 1 RAG assessment was undertaken as part of the Housing SG. However, the agent provided a supporting statement in response to the RAG assessment, since the Housing SG. Therefore, this has been taken into consideration and a full site assessment/consultation has been undertaken as part of the MIR process.

Following consultation with key stakeholders, there are no insurmountable constraints for the development of this site. The site itself appears to be a logical extension to the settlement boundary and relates well to Gordon. Albeit careful consideration would need to be given to the treatment of the site boundaries and the frontage to the south onto the main road. Following consultation, the following constraints/mitigation were identified;

- The proximity to the Gordon Sewage Treatment Works;
- Foul water must connect to the existing foul network;
- Assessment of ecology impacts and provision of mitigation, as appropriate;
- Protection of existing boundary features, where possible, including existing trees on the verge/fence lines;
- Extension of existing footway infrastructure along the frontage of the site;
- Landscaping to assist in integrating the development into the location;
- A Transport Statement would be required;
- Early engagement with Scottish Water, in respect of the WWTW; and
- The site is located within Prime Quality Agricultural land.

The current LDP states that the preferred area for future expansion is to the east of Gordon, north of Eden Road and that development to the north of the settlement will be resisted. The site is also well related to Gordon itself. Overall, there are no insurmountable constraints to the development of this site for housing. In conclusion, taking the above into consideration, it is considered that the site should be put forward as a preferred option for housing within the MIR, for 25 units.

Grantshouse

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR status
AGRAN004	Land north of Mansefield	Grantshouse	Rest of Borders	Housing	8	0.4	Preferred

Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any International/National designation constraint.

SEPA: Based on OS Map there is sufficient height difference between site and the Eye Water. Due to steep topography through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff.

There is the potential that development on this site could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. A Surface Water Hazard has been identified within the site. Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	On/Adjacent to site	Greenfield	Local Plan: (BGH3), this site formed part of a much larger site which was considered Local Plan: (BGH16), this site formed part of a much larger site which was considered Local Development Plan: (AGRAN001), this site formed the corner of a site to the west Planning applications (12/01272/PPP): Erection of 12 dwellinghouses - refused planning consent. (11/01464/FUL): Construction of 15 turbines up to 100m in height. The proposed site is located within the site boundary for the approved wind farm development.

Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Limited	Limited	Limited	Minor	Not applicable

Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Minor biodiversity risk. Site is arable field with hedgerow and tree-lined boundary. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the north of Grantshouse, to the north of Mansfield. Half of the site is located within the existing settlement boundary and is infill land, whereas the area to the west and north is outwith the settlement boundary. There is a bus stop located within Grantshouse, which connects to Edinburgh and Berwick-Upon-Tweed, however this provides limited service to other settlements within Berwickshire. There are limited public services and employment opportunities within Grantshouse itself, however there are opportunities within a number of nearby settlements although they may rely on car for access. Eyemouth is located 11 miles away, while Duns is located 9 miles away.

Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area

Not applicable

Open space

Adjacent to site

Listed buildings

Not applicable

Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

Archaeology

Not applicable

Garden and designed

Not applicable

Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: No known archaeological interests.

Landscape assessment

NSA

Not applicable

SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

Wild Land

Not applicable

Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to the size and location.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: Based on desk assessment – no major constraints. Shape of allocation will dictate direct access off Mansfield street to each property as there is not enough room for an access road. Part of field at the north east corner will also be awkward to manage because of acute angle formed.

Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Did not raise any concerns regarding the proposed development.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the proposed development.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: Grantshouse has no notable services/amenities to justify supporting any significant new development, but a modest scale of housing would be acceptable in principle. The public road along Mansfield is a cul-de-sac with extensive on-street parking restricting traffic flow and there is a significant level difference between the public road and the site. Direct access to the public road is acceptable in principle, but will be difficult to achieve engineering wise and any development will have to address traffic flow and site access issues imposed by existing on-street parking.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the proposed development.

Right of way

On site

TPOs

Not applicable

Contaminated land

Not applicable

Water supply

Yes

Sewerage

Yes

Gas Supply

No

Education provision

Good

Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No response received.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the proposed development.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with SW is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW and there is sufficient capacity in the network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Rawburn WTW has sufficient capacity and there is sufficient capacity in the network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Enhancement to Core Path 100 (Right of Way BB1) to the east would be recommended.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

Overall assessment

MIR status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Preferred	Acceptable	8

Conclusions

The proposal is for a housing allocation, with an indicative site capacity for 8 units. The site is located to the north of Grantshouse. Part of the site is already located within the settlement boundary for Grantshouse, the western and a small area to the north area outwith the settlement boundary. As a result, it is considered that the site relates well to the existing settlement boundary and the expansion to the west would be in a logical extension to the settlement boundary.

Following consultation, the following constraints and mitigation were identified;

- Any development must give consideration to potential surface water runoff within the site;
- The site is located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Protect the existing boundary features;
- Mitigation for protected species including breeding birds;
- The Roads Planning Officer has no objections to the proposal, however direct access to the public road is acceptable in principle, but will be difficult to achieve engineering wise and any development will have to address traffic flow and site access issues imposed by existing on-street parking; and
- Contact Scottish Water regarding WWTW capacity.

There is existing housing on the south side of Mansefield, therefore the proposal for housing would be compatible with the surrounding land uses. There are no insurmountable planning constraints which would prevent the development of this site. The part of the site which is currently included within the settlement boundary, appears to be quite small to allow any housing development with current parking/access standards. Therefore, by increasing the site to the north and west, this allows the site to be developed, whilst ensuring that there is sufficient space to accommodate a new access and parking for the development. Overall, the site is considered acceptable for a housing development. In conclusion, the site will be taken forward for inclusion within the MIR, with an indicative site capacity for 8 units.

Greenlaw

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR status
BGREE005	Land South of Edinburgh Road	Greenlaw	Rest of Borders	Employment	N/A	1.2	Preferred

Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

Initial assessment summary

The site is not located within any international/national designation constraint.

SEPA: Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at increased risk of flooding.

There is a surface water hazard identified within the site.

Foul drainage from the site must be connected to the existing public foul sewer. Std comments for SUDS. Depending on the use of the proposed units there may be a requirement for permissions to be sought for certain activities from SEPA.

SBC COASTAL AND MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	On/Adjacent to site	Greenfield	LDP: MGREE001 - The site is allocated for mixed use development within the current LDP. The site currently has an indicative site capacity for 6 units. LPA & LDP: BGREE003 - Part of the this site was considered for business use previously, however not allocated as such.

Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Limited	Limited	Limited	Minor	South

Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Low biodiversity risk. Site appears to be an arable field with hedgerow and garden ground on part of the boundary. No obvious connectivity to River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including badger and breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site lies to the south west of Greenlaw and is currently allocated for mixed use development (MGREE001) within the Local Development Plan. There are bus services within Greenlaw, providing buses to Galashiels and Berwick-Upon-Tweed, both of which have Railway connections. There are limited services located within Greenlaw itself and it would be necessary to drive or take the bus to access a wider choice and range of these services. There is some employment land in Greenlaw to the north. Duns, Eyemouth and Coldstream currently provide greater employment opportunities. Duns is located 7 miles away and Kelso is located 9 miles away. The site is within walking distance of the centre of Greenlaw and is located on the edge of the settlement, opposite an allocated housing site.

Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area	Open space	Listed buildings	Scheduled Monument	Ancient woodland inventory	Archaeology	Garden and designed
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No comment on the proposed change of use.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: No response received. However, the site is an existing mixed use allocation and there are currently no site requirements proposed for archaeology mitigation at present.

Landscape assessment

NSA	SLA	Over 200 metres? <input type="checkbox"/>	Over 12 degree slope <input type="checkbox"/>	Wild Land
Not applicable	Not applicable			Not applicable

Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: This is a change of use of an existing allocation and we have no comment to make.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: Because of its very high visibility from the A6105 Earlston and the B6364 Kelso roads and from the A697 at the western gateway to Greenlaw, I would not be particularly comfortable with a housing allocation but I am very uneasy with the proposed allocation because of its potential to create highly visible 'industrial' character in an otherwise open rural area. There is little potential for effective screening too.

Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity	Near a trunk road? <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	--

NETWORK MANAGER: No response received.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I have no objections in principle to this land being zoned for business and industrial development. The junction arrangement with the A697 will have to allow for future upgrading to a more substantial junction if and when the land to the south of this site is developed. Similarly the development layout will need to allow for future street connectivity with the adjacent land. All of this can be covered in a Transport Statement. The existing street lighting, footway and 30 mph speed limit will have to be extended out from the village as appropriate.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No response received.

Right of way	TPOs	Contaminated land	Water supply	Sewerage	Gas Supply	Education provision
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Yes	Yes	No	Good

Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No real problems with the proposed change from mixed use to employment use. Adjoining uses are primarily residential in character and proposed use may have unacceptable adverse impacts on residential amenity. Access would appear to be achievable. There is a wider history to this proposal, principally in that this was the subject of a planning application a few years ago in relation to a housing proposal that was ultimately refused – I can supply details if necessary. The success of the appeal re the poultry farm site on Marchmont Road, has reduced the land that might otherwise have gone forward for business use, so this one is probably now in a stronger position.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. Depending on the flow demand for this development, will determine if a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Sufficient capacity at Rawburn WTW. Please note there is an existing 180mm water main running through the North edge of site. Depending on flow demand for this development, will determine if a Water Impact Assessment (WIA) is required.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the proposed development.

CONTAMINATED LAND: There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: It would be helpful to know whether there are longer term plans for additional housing to the south and south east of this site, to ensure a shared access road could be constructed and designed, to also allow further expansion of this business site in a sensible and planned way.

EDUCATION OFFICER: n/a

Overall assessment

MIR status

Preferred

Overall assessment

Acceptable

Site capacity

N/A

Conclusions

The site is currently allocated for mixed use development, within the Local Development Plan. The site is located within the defined settlement boundary of Greenlaw and has an indicative site capacity for 6 units. The proposal currently under consideration is to change this to a business & industrial allocation. This would result in the removal of the indicative site capacity for 6 units. It is considered that the site is prominent from the entrance to Greenlaw from the west, however this can be mitigated through landscaping and planting. Following consultation on this site, the following constraints were identified;

- Consideration must be given to surface water runoff;
- Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Protect and enhance existing boundary features;
- Assessment of ecology impacts and provision of mitigation, as appropriate;
- Potential Drainage Impact Assessment and Water Impact Assessment required;
- Transport Statement required; and
- Landscape Officer states the site is visible and would not be comfortable with such an allocation.

As part of the employment land working group, which feeds into the MIR process, a demand for business land within Greenlaw and the surrounding towns was identified. It is acknowledged that the site has an indicative site capacity for 6 units and this would be lost. However, there is a plentiful housing land supply currently within Greenlaw and via the housing options contained within the MIR. Furthermore, due to the restricted size of the site, it was considered that the site would be better developed for business and industrial purposes. It is important to have a business and industrial allocation site within the settlement, to provide opportunities to local people within the surrounding Greenlaw. Although the Landscape Officer does not support the allocation, it should be noted that the site is already allocated for mixed use development. It is considered that appropriate planting would provide screening. Therefore, taking the above into consideration, it is considered that the site will be included within the MIR as a preferred option.

Site reference AGREE008	Site name Halliburton Road	Settlement Greenlaw	RGA Rest of Borders	Proposed Use Housing	Indicative Capacity 40	Ha 3.4	MIR status Alternative
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	----------------------------------

Initial assessment

Floodrisk Not applicable	SAC Not applicable	SPA Not applicable	SSSI Not applicable	Ramsar Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any International/National designation.

SEPA: Based on OS Map there is sufficient height difference between site and the Blackadder Water. Due to steep topography through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff. There is potential fluvial risk of flooding adjacent to the site. There is the potential that the development of this site could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a Surface Water Hazard within the site.

The foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. Due to the size of the development the applicant should consider surface water runoff, drainage and SUDS. Drainage Impact Assessment/SUDS.

Background information

Minerals and coal Not applicable	NNR Not applicable	Prime Quality Agricultural Land On/Adjacent to site	Current use/s Greenfield	Planning history references Local Plan: (BG10D) - smaller site under consideration Local Plan Amendment: (AGREE002) - same site as under consideration Local Plan Amendment: (SGREE003) - same site as under consideration Local Development Plan: (SGREE003) - same site as under consideration Local Development Plan: (MGREE002) - same site as under consideration Housing SG: (AGREE008) - same site as under consideration
--	------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	---

Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport Limited	Access to employment Limited	Access to services Limited	Wider biodiversity impacts Minor	Site aspect South-west
--	--	--------------------------------------	--	----------------------------------

Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Low biodiversity impact. Site is arable field with hedgerow young plantation on boundary. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including badger and breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the west of Greenlaw and is currently identified as a longer term housing site, within the Local Development Plan. There are bus services within Greenlaw, providing buses to Galashiels and Berwick-Upon-Tweed, both of which have Railway connections. There are limited services located within Greenlaw and it would be necessary to drive or take the bus to access a wider choice and range of these services. There is some employment land in Greenlaw but this would be limited for providing local employment. Duns, Eyemouth and Coldstream would provide greater opportunities. Duns is located 7 miles away and Kelso is located 9 miles away. The site is within walking distance of the centre of Greenlaw and is located off a quiet road leading out of the settlement.

Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area

Not applicable

Open space

Not applicable

Listed buildings

Not applicable

Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

Archaeology

Adjacent to site

Garden and designed

Not applicable

Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: There are no known implications, although the known site of a medieval and later farmstead lies immediately to the north. Some mitigation may be required.

Landscape assessment

NSA

Not applicable

SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

Wild Land

Not applicable

Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: While the site is outwith the current settlement boundary as shown in the LDP, we note that it is included as a longer-term safeguard (SGREE003). If you are minded to support development of this site during the current plan period, further detailed assessment, particularly for the open space along the ridgeline, will be required.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No response received to date. However, the Landscape Officer was consulted on this site (AGREE008) as part of the Housing SG and offered the following comments. Due to the lack of fit with the existing settlement pattern of Greenlaw and the high visibility of this site in the view from several roads on approach, coupled with potential privacy issues to adjoining properties, it is recommended that this site is not taken forward.

Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Would need to extend existing 30mph limit.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding development of the site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: Direct vehicular access from the A697 (Edinburgh Road) is possible via the allocated housing site AGREE004. This will entail extending the footway out from the town on the north side of the A697 along with a slight extension of the 30 mph speed limit. This environmental change may have a positive influence on driver speeds on the main road. A right turn lane type junction may be required and visibility splays of 4.5m by 90m should be achievable. This can all be addressed in a supporting Transport Assessment.

The use of Halliburton Road as an additional means of vehicular access to the site, to help achieve good connectivity, should be explored. The junction of Halliburton Road with the A697 would ideally have to shift slightly to the west so that stacking traffic behind right turn traffic for Halliburton Road does not impact unduly on right turn traffic for Wester Row (A6105) and vice versa. The southerly boundary of the property known as '2 Edinburgh Road' would be directly affected by this, and by junction visibility requirements (4.5m by 90m). The carriageway of Halliburton Road would have to be widened and a footway provided as well as the extension of the 30 mph speed limit. Irrespective of vehicular connectivity with Halliburton Road, pedestrian/cycle linkage is essential.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

Right of way

Adjacent to site

TPOs

Not applicable

Contaminated land

Not applicable

Water supply

Yes

Sewerage

Yes

Gas Supply

No

Education provision

Good

Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. Further investigation such as Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Howden WTW has sufficient capacity and sufficient capacity in the network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Potential opportunity to improve pedestrian/cycle access into the village. Enhancement to existing path network would also be recommended. (2016 HSG Consultation).

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

Overall assessment**MIR status**

Alternative

Overall assessment

Acceptable

Site capacity

40

Conclusions

The site is currently identified as a longer term housing site within the LDP, therefore acceptable for housing. The site is close to the centre of Greenlaw and if sensitively designed would integrate well into the settlement. The site has limited access to public services and employment within Greenlaw, however there are employment and services available in nearby settlements, which can be accessed by car or bus. It is acknowledged that the site is quite prominent, however it is considered that the existing tree belt to the west screens the site on the approach road and additional landscaping would further mitigate visual impacts. Overall, there are no insurmountable planning constraints which would prevent development on this site. Through the consultation process, the following constraints and mitigation would be required for any development on the site;

- Surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue and require mitigation;
- The site is located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Potential for archaeology within the site, which would require appropriate mitigation;
- Careful design to ensure that the site is integrated into the rest of the settlement;
- Drainage Impact Assessment may be required in respect of WWTW;
- Protect and enhance existing boundary features;
- Assessment of ecology impacts and mitigation where appropriate;
- In respect of landscape capacity, there is an area of young woodland to the west of the site, with further arable land to the north;
- The site has potential to be prominent from certain angles, however the tree belt provides shelter from the western approach and the existing housing and planting screens part of the site from the south;
- The site provides opportunities for improved pedestrian/cycle access into the village and enhancement to the path network; and
- Transport Assessment would be required.

Overall, it is considered that the site would be acceptable for housing development, subject to mitigation in respect of the above constraints. There is already a large amount of un-developed established housing land supply within Greenlaw, totalling 113 units in the 2017 HLA, including 3 housing allocations (AGREE004, AGREE006 and BG200), although it is questionable how well these are being

advertised and promoted. Taking into consideration that there are no insurmountable constraints on this site, the site can be considered as a further alternative option for housing within the MIR.

Site reference AGREE009	Site name Poultry Farm	Settlement Greenlaw	RGA Rest of Borders	Proposed Use Housing	Indicative Capacity 38	Ha 2.3	MIR status Preferred
-----------------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	--------------------------------

Initial assessment

Floodrisk Not applicable	SAC Not applicable	SPA Not applicable	SSSI Not applicable	Ramsar Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designations.

SEPA: Should planning application differ from what was previously agreed we would require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Blackadder Water which flows to the south of the site. In addition there is a small watercourse which flows along the eastern perimeter of the site. There are bridges/culverts along the small watercourse which could potentially exacerbate flooding. Surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage.

This site is next door to the Greenlaw STW. This may give rise to odour issues.

There is the potential that development of this site could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. Surface Water Hazard identified within the site. Foul waste must connect to SW foul network.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The southern boundary of the site is at risk of flooding from the Blackadder Water at a 1 in 200 year flood event. The Officer would require that a Flood Risk Assessment is undertaken for this site.

Background information

Minerals and coal Not applicable	NNR Not applicable	Prime Quality Agricultural Land On/Adjacent to site	Current use/s Brownfield	Planning history references Planning application (16/01360/PPP) for residential development was refused planning consent in 2017. There remains an outstanding appeal with the DPEA for this application at the time of the site assessment. Housing SG: The site was considered for housing (AGREE007) and not included LDP: The site was considered for housing (AGREE007) and not included LDP2: The site is also being considered for mixed use development (MGREE004) as part of the MIR process
--	------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--

Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport Good	Access to employment Limited	Access to services Good	Wider biodiversity impacts Moderate	Site aspect South
---	--	-----------------------------------	---	-----------------------------

Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: The Ecology Officer did not respond to the consultation as part of the current MIR. However, the Officer provided comments for (MGREE004) which is also under consideration as part

of the MIR process. The Officer provided the following comments; 'Moderate biodiversity impact. Site includes poultry sheds and improved grassland, tall ruderal and scrub habitat. On the southern boundary within SEPA 1 in 200 year indicative flood risk area. Potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC via drains. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats, otter (EPS), badger and breeding birds. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC/SSSI. See also Planning Application 16/01360/PPP'.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the east of Greenlaw and is located outwith the settlement boundary. The land is currently brownfield and the site is a series of former poultry units. There are bus services within Greenlaw, providing buses to Galashiels and Berwick-Upon-Tweed, both of which have Railway connections. There are limited services located within Greenlaw and it would be necessary to drive or take the bus to access a wider choice and range of these services. There is some employment land in Greenlaw but this would be limited for providing local employment. Duns, Eyemouth and Coldstream would provide greater opportunities. Duns is located 7 miles away and Kelso is located 9 miles away. The site is within walking distance of the centre of Greenlaw and is located off a quiet road leading out of the settlement.

Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area

Not applicable

Open space

Not applicable

Listed buildings

Not applicable

Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

Archaeology

Not applicable

Garden and designed

Not applicable

Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE AND DESIGN: No specific comment.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any objections.

ARCHAEOLOGY: There is low potential within the site.

Landscape assessment

NSA

Not applicable

SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

Wild Land

Not applicable

Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to the location.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: The Landscape Officer did not respond to this site, however provided a response for (MGREE004) also under consideration and offered the following comments: 'This site could accommodate some level of mixed business and industrial use although would be equally good site for residential development. Perhaps the western end should be developed for housing and eastern half/third developed for small scale industrial use. The existing road and residential to the west preclude large scale business or industrial use'.

Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: May impact on location of 30 mph limit. Also need to consider existing access onto A697.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any objections to the proposed development.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: No objections in principle to this land being zoned for housing. Numerous access points are achievable along the northern boundary of the site. The existing public road will need widened to accommodate two-way traffic flow. Footways and street lighting infrastructure will also be required as part of the improvement works to the public road. A Transport Statement will be required.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comment.

Right of way

Adjacent to site

TPOs

Not applicable

Contaminated land

On/adjacent to site

Water supply

Yes

Sewerage

Yes

Gas Supply

No

Education provision

Good

Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: The site has a complex history, and I note the appeal pending a decision. The refusal was on the basis of the unacceptability of the unallocated site, which was positioned beyond the development boundary. My own view, setting aside the timing of any application or appeal, and looking solely at the merits of the site in isolation, as a possible allocation, is that the site itself could acceptably accommodate residential development at some stage in the future.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any objections.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Rawburn WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment (WIA) or Flow and Pressure test will be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS OFFICER: Potential to improve access to disused railway.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site is developed with a poultry farm. The site is brownfield and its former use may present development constraints.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No objections.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: This is a large allocation; it already has a business use on it and is close to the sewage works. Whilst we know little about the site history and servicing information, perhaps the eastern part of the site, which is flat, may be appropriate for employment use and consider the site is allocated for mixed use, if the appeal is approved.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

Overall assessment**MIR status**

Preferred

Overall assessment

Acceptable

Site capacity

38

Conclusions

The site was previously considered for housing as part of the Housing SG (AGREE007), however was not included within the Finalised Housing SG. The site was submitted for mixed use development, as part of the LDP2 MIR process (MGREE004). Further to this, a planning application (16/01360/PPP) was refused planning consent for housing in 2017 and subsequently granted at appeal. This site was originally coded as (RGREE001) and consulted on, however was changed to site code (AGREE009) throughout the process. Therefore, the consultation responses may refer to (RGREE001).

The site is directly adjacent to the existing settlement boundary therefore the site provides a logical extension to Greenlaw and would integrate well with the existing settlement. There are no insurmountable planning constraints regarding the development of this site. The site is brownfield land currently disused poultry units and the re-use of the site would be a benefit. However, through the consultation process, the following constraints were identified;

- Flood Risk Assessment is required for any development on this site;
- The site is located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC/SSSI;
- Protect boundary features;
- Mitigation for protected species;
- Potential for archaeology within the site;
- Transport Statement required;
- A number of access points are achievable along the northern boundary of the site;
- Potential for contamination, given the brownfield nature of the site;
- Early engagement with Scottish Water to ascertain whether a Drainage Impact Assessment in respect of WWTW; and

- Water Impact Assessment required, in respect of WTW.

The current proposal put forward by the land owner is for a residential development, with an indicative site capacity for 38 units. As stated above there are no insurmountable planning constraints to the development of this site. Furthermore, planning consent has been granted on appeal for housing on this site. Therefore, the principle of housing on this site has been established through the planning consent and the proposal will be included within the MIR as a preferred option for housing, with an indicative site capacity for 38 units. It is noted that the planning consent is only PPP with no specified capacity.

Reston

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR status
AREST005	Land east of West Reston	Reston	Eastern	Housing	5	0.4	Alternative

Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any International/National designation constraints.

SEPA: Sufficient height difference between the site and the Eye Water and lade. There is potential fluvial flood risk adjacent to the site.

Foul water must be connected to the existing sewer network. SW should confirm any capacity issues.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	Local Plan: (BR10D) - formed part of a much larger site which was considered Housing SG: (AREST002) - formed part of a much larger site which was considered

Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Good	Limited	Good	Minor	Not applicable

Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Site is an arable field with field margins, broad-leaved trees on eastern boundary. Possible connectivity with Eye water via surface water run-off. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds and protect waterbodies.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site has good access to the few local services provided within the settlement and the services located within Eyemouth nearby. It has good access to the public transport network and limited access to employment in Eyemouth and Berwick-Upon-Tweed.

Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area

Not applicable

Open space

Not applicable

Listed buildings

Not applicable

Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

Archaeology

On/adjacent to site

Garden and designed

Not applicable

Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: The site is within a field of high archaeological potential. Investigation will be required.

Landscape assessment

NSA

Not applicable

SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

Wild Land

Not applicable

Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment, existing allocation.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No constraints identified but site shape bears no relation to existing site features and is simply a diagonal strip within an existing arable field. It appears to be an extension to the existing allocation at BR5 although it does not exactly match? Recommend coordination with BR5 and allocation of a 10m planting strip along the north east (i.e. Mill House) boundary to retain separation from the existing track and provide, potentially some screening and shelter from the north east.

Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I have no objection to the extension to the existing allocation BR5 to include this land.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: I have no objection to the extension to the existing allocation BR5 to include this land.

Near a trunk road?

Right of way

Not applicable

TPOs

Not applicable

Contaminated land

Not applicable

Water supply

Yes

Sewerage

Yes

Gas Supply

No

Education provision

Good

Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No response received.

HOUSING STRATEGY: I have no objection to the extension to the existing allocation BR5 to include this land.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Reston WWTW has sufficient capacity and sufficient capacity in the network. Note that there are sewers slightly within site boundary.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Rawburn WTW has sufficient capacity and sufficient capacity in the network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS OFFICER: I have no objection to the extension to the existing allocation BR5 to include this land.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.
NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.
PROJECTS TEAM: I have no objection to the extension to the existing allocation BR5 to include this land.
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.
EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.
NHS: No response received.

Overall assessment

MIR status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Alternative	Acceptable	5

Conclusions

This proposal is for 5 housing units, which would effectively extend the existing housing allocation (BR5) to the west. The proposal would allow an additional 25 metres to the existing housing allocation (BR5) which would allow an improved layout for development. There are 3 existing housing allocations within Reston, contained within the LDP, these are (BR5 for 20 units; BR6 for 16 units and AREST004 for 38 units). The latter was most recently taken forward as part of the Housing SG in November 2017. There is an additional area for longer term housing identified within the LDP (SREST001). Furthermore there is an allocated mixed use allocation (MREST001) within the LDP, with an indicative capacity for 100 units. It is considered that there is sufficient un-developed land available within Reston including the recent allocation for 38 units (AREST004) as part of the Housing SG. However, notwithstanding that, the proposal intends to allow the expansion of an existing housing allocation, to better the proposed layout.

Further to the site assessment, the site does not have any insurmountable constraints to development. It should be noted that the following constraints were highlighted throughout the site assessment and would require suitable mitigation measures;

- Potential fluvial flooding risk adjacent to the site;
- Protect existing boundary features;
- Protect existing species including breeding birds and protected waterbodies; and
- There is potential archaeology within the site.

The development of this site would respect the existing settlement pattern, landscape setting and would not be highly visible from any of the approach roads. Therefore, taking the above into consideration, it is considered acceptable in this instance to recommend the inclusion of the site within the MIR for an additional 5 units. This would aid the delivery of the adjacent housing allocation (BR5), in line with the comments from the land owner.

Westruther

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR status
BWESR001	Land south west of Mansefield House	Westruther	Rest of Borders	Employment	N/A	0.8	Preferred

Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

Initial assessment summary

The site is not located within any International/National designation constraint.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourse adjacent to the site. Site is relatively flat and hydrology would appear complicated at site. Consideration should be given to bridge and culvert structures which may exacerbate flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. There is the potential that the development of this site could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a Surface Water Hazard identified within the site.

Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. There appears to be a drain partially culverted running along the northern boundary of the site. This should be protected and de-culverted if possible.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk

Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Brownfield	No planning application history. Local Plan: (BWE1) - this site formed part of a much larger site considered Local Plan: (BWE6) - this site formed a corner of a site previously considered LDP: (MWESR001) - this site formed part of a much larger site considered

Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Limited	Limited	Limited	Minor	Not applicable

Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Low biodiversity risk. Site appears to be rank improved with two metal roofed barns and broad-leaved trees on boundary. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected

species including breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the west of Westruther. There is limited public transport available within Westruther, however there is a local regular bus service to Duns. Therefore, car usage would likely be higher within Westruther. In terms of access to services and employment, these are currently limited within Westruther itself. Duns is located 11 miles away, where a greater selection of services and employment opportunities are available. Lauder is located 8 miles away and Coldstream 17 miles away.

Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area

Not applicable

Open space

Not applicable

Listed buildings

Not applicable

Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

Archaeology

Not applicable

Garden and designed

Not applicable

Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Appears in part to be brown field land, appears to have some potential for redevelopment.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding development on this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: There is some archaeological potential within undisturbed areas of the site, but as it has been built on this potential is low. Some form of mitigation may be required.

Landscape assessment

NSA

Not applicable

SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

Wild Land

Not applicable

Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to the size and location.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: It is not clear that an adequate access road can be provided to this site without significant impacts on narrow village roads and roadside trees and hedges and potential loss of amenity to associated housing, both existing and proposed. Business use also implies potential need for screening some of which is currently provided by trees in AWESR011 which may be removed?

Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I would observe on the 5 Westruther sites served by the road past the school collectively. These are Sites: AWESR002; AWESR010; AWESR011; AWESR012; and BWESR001. The standard of the road leading to these sites from the B6456 past the school is certainly not of a standard suitable for serving all of this development. I am happy to support some development, but the scale should be respectful of the village setting and the limitations of the road. Residential development should primarily front onto and focus on the main service road leading to the sites from the village centre and to a lesser extent Edgar Road. Employment land can be behind and to the west of any residential development and I would not expect any uses which would be HGV intensive. There is a real opportunity for creating a village street feel on the existing public road adjacent to Sites 002, 010 & 011. A strong street frontage will be required as will carriageway widening and footway provision. Existing drainage and street lighting infrastructure will likely need to be adjusted to suit. Development should also front onto Edgar Road and a footway will be required on the north side of Edgar Road as will proper vehicle turning provision for Edgar Road traffic. Provision for vehicles passing needs to be improved on the existing public road on the stretch adjacent to and west of the school. Consideration should be given to defining a pedestrian strip in the road between the school and the village pub. A Transport Assessment, or at least a Transport Statement, would be required to address accessibility and sustainable transport.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Did not raise any concerns regarding development on this site.

Right of way

Not applicable

TPOs

Not applicable

Contaminated land

On/adjacent to site

Water supply

Limited

Sewerage

Limited

Gas Supply

No

Education provision**Planning & infrastructure summary**

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Questioned whether there is demand for such an allocation, who was proposing the allocation, is there an intended occupier.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with SW is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. There is a sewer within the site. There is sufficient capacity in the network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. A flow and pressure test is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have formed part of a site developed with structures understood to be associated with commercial poultry rearing. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: We believe small settlements, such as Westruther, can benefit from a small allocation of employment/business land for a mix of uses. The site appears to be currently, or previously, used for poultry production so has an existing business use. Any redevelopment may have a need to investigate improvements to the road network, which is not ideal for a more intense use, but this perhaps could be tied to any housing land approval on, say, the adjacent AWESR010, 011 or 002 housing allocations.

Overall assessment**MIR status**

Preferred

Overall assessment

Acceptable

Site capacity

N/A

Conclusions

The site was submitted for consideration, as part of the 'Call for Sites' process, for a business and industrial allocation. The land is brownfield and was previously used for game rearing/sheds. Westruther has limited access to public transport, employment and services. However, there is a local regular bus service to Duns. Duns is located 11 miles away, where a greater selection of services and employment opportunities are available. There are currently no business and industrial allocations within Westruther. Further to the site assessment, the following constraints were highlighted, however are acceptable subject to appropriate mitigation measures;

- Flood Risk Assessment is required, to ascertain the flood risk from the small watercourse adjacent to the site;
- There is potential for breeding birds and protected species within the site;
- Existing boundary features should be protected, where possible;
- The site is brownfield land, therefore potential contamination may be present;
- Early engagement with Scottish Water regarding the WWTW and WTW network capacities; and
- Potential archaeology within this site.

Further to the above, the Roads Planning Officer advised that a Transport Statement would be required for any development and raised no objections regarding the proposal.

There are currently no business and industrial allocations within Westruther. Economic Development stated in their response that small settlements, such as Westruther, can benefit from a small allocation of employment/business land for mix of uses. There are no insurmountable constraints to the development of this site for business and industrial land. Furthermore, the allocation of such a use on brownfield land is considered to be a more sustainable approach, in comparison to allocating a greenfield site. In conclusion, the site will be taken forward for inclusion within the MIR as a preferred option for business and industrial land, subject to site requirements.

Site reference AWESR002	Site name Edgar Road	Settlement Westruther	RGA Rest of Borders	Proposed Use Housing	Indicative Capacity 10	Ha 0.4	MIR status Preferred
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	--------------------------------

Initial assessment

Floodrisk Not applicable	SAC Not applicable	SPA Not applicable	SSSI Not applicable	Ramsar Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

Initial assessment summary

The site is not located within any International/National designation constraints.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourse adjacent to the site. Site is relatively flat and hydrology would appear complicated at site. Consideration should be given to bridge and culvert structures which may exacerbate flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Potential development of allocation could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a Surface Water Hazard identified within the site.

Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

Background information

Minerals and coal Not applicable	NNR Not applicable	Prime Quality Agricultural Land Not applicable	Current use/s Greenfield	Planning history references 07/01957/OUT: Erection of 6 affordable houses (refused consent) 14/01324/PPP: Demolition of derelict building and erection of dwellinghouse (approved) extant planning consent until June 2018. No detailed planning consent submitted to date. 15/00576/AGN: Formation of agricultural access track (No objection) Local Plan: (BEW2), part of a much larger site which was considered Local Plan: (BEW9), a smaller corner of the current site under consideration LDP: (AWESR007), smaller part of the site currently under consideration LPA: (AWESR002), exact same site as currently under consideration
--	------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--

Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport Limited	Access to employment Limited	Access to services Limited	Wider biodiversity impacts Moderate	Site aspect Not applicable
--	--	--------------------------------------	---	--------------------------------------

Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Site appears to be improved grassland with tree and hedgerow on the boundary. Existing stone-built, slate-roofed built structure has some potential to support bats (EPS) and

breeding birds. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including potentially bats (EPS) and breeding birds

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the north of Westruther. There is limited public transport available within Westruther, however there is a local regular bus to Duns. Therefore, car usage would likely be higher within Westruther. In terms of access to services and employment, these are currently limited within Westruther itself. Duns is located 11 miles away, where a greater selection of services and employment opportunities are available. Lauder is only 8 miles away and Coldstream 17 miles away.

Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area

Not applicable

Open space

Not applicable

Listed buildings

Not applicable

Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

Archaeology

Adjacent to site

Garden and designed

Not applicable

Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Some potential for redevelopment.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: While there are no known archaeological sites within the proposed LDP area, there are a number of records for prehistoric features in the surrounding area. Additionally, the site is within an area where evidence of medieval settlement is a possibility. A requirement for evaluation is likely.

Landscape assessment

NSA

Not applicable

SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

Wild Land

Not applicable

Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to the size and location.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No major constraints identified but mature beech tree on southern, boundary beside Edgar Road looks worthy of retention (either by identifying in site brief or by TPO?). Also mature hedge along west boundary should be retained to give some separation between housing and the road.

Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I would observe on the 5 Westruther sites served by the road past the school collectively. These are Sites: AWESR002; AWESR010; AWESR011; AWESR012; and BWESR001. The standard of the road leading to these sites from the B6456 past the school is certainly not of a standard suitable for serving all of this development. I am happy to support some development, but the scale should be respectful of the village setting and the limitations of the road. Residential development should primarily front onto and focus on the main service road leading to the sites from the village centre and to a lesser extent Edgar Road. Employment land can be behind and to the west of any residential development and I would not expect any uses which would be HGV intensive. There is a real opportunity for creating a village street feel on the existing public road adjacent to Sites 002, 010 & 011. A strong street frontage will be required as will carriageway widening and footway provision. Existing drainage and street lighting infrastructure will likely need to be adjusted to suit. Development should also front onto Edgar Road and a footway will be required on the north side of Edgar Road as will proper vehicle turning provision for Edgar Road traffic. Provision for vehicles passing needs to be improved on the existing public road on the stretch adjacent to and west of the school. Consideration should be given to defining a pedestrian strip in the road between the school and the village pub. A Transport Assessment, or at least a Transport Statement, would be required to address accessibility and sustainable transport.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

Right of way	TPOs	Contaminated land	Water supply	Sewerage	Gas Supply	Education provision
Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	Yes	Yes	No	Good

Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Could work well; mature trees to the south of the site should be accommodated and clarification on the access point.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with SW is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. It should be noted that there is a sewer within the site. Sufficient capacity in the network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. A flow and pressure test is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Potential to improve local path network.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped with the exception of apparent residential dwellings to the south of the subject site. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

EDUCATION OFFICER: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

NHS: No response received.

Overall assessment

MIR status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Preferred	Acceptable	10

Conclusions

The site was submitted for consideration, as part of the 'Call for Sites' process, for a housing allocation of 10 units. Westruther has limited access to public transport, employment and services. However, there is a local regular bus service to Duns. Therefore, car usage would likely be higher within Westruther. Duns is located 11 miles away, where a greater selection of services and employment opportunities are available. Further to the site assessment, the following constraints were highlighted, however are acceptable subject to appropriate mitigation measures;

- Flood Risk Assessment is required, to ascertain the flood risk from the small watercourse adjacent to the site;
- There is potential for breeding birds and protected species within the site;
- Existing boundary features should be protected;
- Early engagement with Scottish Water regarding the WWTW and WTW network capacities;
- Potential archaeology within this site; and
- Mature beech tree on southern boundary and mature hedge along west boundary should be retained.

Further to the above, the Roads Planning Officer advised that a Transport Statement would be required for any development. Potential access would be from Edgar Road and/or from the minor road to the west. There is an opportunity to enhance turning, parking and pedestrian connectivity along Edgar Road.

There is currently 1 allocation for housing within Westruther for 5 units. Taking the above into consideration and the fact there are no insurmountable constraints to the development of housing on this site, it is considered that the proposal would provide an opportunity for an additional housing site. This would provide a range of housing opportunities within smaller settlements, such as Westruther. Therefore, the site will be included within the MIR as a preferred option for housing. It should be noted that there are a number of other housing allocations proposed by the landowner. However, it is considered that (AWESR002) would be sufficient for the LDP2 period, along with the proposed business & industrial site, also put forward by the landowner (BWESR001). Together they provide housing and employment opportunities within a smaller settlement within the Berwickshire area.

Central HMA

Ancrum

Site reference AANCR002	Site name Dick's Croft II	Settlement Ancrum	RGA Central	Proposed Use Housing	Indicative Capacity 60	Ha 3.2	MIR status Alternative
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	----------------------------------

Initial assessment

Floodrisk Not applicable	SAC Not applicable	SPA Not applicable	SSSI Not applicable	Ramsar Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

Initial assessment summary

There are no initial constraints on the site which would preclude it from being developed.

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is outwith both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. I would, however, ask that due to the size of the development that surface water flooding is considered and it is ensured that any water would be routed around the housing.

SEPA: Due to steep topography adjacent/ through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and the proposed development is not affected by surface runoff. There is a surface water hazard identified within the site.

Background information

Minerals and coal Not applicable	NNR Not applicable	Prime Quality Agricultural Land On site	Current use/s Greenfield	Planning history references There is no relevant planning history on the site. It should be noted that this site was considered as an 'alternative' option as part of the Draft Housing Supplementary Guidance and further to public consultation, the site was included within the Finalised SG on Housing. The site was later excluded from the adopted Housing SG 2017.
--	------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	---

Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport Good	Access to employment Limited	Access to services Good	Wider biodiversity impacts Minor	Site aspect South-west
---	--	-----------------------------------	--	----------------------------------

Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Low impact biodiversity risk. Site is improved pasture with hedgerow, trees and garden ground on boundary. No obvious connectivity to River Tweed SAC (Ale Water). Protect trees and boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: There are local village services in Ancrum. These include a primary school, bar, shop and post office, and local facilities including village hall, church, and bowling club. Other services and employment opportunities are located four miles away in Jedburgh. Four bus routes serve the village: 20 - Hawick - Jedburgh; 51 - Jedburgh - Edinburgh; 68 - Jedburgh - Galashiels.

Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area	Open space	Listed buildings	Scheduled Monument	Ancient woodland inventory	Archaeology	Garden and designed
Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable

Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY: In an area of archaeological potential. May require evaluation.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Lies just outwith the conservation area, development of the site should take account of the potential impact on the conservation area.

HES: No comments.

NHS: No comments received.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is currently a pasture field surrounded by hedgerows, with some deciduous trees to the north-west. C class roads envelop the site on its northern, eastern, and southern boundaries and would provide access, although widening would be required. It is located just south of the village primary school and just west of a very recent housing development which has taken quite some time to develop and has provided a relatively substantial increase in the size of the village. Given Ancrum's size and character, another allocation - particularly of 60 units - would have a substantial cumulative impact.

Landscape assessment

NSA	SLA	Over 200 metres? <input type="checkbox"/>	Over 12 degree slope <input type="checkbox"/>	Wild Land
Not applicable	On site			Not applicable

Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: Relatively straight forward site for development without any major issues to be addressed. The character of existing detached houses at Dick's Croft might be best served by continuing this style of development along the northern end of the site (see plan) accessed separately from the lane at the Loaning with denser housing on the flatter lower ground on the main part of the site. Retention of existing hedgerows on boundaries supplemented by some new planting is desirable to relate development to its rural setting.

SNH: From our response of 03 August 2016: This site lies outwith the current settlement boundary as shown in the LDP and is within a Special Landscape Area. If you are minded to support development of this site during the current plan period, further detailed assessment will be required. Given the site's location within a Special Landscape Area we recommend that this assessment includes landscape capacity for development and careful consideration of the site boundary, the landscape and visual impact mitigation and the site design. Subject to the conclusions of any detailed capacity assessment we would advise that any proposed allocation in this location should be supported by a site development brief.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is affected by significant sloping and the northern half of the site would have a significant visual impact, in terms of views from the south and west, given its prominent position. Development would most likely require the widening of the C road running north-south on the western approach to Ancrum, this would also require the removal of hedgerows which currently provide a landscape buffer to the west of the village. This development would add to the very recent western expansion of Ancrum, and in landscape terms would have a detrimental cumulative impact.

Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Will impact on existing 30 mph limit.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: This site has been looked at previously and I have no objections in principle to this land being allocated for housing. The majority of traffic would access the site via South Myrescroft but the pinch point in the road at the north corner would require to be looked at in more detail in terms of localised widening to accommodate the increase in pedestrian footfall and vehicular movements. The existing roads bounding the site will need to be widened to cater for two way traffic flow and to provide 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 adjacent Myrescroft development should also be incorporated into any proposal. Vehicular access is acceptable from all existing roads adjacent to the site and a strong street frontage onto these roads is recommended. A Transport Assessment will be required for the site.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No concerns regarding the development of this site.

Right of way

Adjacent to site

TPOs

Not applicable

Contaminated land

Not applicable

Water supply

Yes

Sewerage

Yes

Gas Supply

Yes

Education provision

Good

Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Connectivity footways are required to the school, village centres and path to Ale Water to the south of the site. Pedestrian linkage to the footpath along the north western edge of the new Myrescroft development should also be incorporated.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Eildon Housing Association 'potential pipeline' site for 12 houses

EDUCATION: No issues.

SCOTTISH WATER - Waste: Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. Sufficient capacity in the network. Water: Robertson WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment will be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SEPA: Foul must connect to the existing SW foul network. It is likely that for a development of this size and upgrade may be required to the existing STW. SW should confirm.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Road widening would likely require the loss of hedgrows which at present provide quite a solid western boundary to the village. Would have an appreciable impact on the setting of the village.

Overall assessment

MIR status

Alternative

Overall assessment

Acceptable

Site capacity

60

Conclusions

Overall the site is assessed as acceptable however it should be noted the site is within a Special Landscape Area and careful consideration must be given to boundary treatments, the landscape and visual impact mitigation as well as the site design. Due to recent development within Ancrum consideration should be given to the scale of the proposal and its effect on the size of the settlement and the character

of the village and its Conservation Area. Allocation of this site would increase pressure on services since the previous housing allocation has only recently been completed and further discussions would need to be held with Scottish Water in relation to wastewater treatment as the development is required to connect to the existing Scottish Water foul network.

Structure planting to the south and west would be required to reduce visual impact from the countryside and create an edge to the settlement. Existing hedgerows would need to be retained or improved where possible. Mitigation measures are required to prevent any impact on the River Tweed SAC. Mitigation measures are also required in relation to the impact of surface water runoff from nearby hills and this should be considered during the design stage.

Vehicular access is acceptable from all existing roads adjacent to the site and a strong street frontage onto these roads is recommended. A pedestrian linkage to the footpath along the north western edge of the new Myrescroft development should also be incorporated into any proposal. It is also important that there is connectivity from the site to the village centre for both pedestrians and cyclists.

The development at Myrescroft to the north east of this site confirmed that there was a healthy market for house purchasers within Ancrum. Consequently this proposal could be considered to be effective and there is an interested developer associated with the site. However care must be taken to ensure any new development does not saturate the village within a relatively short period of time.

Scottish Water has confirmed that there is sufficient capacity. SG assessment raises the possibility that land will be required to safeguard for education provision, implying an education capacity problem.

While there are no absolute constraints, given the issue of cumulative impact on the character of the village, the site should only be included in the MIR as an 'alternative' site. At this point in time the village should be given time to adapt to the relatively recent large scale development of Myrescroft although the site may be included in a future Local Development Plan. For these reasons, the site has been identified only as an alternative if required.

Crailing

Site reference ACRAI004	Site name Crailing Toll (Larger Site)	Settlement Crailing	RGA Central	Proposed Use Housing	Indicative Capacity 5	Ha 1.2	MIR status Alternative
-----------------------------------	---	-------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	----------------------------------

Initial assessment

Floodrisk Not applicable	SAC Not applicable	SPA Not applicable	SSSI Not applicable	Ramsar Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

Initial assessment summary

There are no major issues at this initial assessment stage. Part of this site is allocated within the Consolidated Local Plan.

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site lies out with the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extent. I would have no objections to this development on the grounds of flood risk.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourse which would appear to be culverted either through or immediately adjacent to the site. We do not support development over culverts that are to remain active.

Background information

Minerals and coal Not applicable	NNR Not applicable	Prime Quality Agricultural Land On site	Current use/s Greenfield	Planning history references 99/00897/OUT - Erection of a dwellinghouse (Refused) The site was considered through the process of the Housing SG 2017 but was rejected (ACRAI004).
--	------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	---

Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport Limited	Access to employment Limited	Access to services Limited	Wider biodiversity impacts Moderate	Site aspect South-west
--	--	--------------------------------------	---	----------------------------------

Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Moderate biodiversity risk. Site is improved pasture with some mature broad-leaved trees and garden ground on boundary. Potential connectivity with the River Tweed SAC (Oxnam water) via drain. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC (Oxnam water). Protect boundary trees and features and mitigation for protected species including bats and breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Crailing is a hamlet with a limited bus service. It relies on nearby Jedburgh for services. Mitigation measures would be required to prevent any impact on the River Tweed SAC.

Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area

Not applicable

Open space

Not applicable

Listed buildings

Not applicable

Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

Archaeology

Not applicable

Garden and designed

Not applicable

Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY: The site formerly contained a farm steading and is at the edge of the medieval village. Archaeological evaluation is required.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific comment

HES: No comments.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Site is relatively large in relation to the existing settlement and there remains an undeveloped allocated site in the existing LDP.

Landscape assessment

NSA

Not applicable

SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

Wild Land

Not applicable

Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: The site would benefit from some landscape structure planting along the south eastern boundary to help screen road and reduce road noise from site. Care will be needed to ensure structure planting does not shade development in the longer term.

SNH: No comment due to size and location of the site.

Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Additional properties will add to traffic using existing less-than-ideal junction with A698. Visibility out is okay but fast section of road and potential for nose to tail shunts for right-turning traffic as no dedicated right turn lane.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: I have no objections to this site being developed for housing although access would have to be via the adjacent approved site (ACRAI001) and not directly off the A698.

Right of way

Not applicable

TPOs

Not applicable

Contaminated land

Not applicable

Water supply

Yes

Sewerage

No

Gas Supply

No

Education provision

Average

Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND: An area of the site appears to have been previously developed with agricultural buildings. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Connecting pathways/pavements between the East and West of the site requested for options for pedestrian access around the village.

EDUCATION: No issues.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER - Waste: No waste infrastructure in the area. Water: Robertson WTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the network

SEPA: There is no SW foul sewer network in this location. Consideration should be given to first time sewerage for this village to include the existing and proposed development site. Failing that private drainage would need to be provided with discharge to the Oxnam water (as opposed to the small burn). There may be a culvert running through or close to the site boundary - opportunities should be taken to de-culvert.

Overall assessment

MIR status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Alternative	Acceptable	5

Conclusions

There are no specific issues which would rule out development. There is a reliance on septic tanks in Crailing. SEPA have stated that consideration should be given to first time sewerage for this village to include the existing and proposed development site. If a WWT connection was not provided, SEPA have stated that overflow would have to be diverted to Oxnam Water not the small burn nearby. SEPA have not objected, either have Scottish Water, but there would be a need to ensure no impact on the River Tweed SAC (the Oxnam Water is covered by the SAC).

Crailing has the existing undeveloped allocated housing site for 5 units which forms part of this site. The landowner has stated that the additional allocation would make the existing site more marketable. However, no specific information has been provided to support this. Moreover, the scale of any allocation needs to be carefully considered with attention to the size of the existing settlement. It is considered that this site should have an indicative capacity of 5 units.

(The site was originally plotted as ACRAI003. Part of ACRAI003 is already allocated as ACRAI001 for 5 units. The site boundaries were therefore reduced and a new code was created - ACRAI004).

Darnick

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR status
ADARN005	Land south of Darnlee	Darnick	Central	Housing	10	0.8	Preferred

Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is outwith both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. Would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

SEPA: No comments in respect of flood risk.

Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	No planning application history.

Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Good	Good	Good	Moderate	Not applicable

Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site is improved pasture with mature broad-leaved trees on boundary/within site. Potential for EPS (bats). No obvious connectivity with the River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Protect boundary trees and features and mitigation for protected species including bats and breeding birds.

Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area	Open space	Listed buildings	Scheduled Monument	Ancient woodland inventory	Archaeology	Garden and designed
On site	On site	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	On site	Not applicable

Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: The site is within the Inventory Battlefield of Darnick. Mitigation is likely. Consideration of impacts to the setting of the battlefield is needed.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: The site is to the south of Darnlee, a category B listed building and lies within the Darnick conservation area. Whilst there may be some scope for a very small scale, well designed development on the southern boundary, it is considered that development of all of the proposed site would have an adverse impact on the setting of Darnlee and adversely impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: No comments.

Landscape assessment

NSA

On site

SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

Wild Land

Not applicable

Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: 10-12 units given constraint of existing trees on site.

Scottish Natural Heritage: Wish to ensure that if this site is to be allocated within and adjacent to the NSA that a site brief is produced to identify the key natural heritage assets of the site to be protected and the key opportunities for the integration of green infrastructure within future development. The majority of the site lies within the Eildon & Leaderfoot Hills NSA. The site also forms an important context for, and a gateway to, Darnick. Its location within the NSA means that high standard design will be required. Key issues for a site brief are likely to include:

- Retention of key boundary features, including the existing wall and fence, woodland along the western boundary and mature trees along southern and eastern boundaries;
- Integration of the site with Broomilees Road, maintaining landscape character and sense of scale and place of this area with dwellings relating to both the parkland and the street.

Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: New junction required off existing Broomlees Road.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING: Not opposed in principle to this land being allocated for residential development. The site stacks up well in terms of sustainable transport with good opportunities for pedestrian and cycle connectivity with Melrose and Galashiels. The site is well served by public transport with a bus service close at hand and railway station nearby. Vehicular access is possible off the main road into Darnick on the east side of the site, but there is an issue to be addressed here as part of any development. The stretch of road here is used extensively for on-street parking for the village. Any road junction in this location would not work safely with this on-street parking remaining as junction visibility splay standards would not be met. Displacement parking would have to be provided in the site. Alternatively, it may be possible to upgrade the existing access serving Darnlee as a means of serving the site and introducing some lay-by parking in the main road. A supplementary vehicular access is also possible off Broomlees and this would help with street connectivity. This would entail widening Broomlees Road between the mature trees and may offer scope for a one-way traffic system over the initial narrow length of Broomlees Road. Strong street frontages are recommended and allowance for future street connectivity would be required. A Transport Statement can address the issues raised.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No comments.

Right of way

Adjacent to site

TPOs

Not applicable

Contaminated land

Not applicable

Water supply

Yes

Sewerage

Yes

Gas Supply

Yes

Education provision

Good

Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Safe route for non-vehicular access would be strongly advised from this site to existing pavements and, therefore, the core path network.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Attractive area of parkland within the village associated with the Listed Building, within the Conservation Area; Archaeological/battlefield implications; Potential impact on trees; Need structure planting/buffer between site and Listed Building; Some limited development of a high quality may be appropriate.

EDUCATION: No objections.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. A Flow and Pressure test is likely to be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. A Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing Scottish Water foul network.

Overall assessment

MIR status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Preferred	Acceptable	10

Conclusions

The site is considered to represent a suitable infill development within the settlement of Darnick.

The existing woodland belt along the western boundary of the site as well as specimen trees along the southern boundary would require to be retained where possible. The developable area of the site would be established by the route protection areas of existing trees. Consideration would require to be given to how best to create separation along the northern boundary of the site to ensure the integrity of the setting of Darnlee is maintained.

Existing boundary features (including the existing stone wall and fencing) would require to be retained as much as possible.

On-street parking is currently an issue on Abbotsford Road. Main access would be from Abbotsford Road with a potential link into Broomilees Road which in turn may result in localised improvements. This would require to be addressed through any development of this site.

Any development would require to be of a high quality in order to safeguard the character and setting of the conservation area, the B listed Darnlee and the Inventory Battlefield. The relationship of development with the parkland and the street would require to be well considered. Due to the sensitivity of the site, it is considered that a Planning Brief would be required.

There is undeveloped land to the west of the site which may, in the future, offer an opportunity for future development. Access from the site in question would therefore require to be considered along with improvements to Broomilees Road as suggested by the Roads Officer.

Denholm

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR status
ADENH006	Land south east of Thorncroft	Denholm	Central	Housing	12	0.6	Preferred

Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is outwith both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. However, there is a ditch running through the grounds that has come close to flooding property in the past. This has, to our knowledge, not spilled onto this field but would still require a Flood Risk Assessment to show the risk to this development. At present, SBC Flood Team are considering work such as culverting this ditch.

SEPA: Require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourses which flow along the boundary of the site. These watercourses then enter a FPS which will require careful consideration to ensure there is no increase in flood risk due to site development. The study undertaken by JBA indicates that part of the site is at risk of flooding but it does not appear to fully modelled the adjacent watercourse. Consideration will need to be given to any culverts/ bridges which may exacerbate flood risk. Site may be constrained due to flood risk. Due to steep topography through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff.

Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Combination	No relevant planning application history.

Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Good	Good	Good	Moderate	Not applicable

Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site is improved pasture with hedgerow and trees on boundary. Potential for EPS (bats) and breeding birds to use built structures within the site. No obvious connectivity with the River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Protect boundary trees and features and mitigation for protected species including bats and breeding birds.

Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area

Not applicable

Open space

Not applicable

Listed buildings

Not applicable

Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

Archaeology

Not applicable

Garden and designed

Not applicable

Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There are no known archaeological issues.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: No comments.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: No comments.

Landscape assessment

NSA

Not applicable

SLA

Adjacent to site

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

Wild Land

Not applicable

Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: 10 – 12no taking account narrowness of site and RPAs of adjacent field boundary trees.

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to size and location.

Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGEMENT: Creation of a new junction onto the A698.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Consider relocation of bus stop, provision of shelter.

ROADS PLANNING: Not opposed to development on this site. Access via the A698 will require the demolition of some existing outbuildings, but satisfactory access can be achieved. An acceptable revised parking arrangement would be required for the existing dwellinghouse (Thorncroft). The linear nature of the site limits potential internal street connectivity; however there may be the possibility of a link to Ruberslaw Road via the vacant plot within that development. This would require 3rd party discussions. If this site is allocated, any site layout would have to allow for future links to the land along the eastern boundary. The existing infrastructure along the A698 would have to be extended into the development site.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No comments.

Right of way

Not applicable

TPOs

Not applicable

Contaminated land

On site

Water supply

Yes

Sewerage

Yes

Gas Supply

No

Education provision

Good

Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: An area of the site appears to have been previously developed with buildings, possibly of commercial/ industrial use. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: If possible a pedestrian link to Ruberslaw Road would allow pedestrian access to Core path 01 avoiding the A698.

EDUCATION: No objections.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Robertson WTW has sufficient capacity. There is a 6" water main running across the South side of the site. There is also a 4" water main north of site. Sufficient capacity in the network. Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. There is a foul and surface water sewers running through the middle of the site. Sufficient capacity in the network for foul only connection.

Overall assessment

MIR status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Preferred	Acceptable	12

Conclusions

The site is considered to offer an appropriate opportunity for infill development within the settlement boundary of Denholm. Consideration will require to be given to the residential amenity of existing properties within the immediate vicinity. The Roads Officer has confirmed that an acceptable access is achievable from the A698, this would require removal of some existing outbuildings. These would require investigation for potential contamination.

The Council's Flood and Coastal Management Team and the Scottish Environment Protection Agency have requested that a Flood Risk Assessment be undertaken in relation to a ditch running through the grounds that has come close to flooding property in the past. Consideration is currently being given to culverting this ditch. The site would require careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and the proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff.

Eckford

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR status
AECKF002	Land at the Black Barn	Eckford	Central	Housing	10	1.1	Alternative

Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

Initial assessment summary

There are no initial constraints on the site which would preclude it from being developed.

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

SEPA: Review of OS Map indicates a potentially culverted watercourse along the eastern boundary of the site. We would recommend that this is investigated as part of an FRA. We do not support development over culverts that are to remain active.

Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	On site	Buildings	97/00580/OUT - Residential development 97/00617/COU - Change of use of land from agriculture to garden ground

Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Poor	Poor	Poor	Moderate	Not applicable

Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site appears to be arable field and improved pasture with hedgerow on boundary and trees and scrub within site. Possible potential for EPS (bats) and breeding birds to use built structures within the site. No obvious connectivity with the River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Protect boundary features and trees, mitigation for protected species including bats and breeding birds

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located on the south-eastern edge of the small village of Eckford. In terms of accessibility it scores poorly. There are no key services in Eckford.

Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area

Adjacent to site

Open space

Not applicable

Listed buildings

Not applicable

Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

Archaeology

Not applicable

Garden and designed

Not applicable

Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY: There are no known archaeological issues. However, the site is in close proximity to the known location of medieval Eckford and some evidence for this may exist in the site. Also, the existing building is on the site of an early 19th century farmstead evidence of which may also exist. Mitigation may be required.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific comment.

HES: No comments.

Landscape assessment

NSA

Not applicable

SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

Wild Land

Not applicable

Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: Given the existing density and pattern of development in Eckford, capacity is likely to be 6-8 units. To alleviate the restricted nature of the existing access track, an additional strip of the field alongside the established woodland strip next to the access track could be included in the site and planted up with trees. This would allow the removal of the existing tree belt. Any removal of hedges on either side of the track should be replaced outwith the visibility splays.

SNH: No comment due to size and location.

Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: No comments.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: I am not opposed in principle to this land being allocated for housing. The main road through the village already benefits from street lighting provision, but lacks provision for pedestrians. If this site is to be allocated for housing then footway provision between the site access and the crossroads in the village at 'Tower Cottage' should be a consideration. A length of road side hedging is likely to have to be removed in order to achieve suitable junction visibility.

Near a trunk road?

Right of way

Not applicable

TPOs

Not applicable

Contaminated land

Not applicable

Water supply

Yes

Sewerage

No

Gas Supply

No

Education provision

Average

Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND: An area of the site appears to have been previously developed with a building, possibly of commercial/ industrial use. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Connecting path suitable for walkers cyclists from road through site and on to North East corner of site to allow future link for footpath network to link site to Loaning local path network. Section of wide verge required at entrance of site into the public road for pedestrian use.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: History of refusal and appeal, 97/00580/OUT. Suggest a development brief is required. Again private waste water systems are currently being used in development boundary, 17/00032/FUL.

EDUCATION: No comments.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER - Waste: No sewers within the area. Water: Roberton WTW has sufficient capacity. A Flow and Pressure test is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. This may require to be upgraded to accommodate this development.

Overall assessment

MIR status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Alternative	Acceptable	10

Conclusions

The proposal involves the demolition of an agricultural barn/shed currently situated outside the settlement and its replacement with housing. In addition to this, housing would be allocated on fields that currently surround the shed and the village. The landowner's proposal suggests a new settlement boundary enveloping the site with 5+ houses to be developed. Technically the site could accommodate up to 10 units. The site is partly enveloped by existing buildings to the north, west, and south. There are no absolute constraints ruling out development. However, Eckford is a village without basic services. There is no WWT available, so private sewerage would be required. It is a very small village and development of the whole site, although small, would still be relatively significant.

This site should not be preferred for development but could be included only as an alternative site should a higher level of housing land be required as per SESPlan.

Ednam

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR status
AEDNA011	Cliftonhill (v)	Ednam	Rest of Borders	Housing	15	1.3	Alternative

Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
1:200	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

Initial assessment summary

There are no initial constraints on the site which would preclude it from being developed.

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourse which flows adjacent to the site and enters the Eden Water. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map and steep topography indicates that there may be flooding issues at this site or immediately adjacent. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff.

Note: Surface water flood map is offset from burn suggesting an error within the flood map.

Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	On site	Greenfield	99/00957/OUT - Residential Development Refused, Appeal Dismissed. 01/00782/OUT - Residential Development Refused. 04/02140/OUT - Residential Development Refused.
				Site has been considered as part of previous LDP processes (site NE of War Memorial). The Reporter concluded that once the allocated site (AEDNA002) is fully developed "the preferred area for future period of this Local Plan (2011), if required, will be to the east side of the village".

Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Limited	Limited	Limited	Moderate	Not applicable

Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Moderate biodiversity risk. Site an arable field with lowland mixed deciduous woodland and hedgerow on boundary. Potential connectivity with the River Tweed SAC via drainage to the Eden water. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC. Mitigation for protected species including bats, badger and breeding birds.

SNH: No comments received

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located in the centre of Ednam, close to the crossroads and the bus shelter. Ednam has a bus service to Kelso and Berwick and is only 2.5 miles from Kelso. The site slopes towards the crossroads but sits higher than the centre of the village. The village has a post office, village hall and a primary school. Mitigation would be required to prevent any impacts on Eden water.

Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area	Open space	Listed buildings	Scheduled Monument	Ancient woodland inventory	Archaeology	Garden and designed
Not applicable	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	On/adjacent to site	Not applicable	On/adjacent to site	Not applicable

Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY: Historic mapping (General Roy 1750s, Stobie 1770) shows this area as containing the earlier village core to the east of the burn. Mitigation is likely.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No comments received

HES: No comments.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located close to the centre of the small village. Boundary is provided to the south by heavy hedgrows which run along the road towards Milburn. There is heavy vegetation on the western border which separates the site from the village on this side. The northern section of the site would take development up the Duns road in quite a prominent position and in quite a linear form. The Old Smiddy is a C listed building, but any impact would be low. Archaeological interests in the southern half of the site which would required mitigation.

Landscape assessment

NSA	SLA	Over 200 metres? <input type="checkbox"/>	Over 12 degree slope <input type="checkbox"/>	Wild Land
Not applicable	Not applicable			Not applicable

Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: No fundamental concerns but eastern boundary looks very arbitrary and does not relate to any features on the ground. One consequence of that is that the northern end is so narrow that it is probably undevelopable. It would be desirable to retain all the existing woodland that is outside the site on the west side and this implies a buffer zone of at least 10m along that side. This will affect the developable area. Presumably access would have to come off the SW corner which would affect the amenity of the Ednam to Cliftonhill road and would need to avoid impacting on the War Memorial and the Old Smithy opposite which is all quite tight and awkward.

SNH: No comment due to size and location.

General comments: This is quite a large site but the landscape impact is relatively limited. The site is partly screened by heavy hedgrows and vegetation on the west and south sides. The south-western part of the site slopes steadily towards the crossroads and this reduces landscape impact on a large portion of the site. However, roads requirements for widening of the C-class road on the south of the site might significantly reduce the hedgerow/vegetation on the south side of the site.

Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity	Near a trunk road? <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	--

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

NETWORK MANAGER: Access off single track road and then junction with limited visibility onto B Class Road.

ROADS PLANNING SERVICE: I am able to support this site for residential development on the basis of provision of suitable pedestrian and street lighting connectivity with the rest of the village and the carriageway of the minor public road to the south being widened to 5.5m. Frontage development along the minor public road is highly desirable; however this will require significant engineering works given the difference in level. It should be noted that the shape of the site under consideration does not bode well in terms of a potential layout; however a link through to Eden Park should be considered which would benefit the site. A strip of housing adjacent to the existing public road may be more in-keeping with the form of the village and the lie of the land.

Right of way

Not applicable

TPOs

Not applicable

Contaminated land

Not applicable

Water supply

Yes

Sewerage

Yes

Gas Supply

Yes

Education provision

Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: No comment.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Potential coalescence of Cliftonhill and Ednam.

EDUCATION: No issues.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER - Waste: Kelso WwTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the network. Water: Robertson WTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the network.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. The pump station at Ednam may require to be upgraded to account for the proposed developments. SW should confirm.

OVERALL SUMMARY: No major planning and infrastructure constraints. However, there are roads issues on this site. The road to the south is a single track road, which will require widening, and there are visibility issues on the B-road (Duns Road). Each of these could be resolved.

Overall assessment

MIR status

Alternative

Overall assessment

Acceptable

Site capacity

15

Conclusions

If this site was to be allocated, it would be important to incorporate landscaping to resist further development to the north east and coalescence with Milburn and Cliftonhill Farm. The minor road to the south of the site requires widening for access. This will mean a reduction in the hedgerow screening. Level differences from the site to the minor road means major engineering required in order to achieve desirable development frontage along the southern section of the site, avoiding a layout that turns its back on the village. That said, as much of the hedgerow as possible would need to be retained on the southern boundary. On balance appears a more complex site to bring up to appropriate roads access standards than others.

There are no significant constraints affecting the site although there is already an allocated site in this small village and it is considered there are better options available. The site could be considered as an 'alternative' in the MIR.

Site reference AEDNA013	Site name Land north of Primary School	Settlement Ednam	RGA Rest of Borders	Proposed Use Housing	Indicative Capacity 20	Ha 1.4	MIR status Alternative
-----------------------------------	--	----------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	----------------------------------

Initial assessment

Floodrisk Not applicable	SAC Not applicable	SPA Not applicable	SSSI Not applicable	Ramsar Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

Initial assessment summary

There are no initial constraints on the site which would preclude it from being developed.

SEPA: No detailed comments on flood risk.

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is outwith both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. Due to the size of the development I would recommend surface water runoff be considered.

Background information

Minerals and coal Not applicable	NNR Not applicable	Prime Quality Agricultural Land On site	Current use/s Greenfield	Planning history references 01/00782/OUT - Residential development (refused) 04/02140/OUT - Residential development (refused) 99/00957/OUT - Residential development (refused)
--	------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--

Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport Limited	Access to employment Limited	Access to services Limited	Wider biodiversity impacts Minor	Site aspect Not applicable
--	--	--------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------

Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Low impact. Site is an arable field with hedgerow, garden ground and amenity ground on boundary. No obvious connectivity with the River Tweed SAC. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Ednam has a bus service to Kelso and Berwick and is only 2.5 miles from Kelso. The village does have a post office, village hall and a primary school. The site has low impact in terms of biodiversity risk. There is already an existing allocation in Ednam.

Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area Not applicable	Open space Adjacent to site	Listed buildings Not applicable	Scheduled Monument Not applicable	Ancient woodland inventory Not applicable	Archaeology Not applicable	Garden and designed Not applicable
--	---------------------------------------	---	---	---	--------------------------------------	--

Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Site lies on the approach to the village form Ednam; boundary treatments and connections (both physical and visual) to the settlement will be important issues.

ARCHAEOLOGY: There are no known archaeological issues.

HES: No comments.

Landscape assessment

NSA

Not applicable

SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

Wild Land

Not applicable

Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: 20-25no houses, if density of adjacent Eden Park was reflected in any proposed development.(and if additional land was included to ensure required structure planting was achievable. A belt of structure planting to the north boundary would create shelter from northerly winds and act as visual containment.

SNH: We recommend that if this site is to be allocated that a site brief is produced to identify the key natural heritage assets of the site to be protected and the key opportunities for the integration of green infrastructure within future development. Our advice on this site is based on prior knowledge and desktop assessment using GIS and streetview. We may provide further advice based on a site visit if the potential allocation is carried forward. The current settlement statement in LDP1 states that further expansion of Ednam would be to the north and east. This potential allocation conforms to those placemaking considerations. However, a site brief is still required if potential adverse effects on setting and character of the existing settlement are to be avoided through the promotion of a design led planning approach.

Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Impact on existing 30 mph limit if new access onto B Road. Access off Stichill Road less of an impact but will increase volume through more restricted section of village.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Possible bus stop infrastructure.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I am able to recommend in favour of this land being allocated for development. The street lighting and footway infrastructure in the village will have to be extended along the main road as appropriate and a modest extension of the 30 mph speed limit is likely to be required. Access should be taken from both the B6461 and the minor public road to the south west to allow a connected street network to develop. A strong street frontage onto the B6461 will create a sense of arrival from the north and will help justify a shifting of the 30 mph speed limit. Depending on the scale of development a Transport Statement may be required.

Right of way

Not applicable

TPOs

Not applicable

Contaminated land

Not applicable

Water supply

Yes

Sewerage

Yes

Gas Supply

Yes

Education provision

Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: No comment.

EDUCATION: No issues.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER - Waste: Kelso WwTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the network. Water: Robertson WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. The pump station at Ednam may require to be upgraded to account for the proposed developments. SW should confirm.

Overall assessment

MIR status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Alternative	Acceptable	20

Conclusions

The proposed site is capable of being developed. There are no restrictions that rule out development. This site is in quite a prominent position to the north of the settlement, on slightly raised ground, overlooking Ednam. It could be integrated with the settlement with appropriate layout and design, connectivity, and boundary treatment. Could be considered as an 'alternative site in the MIR' as it is considered there are more preferable site options.

Galashiels

Site reference BGALA006	Site name Land at Winston Road I	Settlement Galashiels	RGA Central	Proposed Use Employment	Indicative Capacity N/A	Ha 2.5	MIR status Preferred
-----------------------------------	--	---------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	--------------------------------

Initial assessment

Floodrisk Not applicable	SAC Adjacent to site	SPA Not applicable	SSSI Adjacent to site	Ramsar Not applicable
------------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------

Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The site is not shown to be at flood risk within the SEPA 1 in 200 year flood map. Small areas of the site are anticipated to be affected by surface water runoff and this site is relatively steep so it would be expected that the applicant shows how this would be mitigated.

SEPA: SEPA have post flood survey levels for nearby area after the 2005 flood event. A flood level of 92.86mAOD recorded 30m downstream of bridge on right bank. SEPA require a FRA which assesses the risk from the River Tweed. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.

Background information

Minerals and coal Not applicable	NNR Not applicable	Prime Quality Agricultural Land Not applicable	Current use/s Brownfield	Planning history references There are no planning applications of interest. The site was considered through the process of the Housing SG 2017 (RGALA003 & RGALA005) but was excluded.
--	------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--

Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport Good	Access to employment Good	Access to services Good	Wider biodiversity impacts Moderate	Site aspect South
---	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	---	-----------------------------

Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGICAL OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site consists of sheds/ abattoir and areas of scrub and tall ruderal vegetation. Potential for EPS (bats) and breeding birds to use built structures within the site. Potential connectivity with the adjacent River Tweed SAC/SSSI via drainage. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC. Mitigation for protected species including bats, badger and breeding birds.

SNH: SNH responded and advised the following; From previous response of 03 August 2016, for allocation references RGALA003 and RGALA005: This site is for re-development of an abattoir and a former refuse tip. The proximity of the former refuse tip site (RGALA003) to the River Tweed SAC means that assessment and mitigation of impacts on the SAC will be required. It is not clear what the site requirement "there is moderate biodiversity risk associated with the site which must be given due consideration" refers to. As related site requirements refer to potential for protected species to be present, the supplementary guidance should make clear the need for survey. Further advice on survey is available on our website: <http://www.snh.gov.uk/protecting-scotlands-nature/protected-species/your-responsibilities/developers-and-builders/>.

Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area

Not applicable

Open space

Not applicable

Listed buildings

Adjacent to site

Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

Archaeology

Not applicable

Garden and designed

Not applicable

Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There are no known archaeological issues.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: Brownfield land in part, appears to have some potential for redevelopment.

HES: No comments.

Landscape assessment

NSA

Not applicable

SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

Wild Land

Not applicable

Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: No comments received although the following comments were received during the process of the Housing SG which remain relevant:

Fairly level site in elevated location above River Tweed with gently rising ground to N and steep bank down to river on SE side. Site elevation is around 105-110m AOD. Following the closure of the abattoir the site has lain empty and become overgrown. It is 'brownfield' land. To the north of site is Scottish Power Substation and storage yard, with field extending from site boundary up the side of Winston Road and along Melrose Road as far as garage. Line of conifers separating ex-abattoir site from field and storage yard to north. Railway running along base of bank at southern side. Steep partially tree clad bank along east side. Site separated from Winston Rd by line of conifers. 2 attractive deciduous trees in verge to outside of western site boundary. 3/4 mature oak near top of slope down to railway track near SW corner of site and a mature sycamore further to east on same banking. 2 mature sycamores on or just outside SE corner at top of Steeply sloping bank down to Tweed. Trees outside and inside northern boundary adjacent to substation. Overhead HV powerlines on various sizes of pylons overrunning site in SE and SW directions. Attractive views out over Tweed with Eildon Hills beyond. Existing trees have value for birds and invertebrates. Potential for woodland restoration on steep slopes to River Tweed and on slope overlooking railway. (The abattoir has now been demolished from the site).

Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Need to consider impact on existing road network, particularly junction of Winston Road and Melrose Road.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comment.

ROADS PLANNING: No objections in principle to the regeneration of this site. There needs to be two public road access points from Winston Road into the site and a strong frontage onto Winston Road is recommended. A footway on the east side of Winston Road from Melrose Road to the road bridge over the railway line will be required and pedestrian crossing points will be needed in Winston Road, the locations of which can be determined through a Transport Assessment for the site.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No comment.

Right of way

Not applicable

TPOs

Not applicable

Contaminated land

On site

Water supply

Yes

Sewerage

Yes

Gas Supply

Yes

Education provision

Good

Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site was quarried and subsequently used as a refuse tip. Part of the site was developed as an Abattoir. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Non-vehicular access to existing pavements required.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: To some extent, it is a more comfortable fit to have this site designated for industrial use, given its closest neighbours to north and south and past abattoir use. The same flooding/ecological constraints would apply. Impacts on residents opposite would need accounted for, however, if both land uses are to avoid conflict.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Whilst this is generally an existing employment land site, its redevelopment to modern standards may be economically challenging due to the apparent problems with the site - o/h power lines, potential contamination, demolition costs, remediation of tip, etc. However, if no other employment land can be identified in the town, this may well be an important allocation.

HEALTH AND SAFETY EXECUTIVE: Require to be consulted.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. "Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the Wtw. Note there is a surface water sewer running through the site.

SEPA: Foul must connect to SW foul network. The site is close to the River Tweed however is elevated above river level. Care should be taken not to damage the river banking as part of any development. This site is located immediately adjacent to the Gala STW (CAR and WML licence). Odour is likely to be problematic from the STW. A suitable buffer should be provided in line with SPP requirements between the licensed sites and the proposed development. This is likely to impact the developable area available.

Overall assessment**MIR status**

Preferred

Overall assessment

Acceptable

Site capacity

N/A

Conclusions

Given the former uses which occupied the site, namely an abattoir and refuse site it is considered that the principle of the use of this site for business and industrial development is acceptable in principle. The residential amenity of the neighbouring residential properties must be considered, however, it is noted that alternative uses to those that existed previously can only offer an improvement. There are limited business and industrial sites in Galashiels and it is considered that this site, albeit with constraints, brings an opportunity forward. It might be possible on the potentially contaminated parts of the site that a use could be implemented that would require minimal groundworks required. Given the nature of this proposed allocation and the identified constraints, including O/H powerlines, odour from sewage works, potential contamination, it is not considered that this site is suitable to accommodate an element of housing.

A Flood Risk Assessment would be required and there is moderate biodiversity risk. Assessment 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.

Site reference AGALA029	Site name Netherbarns	Settlement Galashiels	RGA Central	Proposed Use Housing	Indicative Capacity 45	Ha 7.3	MIR status Alternative
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	----------------------------------

Initial assessment

Floodrisk Not applicable	SAC Adjacent to site	SPA Not applicable	SSSI Adjacent to site	Ramsar Not applicable
------------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------

Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The site is not shown to be at flood risk within the SEPA 1 in 200 year flood map. Small areas of the site are anticipated to be affected by surface water runoff and this site is relatively steep so would expect the applicant to consider this as well as drainage and SUDS.

SEPA: Require an FRA which assesses the risk from the River Tweed. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map and steep topography nearby indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff.

Background information

Minerals and coal Not applicable	NNR Not applicable	Prime Quality Agricultural Land Not applicable	Current use/s Greenfield	Planning history references 04/00706/FUL - Erection of seventy nine dwellinghouse (refused by the Scottish Ministers after they had called it in). This site was considered during the Local Plan Inquiry 2006 (EGL2B) and at the recent Local Development Plan Examination 2016 . The Reporter's recommendation at both was for the site to be removed from the Local Plan/LDP.
--	------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	---

Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport Good	Access to employment Good	Access to services Good	Wider biodiversity impacts Moderate	Site aspect South-west
---	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	---	----------------------------------

Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGICAL OFFICER: Moderate risk – Potential connectivity with River Tweed SAC/SSSI through drainage. Site separated from River Tweed by minor road and disused railway/broad-leaved woodland strip. Mitigation required to ensure no significant adverse effects on integrity of River Tweed SAC. Within site- improved field boundary features of tree line and within site old hedgerow. Protect boundary features, mitigation required e.g. badger and breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site has good access to local services and facilities and employment in the settlement. The settlement is on the A7(T) and A6091(T) and the strategic public transport network.

Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area

Not applicable

Open space

Not applicable

Listed buildings

Adjacent to site

Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

Archaeology

Not applicable

Garden and designed

Adjacent to site

Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There are no known archaeological issues.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: Previously commented on the potential of this site back in 2016. This site lies opposite category A listed Abbotsford House but is screened in part by existing trees along the riverside and the former railway line and is set down below the level of the A7 and more recent housing development. The key issue is to avoid having an adverse impact on the setting of Abbotsford House. There is potentially some scope for limited development on this site, which may require the reinforcement of the planting to the east. Careful attention would be needed to the external colours of any development to minimise its impact.

HES: Setting of LB15104 Abbotsford House and GDL00001 Abbotsford House. Content with the principle of development for 45 units here, on the basis that site development will be brought forward via a masterplan which will ensure that the detail of scale and detailed views analysis, amongst other things, can be considered. HES would wish to be consulted on these details and others as the masterplanning process develops. The Abbotsford Trust have recently commissioned a landscape management plan for the Abbotsford estate. The plan's proposals may involve reopening of historic views from house and estate, which may take in this site. This will also need to be taken into account in the development of the masterplan. HES note that further information has been provided in relation to landscape and visuals since the Housing SG, and recommend that if this site is considered to be a reasonable alternative, these should be made available to inform the Main Issues Report consultation and assessment.

GENERAL COMMENTS: This site was considered in the Local Plan Inquiry and at the recent Local Development Plan Examination. The Garden and Designed Landscape lies to the south east of the site. The Reporters' assessment was that the site should not be developed because of the adverse impact on the setting of the A Listed Abbotsford House and its Garden and Designed Landscape. However, Historic Scotland have now removed their objection to some form of development on the site. The setting of the listed footbridge to the NE of the site and Netherbarns farmhouse, steading and stables to the west of the site should also be taken into consideration.

Landscape assessment

NSA

Not applicable

SLA

Adjacent to site

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

Wild Land

Not applicable

Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: This site has previously been discounted as suitable for development given its proximity to and potential impact on Abbotsford Designed Landscape which is regarded as of national importance. Potential adverse impacts on views from the DL are a major constraint. However, retention of existing (TPO) tree cover will provide a reasonable degree of mitigation (although not entirely in winter). The Landscape Architect previously stated that 'the most sensitive development scenario would be to restrict new development to the lower SE parts of the site avoiding the higher areas which cannot be effectively screened from the DL, at least until further planting has been established.' The recently submitted Landscape and Visual Appraisal in support of the site being allocated suggests with photomontages that the upper field and part of the lower field of the site are suitable for development, given the screening from the intervening trees. Before allocating the site we should require further visual assessment carried out in the winter months to test the conclusions of the recent appraisal. The supporting information lacks any assessment of the tree resource - a Tree Survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment should be part of the information provided to support the allocation and to establish a realistic 'developable area'. It is clear if this site is allocated the protected trees along the south eastern boundary will be critical in protecting the core area of Abbotsford Designed Landscape from visual intrusion and a long term retention and management programme will have to be an intrinsic part of any such allocation. Any development at this location on the edge of site would have to take into consideration SPG 'Placemaking and Design' to establish the correct built form and density.

On receipt of further photo montages from the Agent, the Landscape Architect made the following comments: The Year 15 photomontages show less visibility of existing and proposed housing than the year 1 photomontages, as additional evergreen tree planting is proposed on site. Any gaps that develop in the existing mature tree screen will open up views to the existing and proposed housing opposite. It will be crucial that:

1. The existing mature tree belt is retained and regenerated.
2. Additional screen tree planting along the SW boundary of the site is additional to the existing tree belt.

SNH: This site lies outwith the current settlement boundary as shown in the LDP. SNH understand that the site was included as an allocation in the Proposed Plan but, in their report of examination, the Reporter recommended its deletion. This recommendation was based partly on landscape impacts. SNH is not aware of a potential solution that should change that decision.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is also visible from the stretches of the A7(T) and the Southern Upland Way immediately adjacent to the site. There is a semi mature/ mature tree belt south of the site and young tree belts in the middle of the site and along the A7 (T). There are also mature trees along the fringe of the site. There is a small hillock in the north west of the site. There are small areas of steep slopes in the SW of the site and along its SE fringe. The impact on the Garden and Designed Landscape is also a constraint on landscape capacity.

Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: No comments.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: The A7 immediately adjacent to the site has the benefit of: street lighting and a 40mph speed limit; a footway for pedestrians, including a crossing island in the main road; and public transport provision by way of bus lay-bys and shelters. The existing road junction serving Kingsknowe Drive, which would also serve this site, has the benefit of a right turn lane on the A7 to assist with traffic flow on the main road. As such, much of the transport infrastructure required to serve this site is already in place. A Transport Assessment would be required to address any adjustments/upgrades required to accommodate the increase in traffic associated with the site, particularly at the junction with the A7/Kingsknowe Drive. With the A7 being a Trunk Road, Transport Scotland would observe on the impact on the A7, adjacent to and in the proximity of the site, including any speed reducing measures to be addressed. The design of any development would have to take significant cognisance of pedestrians and cyclists including external links with the surrounding infrastructure. All matters considered, supportive of the principle of development on this site from a transport perspective.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: AGALA029 / 38 / 39 or 06 – The potential cumulative impact of these 3 housing sites, which total 559 units, or 2 housing sites and a business and industry development, would be required to be determined with appropriate and deliverable mitigation measures identified for the trunk road network.

Right of way

Adjacent to site

TPOs

Not applicable

Contaminated land

Adjacent to site

Water supply

Yes

Sewerage

Yes

Gas Supply

Yes

Education provision

Good

Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained largely undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed with the exception of railway running lines along the eastern boundary. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS: Connecting paths to core path 189 (Southern Upland Way) and existing pavements required.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: There are positive elements in the landscape framework/design concept. Sections through the site would be helpful to better understand topographical relationships, particularly the lower area of housing which may appear somewhat detached from the higher section. I would query the value/purpose of the open space that would remain (it appears more left over than an integral space within the residential development, and perhaps may benefit from more substantial woodland creation). I would also query the capacity to develop what remains and still provide the level of tree protection and new tree cover. There is also potentially a general lack of connectivity within the development that the linear form of layout would lead to. I would also voice concern that PD rights be removed from the development, which would be akin to applying a Conservation Area level of regulation which I would suggest would be unnecessary. If the layout has the right landscape containment; is of appropriate scale, form, palette; and based on public fronts/private backs and designing streets concepts, then this additional tier of control should not be necessary, or at least should be minimised. Overall, a well-designed development, with good levels of landscaping at its heart, can be devised, but I think the current proposals here will require more detailed scrutiny and further thought.

EDUCATION: Extension or new school may need to be considered.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network.

Overall assessment

MIR status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Alternative	Acceptable	45

Conclusions

This site has a detailed planning history and has previously been removed from the LDP following Examination by Reporters. This has primarily been in relation to perceived detrimental impacts on the setting and views from Abbotsford House. When considering sites which have been submitted via the call for sites process, which have a detailed planning history, consideration must be given as to any proposed new mitigation matters which have been submitted as part of the proposal. In this instance the plans confirm further screening of the site would be carried out. These proposals confirm the site will not be visible from Abbotsford House during the Summer months and in the Winter months (when Abbotsford House is closed to the public) photomontages have shown that only fleeting views of very small parts of the site could be seen, but proposed housing (i.e. this would be a low density development of 45 units) would not be located within these visible locations. The site is well screened from the A7 and does not interfere at all with any views towards Abbotsford House. The Blueprint for the Railway requires the Council to maximise economic benefits along the railway corridor and finding housing land in Galashiels is a major element of that requirement. Finding housing land in Galashiels is a major challenge given a number of constraints within the town in terms of for example access, flood risk and topography. Officers continue to feel this site remains the best option for new development in the town. It is fully acknowledged that Abbotsford House will continue to have a key role in attracting tourists to the central Scottish Borders and any proposal which is considered to prejudice this position must be thoroughly investigated. However, it is considered any impacts from Abbotsford House will be negligible and the proposal can be incorporated within the MIR for public opinion.

Hawick

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR status
BHAWI003	Gala Law II	Hawick	Central	Employment	N/A	0.6	Preferred

Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is outwith both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. No objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

SEPA: Due to steep topography through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff.

Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	There is no history of planning applications. The site is currently allocated within the LDP 2016 as part of a mixed use site (MHAWI001).

Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Good	Good	Good	Moderate	Not applicable

Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site appears to be dense scrub, poor semi-improved grassland and mature broadleaf trees/ garden ground. No obvious connectivity to River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats, badger and breeding birds (0.64ha)

Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area	Open space	Listed buildings	Scheduled Monument	Ancient woodland inventory	Archaeology	Garden and designed
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable

Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: Advised verbally that there is potential for archaeology within the site. Archaeology evaluation/mitigation required.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: No comments.

HES: No comments.

Landscape assessment

NSA

Not applicable

SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

Wild Land

Not applicable

Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: Site is visually well contained and access is good so no issues in principle. The mature trees at the south western end of the site have an important screening function and might be better protected by removing that area from the allocation (unless separately covered in a site development brief)? There could be issues in relation to tree protection / developable area where the site adjoins mature woodland on the south east boundary also.

Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

ROADS OFFICER: No objections to the allocation of this land for business and industrial use. It is noted that the land is currently zoned for mixed use development. This site will essentially be an extension to the existing business and industrial units at Gala Law. As such the existing infrastructure will need to be extended to incorporate this site. Any development of this land must not preclude access to the remainder of the mixed use site (MHAWI001). A Transport Statement will be required.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No objections.

Right of way

On/adjacent to site

TPOs

Adjacent to site

Contaminated land

On/adjacent to site

Water supply

Limited

Sewerage

Yes

Gas Supply

Yes

Education provision

Good

Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have been utilised as land associated with Galalaw Farm and includes a sheepwash. The site is brownfield land and its use may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Track HAWI/GL003/1 forms part of the path network in this area and therefore a pavement or other access route providing non-vehicular access along the North edge of the site is required.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Excepting the need for attention to trees, this would be a logical extension to the existing business/industrial land provision within the area.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: The northern site boundary of this allocation needs to be amended and reduced by around 2-3m. The plot was reduced and a new fence erected to allow a vehicular and pedestrian right of access through to additional land to the west. In addition, the SW corner of the site should also be included as it is defined by the boundary ownership with the private house.

EDUCATION: No comments.

HOUSING STRATEGY: No objections.

SEPA: Foul drainage from the development must be connected to the existing SW foul sewer network. Standard comments for SUDS. Depending on the use of the proposed units there may be a requirement for permissions to be sought for certain activities from SEPA.

SCOTTISH WATER: Robertson WTW has sufficient capacity. Please note there is an existing 180mm water main running through the middle of the site. Depending on flow demand for this development, will determine if a Water Impact assessment is required. Hawick WwTW has sufficient capacity. Please note there is existing foul and surface water sewers running along the North of site. Depending on the flow demand for this development, will determine if a Drainage Impact assessment is required.

Overall assessment

MIR status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Preferred	Acceptable	N/A

Conclusions

The Council's Economic Development Section has highlighted a need for sufficient employment land in Hawick. This is particularly pertinent at this time as funding is available in the forthcoming years from the South of Scotland Economic Partnership as a forerunner to a regional enterprise agency being launched in 2020. Economic Development identified this site as a possibility. The land is currently allocated for mixed use purposes (part of MHAWI001), however, the site represents a logical extension of the existing business and industrial land to the west.

The following issues would require to be addressed during the process of an planning application:

- Consideration is required to be given to surface water
- Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats, badger and breeding birds
- Existing trees to be protected and retained
- A Transport Statement is required. Development must not preclude access to site MHAWI001.
- Potential contamination to be investigated and mitigated
- Footpath link along the northern edge of site is required
- Water and Drainage Impact Assessments may be required
- A water main runs through the middle of the site
- Archaeology evaluation/mitigation required

Overall, it is considered that given the location of this site immediately adjacent to the existing business and industrial site that this site is appropriate for consideration through the Main Issues Report.

Site reference BHAWI004	Site name Land to South of Burnhead	Settlement Hawick	RGA Central	Proposed Use Employment	Indicative Capacity N/A	Ha 5.1	MIR status Preferred
-----------------------------------	---	-----------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	--------------------------------

Initial assessment

Floodrisk 1:200	SAC Not applicable	SPA Not applicable	SSSI Not applicable	Ramsar Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is outwith both the fluvial (river) 1 in 200 year flood extents but there is a very small pocket of potential surface water impacts on the North Western side of the site at a 1 in 200 year flood event. No objections on the grounds of flood risk. However, would ask that due to surface water risk and the size of the development that surface water flooding is considered and it is ensured that any water would be routed around the housing.

SEPA: There does appear to be a surface water/ combined drains through the site but no evidence of a culverted watercourse can be found. Due to steep topography through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff.

Background information

Minerals and coal Not applicable	NNR Not applicable	Prime Quality Agricultural Land Not applicable	Current use/s Greenfield	Planning history references There is no planning application history for this site. The site was assessed as part of the Local Plan Amendment for housing (AHAWI004).
--	------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	---

Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport Good	Access to employment Good	Access to services Good	Wider biodiversity impacts Moderate	Site aspect Not applicable
---	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	---	--------------------------------------

Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site appears to be an arable field with hedgerow, garden ground and mature broadleaf trees on part of boundary. No obvious connectivity to River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats, badger and breeding birds. SEPA CAR construction site licence required (site >4ha) (5.08ha).

Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area Not applicable	Open space Adjacent to site	Listed buildings Adjacent to site	Scheduled Monument Not applicable	Ancient woodland inventory Not applicable	Archaeology On/adjacent to site	Garden and designed Not applicable
--	---------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	--

Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: Advised verbally that there is potential for archaeology within the site. Archaeology evaluation/mitigation required.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: As previously flagged, the site lies close to Burnhead Tower, a category B listed tower house. The proposed development may have an impact on its setting, especially if larger buildings are proposed but this can probably be addressed through mitigation.

HES: No comments.

Landscape assessment

NSA

Not applicable

SLA

On/adjacent to site

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

Wild Land

Not applicable

Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: Site is included within the Teviot Valleys SLA. It is also highly visible from the A7 Galalaw roundabout close to the direction of view towards Rubers Law. This makes it very sensitive to visual intrusion and does not suggest industrial use. Well-designed housing with ample structure planting would be a more acceptable option.

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: We note that a planning brief in the form of Supplementary Guidance is proposed for nearby allocations at BHAWI001 and BHAWI002. The principles established in this planning brief, such as integrating site planning with other allocations and infrastructure should also apply to this site, ensuring green network connections between allocations and existing areas. This is a prominent site for large scale buildings of the type likely for business/industrial use. The rolling topography perhaps does not easily lend itself to the proposed use. Therefore, development of it could have significant landscape and visual impacts, experienced particularly on the important approach to Hawick from the north. The challenging nature of the site suggests it would benefit from a strategic approach to development layout and landscape mitigation. Design approaches which could reduce impacts include guidance on scale and massing of buildings in prominent positions on the site, the colour and detailing of external appearance and measures needed to provide a landscape framework / green network connections.

Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: Vehicular access to this site is easily achievable from the B6359 (Lilliesleaf road). The Roads Officer is therefore able to support the proposal for a Business and Industrial allocation for the land. The B6359, beyond the Henderson Road junction, will have to be upgraded in terms of width, footway provision and street lighting and a 30mph speed limit is likely to be required. The site can fully integrate with the existing residential streets to the south by way of possible links to Boonraw Road, Galalaw Road and Burnhead Road. A Transport Statement will be required.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No objections.

Right of way

Not applicable

TPOs

Not applicable

Contaminated land

Not applicable

Water supply

Yes

Sewerage

Yes

Gas Supply

Yes

Education provision

Good

Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Track HAWI/GL003/1 forms part of the path network in this area and therefore a pavement or other access route providing non-vehicular access along the North edge of the site is required. Opportunity to create better pedestrian/cycling access along the B6359 and also to provide connectivity to the A7 and the rest of Burnfoot and the wider path network.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: This site would be suitable for housing or business and industrial land. It is perhaps unfortunate that the identified housing allocation to the west would essentially end up

sandwiched between two industrial areas. This site – BHAWI004 – also appears to be a relatively contained site.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: No objections.

EDUCATION: No comments.

SEPA: Foul drainage from the development must be connected to the existing SW foul sewer network. Std comments for SUDS. Depending on the use of the proposed units there may be a requirement for permissions to be sought for certain activities from SEPA.

SCOTTISH WATER: Roberton WTW has sufficient capacity. Please note there is an existing 180mm water main running through the middle of the site. Depending on flow demand for this development, will determine if a Water Impact assessment is required. Hawick WwTW has sufficient capacity. Please note there is existing foul and surface water sewers running along the North of site. Depending on the flow demand for this development, will determine if a Drainage Impact assessment is required.

HOUSING STRATEGY: No objections.

Overall assessment

MIR status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Preferred	Acceptable	N/A

Conclusions

The Council's Economic Development Section has highlighted a need for sufficient employment land in Hawick. This is particularly pertinent at this time as funding is available in the forthcoming years from the South of Scotland Economic Partnership as a forerunner to a regional enterprise agency being launched in 2020. Economic Development identified this site as a possibility. Whilst there are concerns relating to the location of the site within the Teviot Valleys SLA, the site is only just within the boundary and it is not considered that the development of the site, with mitigation and high quality design, would have a detrimental impact upon the SLA. The following issues would require to be addressed during the process of an planning application:

- A Planning Brief has been suggested by SNH.
 - Issues relating to surface water would require to be addressed.
 - Ecological impacts require to be considered with appropriate mitigation where appropriate.
 - Burnhead Tower, a category B listed building to the north of the site, must be safeguarded. Mitigation to safeguard the setting is required.
 - A Transport Statement is required.
 - Improved connectivity is required.
 - A Drainage Impact Assessment may be required.
-

Site reference AHAWI027	Site name Burnfoot (Phase 1)	Settlement Hawick	RGA Central	Proposed Use Housing	Indicative Capacity 60	Ha 5.0	MIR status Preferred
-----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	--------------------------------

Initial assessment

Floodrisk 1:100	SAC Not applicable	SPA Not applicable	SSSI Not applicable	Ramsar Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is outwith the fluvial (river) 1 in 200 year flood extents but there are small pockets of potential surface water impacts on the South Eastern side of the site at a 1 in 200 year flood event. No objections on the grounds of flood risk. However, would require that due to surface water risk and the capacity of the development that surface water flooding is considered and it is ensured that any water would be routed around the housing.

SEPA: Historic maps shows a watercourse flowing through the middle of the site which may now be culverted. SEPA require an FRA which assesses the risk from this culverted watercourse. Buildings must not be constructed over an existing drain (including a field drain) that is to remain active. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues at this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes SEPA would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at increased risk of flooding.

Background information

Minerals and coal Not applicable	NNR Not applicable	Prime Quality Agricultural Land Not applicable	Current use/s Greenfield	Planning history references No planning application history. The site was previously considered for a housing allocation within the process of the Housing SG 2017 and is currently shown as a longer term housing site within the LDP 2016.
--	------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--

Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport Good	Access to employment Good	Access to services Good	Wider biodiversity impacts Minor	Site aspect South-west
---	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--	----------------------------------

Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Low impact. Site appears to be an arable field with rank semi-improved grassland / marshy grassland in south-west part of site, scrub and hedgerow and trees on part of the boundary. No obvious connectivity to River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats (EPS), badger and breeding birds. SEPA CAR construction site licence required (site >4ha) (4.95ha)

The site is located adjacent to Hawick's settlement boundary, at Burnfoot. The site is less than 2 km from Hawick High Street. A wide range of facilities and services are available within Hawick, including a number of key services within Burnfoot. Hawick has regular bus service to several places in the Borders, as well as Edinburgh and Carlisle.

Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area

Not applicable

Open space

Adjacent to site

Listed buildings

Adjacent to site

Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

Archaeology

Not applicable

Garden and designed

Not applicable

Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: Advised verbally that there is potential for archaeology within the site. Archaeology evaluation/mitigation required.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: No listed building or conservation area issues. Appears to be a sensible opportunity filling in the low ground between the Retail Park and the existing residential area. The roofscape will be important as it will be viewed from the higher level of the A7.

HES: No comments.

Landscape assessment

NSA

Not applicable

SLA

Adjacent to site

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

Wild Land

Not applicable

Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: The site indicated is not all developable. Protection of views to and from surrounding roads, avoidance of steeper ground along NW side and avoidance of wetland area to W of site all limit developable area.

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: SNH's previous advice on this site (in response to the Housing SG): This prominent site lies outwith the current settlement boundary as shown in the LDP but is included as a longer-term safeguard (SHAWI003). Justification for the eastern boundary of the site is unclear – there are no obvious physical features and it appears likely that the site would extend to the field boundary opposite Burnhead. When considered alongside adjacent allocations in the LDP it appears that a design framework for the north of Hawick is required to co-ordinate issues between sites in this area of significant change. If taken forward individually, SNH would strongly advocate a site brief for this site. SNH maintain this position. In addition, SNH highlight the potential for adverse landscape and visual impacts relating to possible intrusion of development on the wider views currently gained towards the hills on this key approach into Hawick. If this site was to be allocated we would advise that close attention should be paid to the settlement edge and to maintaining key views. Providing green infrastructure connections and suitable densities of development on less sensitive parts of the site should be also be considered.

Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: Access is achievable off the B6359, with pedestrian linkage required to the bus laybys on A7 by the roundabout. A footway will also be required on the north west side of the B6359 to tie-in with A7 footways. Any layout will have to facilitate projections into the adjoining land to the north east (BHAWI001). Whilst there may be some benefits in direct vehicular access to the roundabout on the A7 this is unlikely to be supported by Transport Scotland as trunk road authority and it is not an absolute requirement for the development of this site. Any development will have to incorporate the principles of 'Designing Streets' in terms of layout and design and there is an opportunity to create a street-feel onto the B6359. A Transport Assessment will be required for this level of development.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Would like to discuss the access strategy for this site as it appears to be located adjacent to the A7 trunk road.

STRATEGIC TRANSPORT OFFICER: Opportunity to create better pedestrian/cycling access along the B6359 and also to provide connectivity to the A7 and the rest of Burnfoot.

Right of way

Not applicable

TPOs

Not applicable

Contaminated land

On site

Water supply

Yes

Sewerage

Yes

Gas Supply

Yes

Education provision

Good

Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed with the exception of a water course intersecting the site. This appears to have subsequently been infilled. The site is brownfield land and its use may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Track HAWI/GL003/1 forms part of the path network in this area and therefore a pavement or other access route providing non-vehicular access along the North edge of the site is required. Opportunity to create better pedestrian/cycling access along the B6359 and also to provide connectivity to the A7 and the rest of Burnfoot and the wider path network

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: The landscaping of the boundary of this site would be highly significant given its presence within a 'gateway' approach to Hawick on the A7. The development of this land would appear liable to set off a drift towards the NE in the land between the two roads.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Some landscape separation may be required as a development condition between this site and allocation BHAWI001.

EDUCATION: No comments.

HOUSING STRATEGY: No objections.

NHS: No comments received.

SEPA: Foul drainage from the development must be connected to the existing SW foul sewer network. Standard comments for SUDS.

Overall assessment**MIR status**

Preferred

Overall assessment

Acceptable

Site capacity

60

Conclusions

This site is currently identified as having longer term housing potential in the LDP. Although the site sits outwith the Hawick LDP boundary it is effectively encircled by the town on all sides, including to the north-east of the site, which is allocated for employment use.

The site's relationship with Hawick is acceptable, but careful consideration of that NE boundary and connectivity and boundary treatment between the sites is required. Accessibility within the town, and to neighbouring towns is good.

In landscape terms, the site is acceptable but not all will be developable. Protection of views and attention to the site's boundary to the NE will be required. Up to half the site could need to be given over to landscaping or SUDS, or lost due to being steeply sloping ground on the periphery of the site. Although the LDP longer term site has a capacity of 100 units this does not account for these constraints. In practice the site capacity is around 60 units.

A Flood Risk Assessment is required in order to assess the risk from a watercourse which is understood to run through the site and may be culverted. Consideration should be given to the potential for surface water runoff in the south of the site, as per SEPA's 1 in 200 year surface water flood risk mapping.

There are no significant biodiversity issues, but mitigation for protected species would be required and may be necessary. There is potential for on-site play provision. Archaeology evaluation/mitigation required.

In summary, there are no constraints to development and the site should be included within the MIR.

Overall, the site was considered as a alternative site within the Draft Housing SG and further to public consultation, the site will not be included within the Finalised Housing SG.

Jedburgh

Site reference AJEDB018	Site name Land east of Howdenburn Court II	Settlement Jedburgh	RGA Central	Proposed Use Housing	Indicative Capacity 20	Ha 1.2	MIR status Preferred
-----------------------------------	--	-------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	--------------------------------

Initial assessment

Floodrisk Not applicable	SAC Not applicable	SPA Not applicable	SSSI Not applicable	Ramsar Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

Initial assessment summary

There are no initial constraints on the site which would preclude it from being developed.

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is outwith both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. Due to the size of the development I'd recommend surface water runoff be considered.

SEPA: Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues in this area. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.

Background information

Minerals and coal Not applicable	NNR Not applicable	Prime Quality Agricultural Land Not applicable	Current use/s Greenfield	Planning history references There is no relevant planning history on the site.
--	------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--

Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport Good	Access to employment Good	Access to services Good	Wider biodiversity impacts Minor	Site aspect South
---	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------

Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Low impact. Site appears to be rank neutral grassland with areas of scrub and remnant hedgerow and garden ground on the boundary. No obvious connectivity with River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the east of Howdenburn Court. It is approximately 500m east of Jedburgh town centre (direct measurement) where a range of local services, bus connections to the wider region, and employment opportunities exist. It is located within walking distance of the Hartrigge Park industrial area. Biodiversity impact is low.

Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area

Not applicable

Open space

On site/adjacent to

Listed buildings

Adjacent to site

Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

Archaeology

Adjacent to site

Garden and designed

Not applicable

Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There are no known archaeological issues.

HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER: From a built heritage perspective, there are designations either within or close to this site.

HES: Robust application of national and appropriate local policies should be able to mitigate any potential adverse impacts on heritage assets, and do not have any specific comments to offer. For those sites which are considered to be preferred or reasonable alternatives for allocation in LDP2, the environmental assessment should consider the likely effects and identify site specific mitigation where negative effects are identified.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Allocating this site could improve the integration and deliverability of existing LDP allocations. For this reason it would be a good idea to add this section to the overall development area at the east of Jedburgh. However, any allocation would have to integrate with, rather than necessarily be prioritised over, the existing allocations.

Landscape assessment

NSA

Not applicable

SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

Wild Land

Not applicable

Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: The extended northern part of the site has a width and depth that would allow development. Reflecting the density of adjacent housing to south and west this part of the site might accommodated up to 20 houses/ apartments.

SNH: Site appears to be infill between existing housing at Howdenburn Court and allocation RJ2B. The adopted Planning Brief for Lochend identifies pedestrian links between RJ2B and Howdenburn Court. These links should be designed into any allocation at AJEDB018. Design and landscape principles set out in the Planning Brief should be applied to this site.

Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: No comments.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments received.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: As always, the capacity of Oxnam Road to take additional traffic, without alternative access means, is a matter of concern. That said, this area of land is relatively small and effectively represents a missing link between the existing housing and the housing allocations RJ30B and RJ2B. I am therefore able to support this proposal however given the geometry of the site; it would be better served as part of/in conjunction with the adjoining sites rather than a stand-alone site. Pedestrian and cycle linkage would be required with Howden Park and Howdenburn Court.

Right of way

Adjacent to site

TPOs

Not applicable

Contaminated land

Water supply

Yes

Sewerage

Yes

Gas Supply

Yes

Education provision

Average

Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: An area of the site appears to extend into a former refuse tip, the site also houses a former quarry which appears to have been infilled. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Path link to housing development for non-vehicular access. To paths and roads in current application 16/01587/FUL to south to allow continued use of right of way BR259. Also non-vehicular path link to recreational ground to North of area.

EDUCATION: No comments.

HOUSING STRATEGY: No comment - SHIP 2018 shows that there is development, by Eildon Housing Association at Howdenburn Dr programmed for 2019-2020.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Roberton WTW has sufficient capacity as does the water network. Jedburgh WwTW has sufficient capacity as does the waste network for foul only flows.

SEPA: Foul must connect to SW foul sewer network.

Overall assessment

MIR status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Preferred	Acceptable	20

Conclusions

There are no constraints that rule out development. The site is currently disused agricultural land/scrubland with desire lines/ unadopted paths crossing it. The site would have to be considered within the wider supplementary planning guidance for the development of adjoining allocated housing sites ref RJ30B and RJ2B. Vehicular access to the site would be required from one or both of these sites. The developer states that access/permeability will be greatly enhanced by the allocation, but this is debatable as the site is already used informally for movement around the area and for recreation.

The following issues will require to be considered:

- Surface water run-off would require to be considered
 - Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds
 - Contamination requires to be investigated
 - Path link to housing development for non-vehicular access. To paths and roads in current application 16/01587/FUL to south to allow continued use of right of way BR259. Also non-vehicular path link to recreational ground to North of area.
 - The site would be better served as part of/in conjunction with the adjoining sites rather than a stand-alone site. Pedestrian and cycle linkage would be required with Howden Park and Howdenburn Court.
-

Melrose

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR status
AMELR013	Harmony Hall Gardens	Melrose	Central	Housing	20	0.8	Alternative

Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
1:200	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT: A portion of this site it within SEPA's 1 in 200 year flood map of the River Tweed. A Flood Risk Assessment would require to be undertaken.

SEPA: Require an FRA which assesses the risk from the River Tweed. There was previously a mill lade which flowed along the northern boundary which will also require consideration.

Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	10/00158/LBC - Alterations to wall to widen access and erection of gates - Withdrawn 10/00159/FUL - Alterations to wall to widen access and erection of gates - Approved subject to conditions and informative

Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Good	Good	Good	Moderate	Not applicable

Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site appears to be improved grassland,(old orchard?) and garden ground, mature broad-leaved trees and stone wall on the boundary. Stone built, slate –roofed building within site potential for bats (EPS) and breeding birds. Some potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC/SSSI via run off to burn/lade to east. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including bats (EPS) and breeding birds.

Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area	Open space	Listed buildings	Scheduled Monument	Ancient woodland inventory	Archaeology	Garden and designed
On site	Not applicable	On/adjacent to site	On/adjacent to site	Not applicable	On/adjacent to site	Not applicable

Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: The eastern 1/3 of the site is within the Melrose Abbey Scheduled Monument Area. Any development proposals would need to satisfy HES requirements and Policy EP8. The western 2/3 are within an area of high archaeological potential because of the proximity to the SM, and discoveries previously made nearby. Proposals outside the SM would require archaeological evaluation. All proposals would need to respect the setting of the SM.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: Lies within Melrose conservation area and close to the category B listed Harmony House and the category C listed former stables and St Marys School. There may be some scope for small scale redevelopment within the site, but any development will need to be kept low in height and respect the character of the conservation area.

HES: Development of this site, which is partially within SM90124 Melrose Abbey would raise issues of national significance. The eastern and northern edges of the proposed development site overlap into, and directly adjoin parts of the scheduled monument. No development directly affecting (i.e. within the boundary of) the scheduled monument would be permitted. Consequently, any development of this site would need to avoid the monument entirely and retain it in an appropriate setting. HES consider that the proposed level of development would be likely to affect the setting of the monument. Additionally, there are significant known unscheduled archaeological remains in the area and development of this site would be likely to encounter unscheduled archaeological remains. The Council's archaeological adviser should be consulted for further advice on this.

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: The site lies within the Eildon & Leaderfoot Hills NSA. While well contained, the site makes an important contribution to the character of St Mary's Road. The boundary wall, mature trees and orchard combine to give a strong sense of place. SNH have concerns regarding the allocation of the site as shown in the shapefiles provided with this consultation. Our advice is that the western, slightly elevated, area of orchard should be retained and enhanced through the creation of a new orchard around the remaining trees. Other existing assets such as the boundary wall on the south edge and the mature beeches on the north edge should also be retained for their contribution to sense of place. Promoting higher density of development within the remainder of the site could create a development that is in keeping with the wider area, establishing a place that could be adaptable for all stages of life and which is well connected to the town centre. SNH would wish to ensure that if this site is to be allocated within the NSA that a site brief is produced to identify the key natural heritage assets of the site to be protected and the key opportunities for the integration of green infrastructure within future development. Modification to the proposed extent of the allocation would avoid or reduce likely natural heritage impacts.

Landscape assessment

NSA

On/adjacent to site

SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

Wild Land

Not applicable

Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: A mix of house types, from detached / semi-detached to terraced/ courtyard developments but limited to 1½ storeys to reflect the style and scale of surrounding residential properties and buildings. It is important that the 'genius loci' is retained and enhanced by a high quality development with attention to building pattern and detail.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is constrained within the Development and Landscape Capacity Study (March 2007) which states that the site is within the 'Level Fields' character area which is limited by the contribution it makes to the historic setting of the Abbey and other nearby buildings, and to the setting of the River Tweed, which is characterised by its lack of immediate development.

Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: Existing roads infrastructure not ideal in this area.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: No objections to the principle of housing on this site, however, there are some issues to resolve: The carriageway in St Mary's Road is only around 4.5m wide, with a roadside wall on the north side, so that two-way traffic flow is very difficult. Furthermore, the wall is of a height that it would not afford safe junction visibility for any new junctions unless it was lowered or set back. A solution could be to lower the wall in height and to form at least two new junctions which would double up as passing opportunities. Some concerns regarding the pedestrian network surrounding the site. The existing route to the town centre via Abbey Street is particularly narrow in parts and arrangements for pedestrians at the junction of St Mary's Road with Abbey Street are poor. The site serves as a

pedestrian way between the private school and the sports fields as well as a pedestrian way between Melrose and Gattonside any development on the site would need to respect this and incorporate such movement. A Transport Statement can address all of the issues raised.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No comments.

Right of way

Not applicable

TPOs

On/adjacent to sit

Contaminated land

Not applicable

Water supply

Yes

Sewerage

Yes

Gas Supply

Yes

Education provision

Good

Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have been developed as a residential property with associated garden ground. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: No comments.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Appears to be a logical addition within the development boundary but is an attractive area of parkland. A high quality, low density development would be required as the site is within the Conservation Area. Archaeological/Scheduled Ancient Monument implications. Potential impact on the setting of the Listed Building. Access along St Mary's Road may be a problem.

EDUCATION: No objections.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. A Flow and Pressure test is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. Surface water sewer just within site boundary.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. It appears that the mill lade may be culverted through this development site. Opportunities should be taken to de-culvert this as part of any development.

Overall assessment

MIR status

Alternative

Overall assessment

Acceptable

Site capacity

20

Conclusions

There are clearly sensitive issues which require to be addressed such as the location of the site within the Conservation Area and its proximity to listed buildings. The eastern third of the site is within the Melrose Abbey Scheduled Monument Area and would be excluded from development. Furthermore, archaeological remains are likely within the remainder of the site which would require investigation. It is likely an acceptable access on the western part of the site could be formed with minimal disturbance to the existing walls. It is considered that the development of this sensitive site would be acceptable in principle subject to the following:

- A Flood Risk Assessment is required which should take cognisance of a mill lade which previously flowed along the northern boundary and the River Tweed.
- Retain and protect the existing boundary features and trees, where possible
- Assessment of ecology impacts and provision of mitigation, as appropriate
- Mitigation required to ensure no significant adverse effects upon integrity of River Tweed Special Area of Conservation
- Archaeological assessment (including archaeological evaluation) is required, with any associated mitigation as identified
- Development must respect the setting of the Scheduled Monument. No development within the Melrose Abbey Scheduled Monument (SM90124) would be permitted
- The design and layout of the site should take account of the Conservation Area, the setting of the Scheduled Monuments and trees on/adjacent to the site

- Access to the site should be in a location which results in the least disruption to the existing stone wall along the southern boundary of the site. A Transport Statement would be required
 - Existing trees/hedging within and on the boundaries of the site must be retained and protected
 - In order to safeguard the character of the Conservation Area and adjacent listed buildings, dwellinghouses should be restricted to single storey.
-

Selkirk

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR status
ASELK040	Philiphaugh Mill	Selkirk	Central	Housing	19	1.7	Alternative

Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
1:200	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable

Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: Dependent on SEPA's building behind defences stance.

SEPA: Due to the site being in a sparsely developed area and a proposed increase in sensitivity from commercial to residential we do not consider that it meets with the requirements of Scottish Planning Policy and our position is unlikely to change. We have a shared duty with Scottish Ministers and other responsible authorities under the Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009 to reduce overall flood risk and promote sustainable flood risk management. The cornerstone of sustainable flood risk management is the avoidance of flood risk in the first instance. Therefore, we require that this site is removed from the Local Development Plan.

SEPA previously required the removal of this site during the LDP consultation process in February 2014 and July 2016. Prior to the 2008 Local Plan, SEPA had indicated that the site was unsuitable for residential development. Therefore, SEPA has always had a consistent view regarding this site. SEPA attended a meeting with Scottish Borders Council representatives in November 2015 to discuss the Scottish Government Reporter findings. The Reporter had agreed with SEPA and recommended removal of this allocation. The 2013 Proposed Plan which was adopted in May 2016, included the Philiphaugh Mill redevelopment site, which was contrary to SEPA's and the Scottish Governments Reporter's recommendations. The previous Proposed Plan made no mention of flood risk within the Site Requirements. The Site Requirements did state that "The Redevelopment opportunity at Philiphaugh Mill is for housing use". As part of the November 2015 meeting, SBC pointed out that for the site at Philiphaugh Mill (then Zro200) SEPA could have objected to the housing part of the proposal rather than ask for the removal of the site. The allocation is consistently being promoted as housing and as such the council have not altered the land use.

Review of the SEPA Flood Map shows that the entire site boundary of ASELK040 lies entirely within the estimated 1 in 200 year functional floodplain of the Etrick Water. In addition, there is a mill lade which flows through the site which poses an additional flood risk to the site.

The Etrick Water has a well documented history of flooding. It is also well documented that the site flooded on the 31st of October 1977 in the book "Troubled Waters – Recalling the Floods of '77". "At the top of Etrickhaugh Road, Kendal Fish Farm was flooded out and subsequently many thousands of rainbow trout were released into the river. The following day was a boom time for the local anglers". "Many houses in Etrickhaugh Road, opposite Selkirk RFC, had to be abandoned and the only escape route for one unfortunate man trapped upstairs in the rugby club premises was via a rowing boat! A short distance away, the swollen waters meant the loss of 70,000 rainbow trout from Kendal Fish Farm, valued at £20,000." Philip Edgar, the former manager at Kendal Fish Farm is quoted as saying "A couple of thousand fish were lost from the farm. It was mainly the big fish that got washed away into people's gardens and the rugby pitch – they were everywhere". The site is also within the flood envelope of the 1977 flood as produced by Crouch & Hogg on behalf of Borders Regional Council.

SEPA acknowledge that the Selkirk Flood Prevention Scheme will reduce the risk of flooding to Selkirk, including to site ASELK040 Philiphaugh Mill. However, the primary purpose of a flood protection scheme is to protect existing development from flooding rather than facilitate new development.

The latest development planning/ management guidance published by SEPA (<https://www.sepa.org.uk/media/162837/lups-bp-gu2a-land-use-planning-background-paper-on-flood-risk.pdf>) on development behind defences clearly states that a precautionary approach should be taken to proposed allocations in areas protected by a flood protection scheme. Defences can be breached or overtopped leading to a scenario that can be significantly worse than if there are no defences present as flooding can be sudden, unexpected and floodwater trapped behind defences can extend the period of inundation which can lead to greater damage. FPS have a finite design life, which may be less than that of the proposed and future development.

Scottish Planning Policy (paragraph 263) states that in medium to high risk areas (greater than 0.5% annual probability of coastal or watercourse flooding); “May be suitable for residential, institutional, commercial and industrial 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 measure in a current flood risk management plan.” We consider this site to be within a sparsely developed area and based on the risk framework, these areas are generally not suitable for additional development unless a location is essential for operational reasons.

In summary, the housing allocation for 19 units is in a sparsely developed area and as the proposed development would be an increase in sensitivity from commercial to residential. In line with our SEPA position on development behind formal FPSs, development in this area would add to the overall area at risk and would therefore be contrary to the policy principles of Scottish Planning Policy and the aspirations of the Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act. However, SEPA would be supportive of redevelopment of the site for a similar commercial use.

Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Brownfield	There is no planning application history relating to the site. The site has previously been allocated within the Consolidated Local Plan 2011 as a redevelopment opportunity (zRO200).

Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Good	Good	Good	Moderate	Not applicable

Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGICAL OFFICER: Moderate risk - existing built structures (textile mill) have potential to support protected species such as bats (EPS) and breeding birds. Site contains trees and scrub and derelict buildings adjacent to mill lade, potential connectivity to Ettrick water (River Tweed SAC/SSSI) (protected species interest may include bats, badger and breeding birds). Mitigation required to ensure no significant adverse effects on integrity of River Tweed SAC.

Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area	Open space	Listed buildings	Scheduled Monument	Ancient woodland inventory	Archaeology	Garden and designed
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	On/adjacent to site	Not applicable

Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: The site is partly within the Inventory Battlefield of Philiphaugh. Mitigation will be required. Development must respect the setting of the battlefield.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: Although not listed, the remains of the former mill, including structures, former wheel pit and lade, are of historic significance, any development should take account of these features.

HES: No comments.

Landscape assessment

NSA
Not applicable

SLA
Adjacent to site

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

Wild Land
Not applicable

Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: Trees along mill lades, especially along north and east boundaries should be protected from development as they have a screening and amenity value. Building survey should be undertaken to assess cultural and historic value of remaining buildings. Need to explore potential to make direct pedestrian link onto footpath that runs along south and west boundary site. Perimeter trees and scrub have ecological value and should be retained and supplemented. Capacity is dependent on ability to convert some of the better quality mill buildings and infill development. A capacity of approximately 15-20 does not seem inappropriate for an ex-industrial site where density could be higher than surrounding area. The site has potential to be an interesting combination of building conversion, retaining the more attractive buildings, supplemented by infill development in keeping with the character of the site.

SNH: No comment, redevelopment of existing sites.

Scottish Natural Heritage: No comments.

Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: No comments.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: No objections to the site being zoned for housing. Some minor widening of Ettrickhaugh Road will be required to mitigate the increase in traffic movements. Access to the site will require a new bridge over the Ettrickhaugh Burn. Given that the site only has one realistic point of access, any proposal will need to provide a well-connected layout internally with a potential link to the adjacent site to the north east if that site is also to be allocated for housing. Pedestrian/cycle links will also be required to take advantage of the new riverside path which has been constructed as part of the Selkirk Flood Prevention Scheme.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No comments.

Right of way
On/adjacent to site

TPOs
Not applicable

Contaminated land
On site

Water supply
Yes

Sewerage
Yes

Gas Supply
Yes

Education provision
Good

Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have been developed as a woollen mill. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Non-vehicular access required to existing pavements and links to existing path network.

EDUCATION: No objections.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. A Flow and Pressure test is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Selkirk WwTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the network.

SEPA: Mill lade which went through old fish farm runs through the site. This would need to be protected to maintain flow and protect water quality. There should be no culverting for land gain. Foul water should be connected to the SW foul sewer network. SEPA is aware that there is made ground on the site (filling in of old fish tanks) which could contain unsuitable materials (ie be considered contaminated land).

Overall assessment

MIR status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Alternative	Acceptable	19

Conclusions

SEPA object to the allocation of the site on flooding grounds on the grounds that the site is in a sparsely developed area and there would be and an increase in sensitivity from commercial to residential. SEPA do not consider that the site meets the requirements of SPP and they advise that their position is unlikely to change. SEPA require that the site is removed from the LDP. These matters have been discussed with the Council's Flood and Coastal Management Team and the Senior Project Manager of the Selkirk Flood Protection Scheme. As part of the Selkirk Flood Protection Scheme, a final 'as built' model run will be undertaken of the scheme to determine actual risk. This will confirm the actual standard of protection. It is expected that this will be undertaken by the end of August 2018 and thereafter analysed. This information will then be conveyed to SEPA for their information and further comments. This site is therefore suggested as an 'alternative' site at this point in time, due to the outstanding objection raised by SEPA. This is, however, subject to ongoing discussion and will be reported further in the Proposed Plan. It should be noted that the Council considers that this site is part of the built up area which satisfies the terms of SEPA's 'Planning Information Note 4: SEPA Position on development protected by a Flood Protection Scheme' and does not consider that this is an argument SEPA should be contending.

Moderate risk to biodiversity. Mitigation required relating to River Tweed SAC. It is considered that the site relates well to the existing settlement at this location. Setting of historic battlefield to be considered. Accessibility to local services is acceptable. The site has the potential to be an interesting combination of building conversion with infill development in keeping with the character of the site. An acceptable access arrangement is achievable. Pedestrian/cycle links required. Potential contamination issues. WTW local network issues possible.

Smailholm

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR status
ASMAI002	Land at West Third	Smailholm	Central	Housing	5	1.2	Preferred

Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

Initial assessment summary

There are no initial constraints on the site which would preclude it from being developed.

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is outwith both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. However, dependent on the amount of properties, we may want to see surface water runoff managed on site.

SEPA: Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues in this area. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.

Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	On site	Greenfield	There is no relevant planning history on the site.

Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Limited	Limited	Limited	Minor	Not applicable

Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Low impact. Site appears to be rank improved pasture with areas of scrub in site and garden ground on the boundary. No obvious connectivity with River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Kelso and Melrose are both around 6 miles (10 mins drive) Galashield is 11 miles (20 mins drive). Aside from a village hall and church, there are very few facilities in Smailholm and residents rely on nearby towns for all daily services. As an attractive conservation village, there has been demand for small scale growth in Smailholm. The village does fall within the Central Borders Rural Growth Area but would not represent a suitable location for development other than that which allows for a steady, organic, growth of the village. With this in mind, it might be appropriate to alter the settlement boundary in order to allow for this in future, in a way which does not compromise the setting and Conservation Area status of the village and at a scale that is appropriate for a small isolated village with few facilities. There are only minor ecological risks associated with a redrawing of the settlement boundary at the West Third of Smailholm.

Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area

Not applicable

Open space

Not applicable

Listed buildings

Not applicable

Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

Archaeology

On/adjacent to site

Garden and designed

Not applicable

Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY: The medieval village of Smailholm was formerly much more more extensive. 18th century historic mapping shows it to have extended along the main road at least as far west as West Third. By the middle of the 19th century the village had shrunk to its current size. It is likely that archaeological deposits linked to medieval and post-medieval occupation of this site will exist. Mitigation will be necessary.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Smailholm currently comprises two separate small settlements; the East Third with the church being larger and this is designated as a conservation area. The West Third is quite separate. I am not opposed to the potential expansion of West Third provided that there is no coalescence with East Third.

HES: No comments.

GENERAL COMMENTS: An allocation, via a redrawing of the development boundary at West Third, allowing for 5 units, could be accommodated in terms of impacting on the existing settlement. Smailholm East Third is a Conservation Area. There is a requirement to avoid the coalescence of the two separate parts of the village, and this proposal would not threaten that.

Landscape assessment

NSA

Not applicable

SLA

On site

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

Wild Land

Not applicable

Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: There is adverse landscape or visual impact associated with amending the development boundary of the western part of Smailholm. The development of an informal footpath from the west part to the main Smailholm settlement should be considered as a measure to improve the amenities of the village.

SNH: No comment due to nature of the proposal. However, it should be noted that this consultation was based on an original proposal without an indicative site capacity and only to alter the settlement boundary.

The relevant Tweed Lowlands Local Landscape Area management recommendation is for 'careful management of development at settlement edges.' The West Third of Smailholm sits in low lying flat arable farmland landscape. Existing houses are spread out along the main road in an unplanned fashion. There is scope for self build plots of varying sizes, with appropriate boundary treatment, to respond to the existing settlement pattern and its place within the local landscape.

Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: The site may impact on the existing 30 mph limit position.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING MANAGER: I have no objections to this development boundary amendment. If this part of Smailholm is to eventually join up with the main part of Smailholm then consideration should be given to this being properly planned to allow proper infrastructure to be provided i.e. street lighting, footway provision and an extension of the 30 mph speed limit.

Near a trunk road?

Right of way

Not applicable

TPOs

Not applicable

Contaminated land

Not applicable

Water supply

Yes

Sewerage

Limited

Gas Supply

No

Education provision

Average

Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Opportunity to provide pedestrian path.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Investigate waste water capacity. Boundary requirement? Need for pavements and public roads.

EDUCATION: No comments.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER - Waste: Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. **Water:** Roberton WTW has sufficient capacity. Please note there are Water mains within site. Depending on how many units this site includes will determine if further investigation required.

SEPA: Consideration should be given to extending the sewer network into this part of the village to incorporate this and the existing houses in the west end as there is no nearby watercourse to receive a sewage discharge. There are a number of existing private sewage discharges to soakaway and hence any proposed new discharges to soakaway may impact groundwater.

GENERAL COMMENTS: There are no constraints which should rule out development of five units on the West Third of Smailholm. There is a need to confirm waste water treatment capacity when the final number of units and program for delivery is confirmed. The allocation would be for a maximum of five units to be provided through self build plots and so it is expected that these will be built out privately, demand-led, rather than developer-delivered. Roads planning service have raised the potential need for linking the East and West Third in future. This would not be an objective at present because of the need to consider coalescence and viability of development for five units. However, the specific roads planning service requirement should be clarified before a decision is made.

Overall assessment**MIR status**

Preferred

Overall assessment

Acceptable

Site capacity

5

Conclusions

Smailholm is in the Central Borders Rural Growth Area. It is a settlement with none of the services that are required on a daily basis and so residents rely on neighbouring Kelso, Melrose, St Boswells. It is a distinctive settlement and this is reflected in its Conservation Area status. An allocation of five units would be appropriate in a settlement of this size and function.

The site, and settlement, could only accommodate 5 units. Given the size of Smailholm a 5 unit allocation would be appropriate. The proposal suggests that self-build plots would be likely, rather than developer-led build out. There is a question around marketability in this location, however, a small scale allocation such as this in terms of balancing plan deliverability and allowing for small scale rural settlement growth appears appropriate to consider in the MIR.

There is a need for further investigation around WWTW. There is a need for archaeological investigation as records show that the village's West Third and East Third were once conjoined. In design terms, the existing settlement pattern and architectural heritage in the West Third of Smailholm is varied with individual non-uniform plots and buildings, but new development should recognise the pattern of stone dyke frontages and the traditional building styles that exist. Roads have called for "consideration of proper infrastructure to be provided i.e. street lighting, footway provision and an extension of the 30 mph speed limit.

The site should go forward for consideration in the MIR as an preferred site.

Northern HMA

Cardrona

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR status
SCARD002	Land at Nether Horsburgh	Cardrona	Western	Long Term Mixed Use	N/A	23.8	Preferred

Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable

Initial assessment summary

The site is not located within any international/national designation. However, the River Tweed SAC and SSSI lies to the south of the site, on the opposite side of the road.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourses which flow through and adjacent to the site as well as the River Tweed. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site which may exacerbate flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Site may be constrained due to flood risk.

There are multiple watercourses throughout the site. There is the potential that the development of this allocation could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard at this site. SEPA advise that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

Foul drainage should be connected to the SW foul network at Cardrona stw (the site is outwith the currently sewered area). Options for private drainage on site do not appear to be feasible. Std comments for SUDS. The small watercourses running through/alongside the development should be safeguarded and enhanced as part of any development. Depending on the use of any proposed units there may be a requirement for permissions to be sought for certain activities from SEPA.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with the fluvial 1 in 200 year flood extents. This site is shown to be affected by surface water flooding in some small areas in the North of the site. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk but would ask that surface water runoff be considered.

Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	There is no planning application history within the site. Housing SG: As part of the SG, a smaller site overlapping this one was considered for mixed use development (MCARD008). LDP: As part of the LDP, a much larger site was considered for mixed use development (MPEEB005).

Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport

Good

Access to employment

Good

Access to services

Good

Wider biodiversity impacts

Moderate

Site aspect

South

Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Moderate biodiversity impact. Site appears to be improved pasture with areas of scrub on parts of the boundary and a small coniferous plantation within part of the site. Pond located outside western boundary. Oystercatcher and curlew are recorded in Tetrad NT33E and NT23Z. Potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC/ SSSI via drains. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially badger and breeding birds. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC/SSSI. SEPA CAR construction site licence required (site >4ha 23.78ha)

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located adjacent to the A72 and is a short walking distance from Cardrona. The site is a potential longer term mixed use allocation. Cardrona has good access to public transport, services and employment. Furthermore, good bus connections to Edinburgh and Galashiels. Consideration will need to be given to how active travel between the site and the village of Cardrona will be achieved.

Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area

Not applicable

Open space

Not applicable

Listed buildings

Adjacent to site

Scheduled Monument

Adjacent to site

Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

Archaeology

Adjacent to site

Garden and designed

Not applicable

Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Remote site in a very prominent position would have a significant impact on the Tweed Valley.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Potential to impact on setting of SM 3118: Nether Horsburgh, Castle. There may be potential for development within this area, but without suitable evaluation it is not possible to determine impact and mitigate in line with policy.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Spoke to the Officer and they advised that there is potential for archaeology within the site.

Landscape assessment

NSA

Not applicable

SLA

On/adjacent to site

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

Wild Land

Not applicable

Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: Our previous advice on this site (in response to the Housing SG) - This site lies outwith the current settlement boundary as shown in the LDP and is within a Special Landscape Area. Due to its physical separation there is little relationship of this site to Cardrona or to Peebles and it appears likely that development here would essentially involve the creation of another new village. Due to the prominence and location of this site here is a high potential for adverse landscape and visual impacts within the SLA, even with mitigation. The overall assessment in Appendix 10 of the Housing SG was that the site is unacceptable due to high potential for adverse landscape and visual impacts and the need for a solution to access issues. We are not aware that mitigation has been identified that would address either of these issues and maintain our previous advice regarding the physical separation of this allocation and its potential landscape and visual impacts.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: If a Masterplanning exercise can demonstrate that this site on the north side of the A72 can successfully be connected to the Cardrona settlement to the south of the A72 and the Tweed, and that a scheme of mitigation planting would avoid diminishing the quality of this part of the Tweed valley SLA, this site has potential as a mixed use development. The re-alignment of A72 might help to create a development more unified with the existing settlement to the south.

Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: No response received.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: This site has previously been considered for mixed use development. The difficulty of developing this site is the fact that the A72 runs along the southern boundary of this site with Cardrona being located on the opposite side of the main arterial route linking the Central Borders with the west and beyond. Any allocation of this site would have to include fundamental changes to drastically change the characteristics of the A72 through this area. The idea would be to make the A72 more of a high street rather than bypassing or dividing Cardrona. By creating a high street with dual frontage, this would allow a reduction in the traffic speed limit and help integrate both sides of the A72 into one settlement. A Transport Assessment will be required for this level of development. Master planning of the site would also be required to ensure phasing of the development is carried out in a satisfactory manner. For a development of this scale, consideration should be given to the appropriate infrastructure and amenities required to serve this site and the existing settlement profile of Cardrona, such as retail opportunities and possibly a new school. In summary, developing this site is possible but will require careful planning and a significant investment in infrastructure to create a cohesive and safe residential environment which can sustain this level of development.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No response received.

Right of way

Not applicable

TPOs

Not applicable

Contaminated land

Not applicable

Water supply

Limited

Sewerage

Limited

Gas Supply

No

Education provision

Good

Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No response received.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. Depending on the flow demand for this development, will determine if a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. Please note there is an existing 100mm water main running along side of site. Depending on flow demand for this development, will determine if a Water Impact Assessment (WIA) is required.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Requires non-vehicular links to path network and Peebles town and amenities.

CONTAMINATED LAND: There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: It is desirable for business premises to generally be on flat land as the building footprint is generally larger than residential, so this site affords an opportunity to accommodate future business premises so close to an existing small settlement. The location provides the opportunity for integration of developments with a properly thought out layout and modern design.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

Overall assessment

MIR status

Preferred

Overall assessment

Acceptable

Site capacity

N/A

Conclusions

The site comprises a large, flat area to the north of the A72, at Cardrona. The site was identified as part of the 'Western Rural Growth Area: Development Options Study' which was undertaken by LUC, to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Central Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP and for the future, within the Tweeddale area, in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders. The site currently being considered is proposed for a longer term mixed use development site.

Cardrona has good access to services, employment and public transport. Further to a site assessment, the following constraints/issues were identified, which may require mitigation;

- Flood Risk Assessment required, in respect of potential flood risk and surface water runoff on the site;
- Multiple watercourses within the site, therefore a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6m wide must be provided between the watercourse and any built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures;
- Foul sewerage constraints, as the site is located outwith the current sewered catchment;
- Potential connectivity to the River Tweed SAC/SSSI, mitigation required to ensure no likely significant effects;
- Protect and enhance the existing boundary features;
- Potential protected species, including breeding birds within the site, would require mitigation;
- Scheduled Monument 'Nether Horsburgh Castle' is located to the north east of this site, this would require appropriate mitigation measures;
- Potential for archaeology within the site;
- The site is located within a prominent location and would be visible from the A72;
- Located within the 'Tweed Valley' Special Landscape Area;
- SNH advise that there is the potential for adverse landscape and visual impacts within the SLA, as a result of any development. However, the Council's Landscape Officers advise that development on this site could be acceptable subject to a scheme of mitigation and masterplanning, which would avoid diminishing the quality of this part of the Tweed Valley SLA;
- The Roads Planning Officer does not raise any objections to the development of this site. However, advises that any proposal would include fundamental changes to drastically change the characteristic of the A72 through this area;
- Transport Assessment would be required;
- Non vehicular link would be required, linking to the path network and Peebles town & amenities;
- Potential for Drainage Impact Assessment, in respect of the WWTW; and
- Potential for Water Impact Assessment, in respect of the WTW.

It is acknowledged that this site, albeit smaller, was assessed as part of the Housing SG for a mixed use development. The site was ultimately not included within the Housing SG as it was considered there were more preferable sites and the site assessment concluded that there were a number of constraints and there was the potential for adverse landscape and visual impacts within the SLA, even with mitigation. Since this assessment, a more extensive and detailed study of the Tweeddale area has been undertaken by LUC, in order to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Tweeddale. This site was one option put forward for consideration, in respect of a longer term mixed use site. A re-assessment has therefore been undertaken, in light of the additional information contained within the LUC Study. It should also be noted that there are a lack of suitable development opportunities within the Tweeddale area going forward. Many sites need to be re-visited in order to find further development land.

Overall, taking the above into consideration, there are a number of constraints identified within and adjacent to the site. However, it is not considered that any of these constraints are insurmountable and could be mitigated, subject to appropriate site requirements. There are aspects which would require further investigation, such as the road infrastructure and layout. However, given the longer term nature of this allocation, it is considered that this allows time to look further into the constraints and mitigation measures in more detail, including potential masterplanning of the site.

In conclusion, the longer term mixed use site will be taken forward as a preferred option within the MIR. It should be noted that longer term sites will not be formal allocations within the LDP2, rather areas identified for potential development in the future. It is considered that a masterplan would be required for such a development and the site must accommodate an element of business land.

Dolphinton

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR status
ADOLP004	Land to north of Dolphinton	Dolphinton	Rest of Borders	Housing	10	1.3	Preferred

Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
1:200	Not applicable	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable

Initial assessment summary

SEPA: Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map and steep topography indicates that there may be flooding issues within/adjacent to site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff. There is the potential that the development of this site could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard identified at this site.

This development site does not appear to be served by the SW foul sewer network. However the foul network is not far from the proposed site and hence this is the preferred option. It is likely that the SW foul network/STW would require to be upgraded to accommodate the development site. Opportunity should also be taken to pick up the existing properties to the south and west of the development area.

Co-location issues: A PPC part B cement batcher is currently located south west of the development at 'Heywood'. Likely issues: dust.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial 1 in 200 year flood extents but small parts of the site are within the 1 in 200 year surface water flood extents. I would require that surface water runoff is considered before development.

Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Brownfield	Planning application 04/01122/FUL Erection of 12 houses - refused; 07/01379/FUL - Erection of 14 houses - refused. Housing SG: ADOLP004 - Exact same site was assessed as part of the Housing SG (Stage 1 RAG only)

Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Limited	Limited	Limited	Moderate	Not applicable

Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Moderate biodiversity impact. The site is poor, semi improved grassland. Hedgerow on part of the boundary and garden ground. No obvious connectivity with Dolphinton-West Linton Fens and Grassland SSSI. Protect boundary trees and mitigation for protected species including bats and breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located within Dolphinton. There are no services or facilities within the settlement. The nearest settlement is West Linton 4 miles away, which has a primary school, co-op and other facilities. There is a bus service to Edinburgh, however limited bus services to other towns. This means that there will be a reliance on car travel. Natural regeneration, adjacent trees and woodland should harbour young wildlife habitats. Retention of this where possible and extension to create woodland strip to south. Divisional garden hedges could create further opportunities for wildlife. Retain trees on eastern and northern boundaries if possible. The site appears unused and over grown. Bunds and embankments from railway workings, possibly minor huts/structures amongst vegetation.

Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area	Open space	Listed buildings	Scheduled Monument	Ancient woodland inventory	Archaeology	Garden and designed
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable

Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There is a high concentration of archaeological sites and features in the surrounding landscape which increases the potential for unknown features to exist in the site. There is nothing known for this site, but archaeological mitigation is likely base on the potential.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific comment.

Landscape assessment

NSA	SLA	Over 200 metres? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Over 12 degree slope <input type="checkbox"/>	Wild Land
Not applicable	On/adjacent to site			Not applicable

Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: We recommend that if this site is to be allocated that a site brief is produced to identify the key natural heritage assets of the site to be protected and the key opportunities for the integration of green infrastructure within future development. Our advice on this site is based on prior knowledge and desktop assessment using GIS and streetview. We may provide further advice based on a site visit if the potential allocation is carried forward. This section of the A702 is characterised by small groups of houses, often screened wholly or partly by well-established woodland and boundary planting. If allocated, we recommend that a site brief is prepared, this should include:

- Retention of woodland along the A702 boundary of the site; and
- Maintain and enhance pedestrian and cycle access established by LDP1 allocation ADOLP003.

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: Opportunity to allow natural regeneration to develop and be managed as swathe of woodland; thinned and augmented as required. This young tree cover will in due course provide excellent screen planting from the road and a buffer between the existing and any proposed housing. The majority of it is in the most unsuitable part of the site where there appear to considerable railway workings. The area is low lying and likely to be shady. Houses built on upper part of site to maximise solar gain and views. Position new properties at suitable distance from existing mature trees on boundary to protect trees from development, ensure sufficient light levels and maintain open views across landscape from new development. Recommend low density to safeguard existing tree cover, retain views out of the site to distant hills and prevent adverse effect on the setting of the Pentland hills SLA.

Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity	Near a trunk road? <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	--

NETWORK MANAGER: Would be concerned if a new access was proposed directly off the A702, which is a fast unrestricted road at this location.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Access is not recommended to be taken from the A702 trunk road.

ROADS PLANNING: I have no objections in principle to the allocation of this site. Access is achievable from the allocated site (ADOLP003) to the south. There is a current live outline application for 5 units on the existing allocated site and any detailed design for that site would have to allow for a public road extension through to the site in question here. A pedestrian link will be required from any proposed development to the existing public transport provision on the A702. Any new access onto the A702 to serve this site would be for Transport Scotland (TS) to comment on. Likewise TS will comment on the

impact of any further development should it take access via the existing allocated site and onto the A702 via the existing junction.
 PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Improved pedestrian crossing facilities across the A702 to and from bus stop layby.

Right of way	TPOs	Contaminated land	Water supply	Sewerage	Gas Supply	Education provision
Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	Yes	Yes	No	Average

Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Appears logical link between the two settlement envelopes either side of the A702. Good landscaping along A702 but would need robust landscaping on northern boundary.
 HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.
 SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. Sewer within site boundary. Sufficient capacity in the network.
 SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Roseberry WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.
 OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Connecting paths to core path 169 (RoW BT28) and existing pavements required.
 CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.
 NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.
 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.
 PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the proposed development.
 EDUCATION OFFICER: No Issues.
 NHS: No response received.

Overall assessment

MIR status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Preferred	Acceptable	10

Conclusions

The site is located within Dolphinton and was submitted as part of the 'Call for Sites' process. It should be noted that the site was also submitted and considered as part of the Housing SG and ultimately not included. An initial Stage 1 RAG assessment was undertaken as part of the Housing SG. At that stage, it was concluded that, a recent allocation was made within the LDP for Dolphinton, therefore that was considered to be sufficient for the LDP period.

The site itself includes derelict ground including the remains of the former railway platform and sections of old railroad in parts. The site is considered to be acceptable for housing and there are no insurmountable planning issues, which cannot be resolved through mitigation. Dolphinton has limited access to services, public transport and employment opportunities. The nearby settlement of West Linton has a school and shops. Further to the site assessment, the following constraints/mitigation were identified/proposed;

- The site is adjacent to the SSSI and within the SLA 'Pentland Hills';
- Potential flood risk and surface water hazard;
- Protection of boundary trees and retention of woodland along the A702 site boundary, where possible;
- Mitigation for protected species, including breeding birds;
- Potential archaeology within the site, evaluation/mitigation would be required;
- Maintain and enhance the pedestrian and cycle access established by LDP1 allocation (ADOLP003);
- New planting to the north and enhancement of the woodland along the eastern boundary will be required. Landscape buffers will be required and the long term maintenance of the landscaped areas must be addressed;
- A pedestrian link will be required to the existing public transport provision on the A702, either via this site or the adjacent allocation (ADOLP003);
- Co-location issues, as 'A PPC part B cement batcher' is currently located south west of the development at 'Heywood'. The likely issues are dust;
- The Roads Planning Officer has advised no objections and that access is acceptable via the existing housing allocation (ADOLP003) to the south; and

- Early discussions with Scottish Water, to ascertain whether a Water Impact Assessment will be required.

In conclusion, it is not considered that there are any insurmountable planning issues, which cannot be overcome through mitigation. The site is recommended for inclusion within the MIR as a preferred option for housing, with an indicative site capacity for 10 units.

Eddleston

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR status
AEDDL008	Land West of Elibank Park	Eddleston	Rest of Borders	Housing	40	5.5	Alternative

Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designations.

SEPA: Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at an increased risk of flooding. There is the potential that development of this allocation would increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard identified at the site.

Foul sewage from this development should be connected into the SW public foul network (although the site is outwith the current sewered catchment). Failing that private sewage provision would be required although this could be challenging given the site location. The only possible discharge point would appear to be the Eddleston water for this scale of development. Further discussion would be required to determine whether such a discharge would be feasible in terms of the effluent standards required. Std comments re: SUDS.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

I would, however, ask that potential surface water is considered during development due to the large capacity of the site.

Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	There is no planning application history on this site. The site has not previously been assessed as part of any Local Plan process.

Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Good	Good	Good	Moderate	Not applicable

Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Moderate biodiversity risk. Site appears to be an improved pasture but with Ancient Woodland (Ancient of semi-natural origin) (Cemetery wood) along northern boundary with

record of red squirrel (10 +years) and beech hedgerow along roadside boundary. Potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC via the Dean burn. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats, badger and breeding birds. Planted buffer required to protect ancient woodland. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC (Eddleston water). SEPA CAR construction site licence required (site >4ha)(5.50ha)

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the south west of Eddleston. Good bus route to Edinburgh and Peebles with connecting linkages. The village has a restaurant, hotel, village hall and a primary school. Eddleston is located 5 miles north from Peebles, on the A701 to Edinburgh.

Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area

Not applicable

Open space

Adjacent to site

Listed buildings

Not applicable

Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

Ancient woodland inventory

On/adjacent to site

Archaeology

Adjacent to site

Garden and designed

On/adjacent to site

Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: There may be some minor issues about possible impact on the setting of the Black Barony, although the current woodland provides a buffer. The site is remote from the village.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Spoke to the Officer and he advised that there is potential for archaeology within the site.

Landscape assessment

NSA

Not applicable

SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

Wild Land

Not applicable

Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: This is a large and partially open site on undulating ground. The proposed density of development over the site is very low and it is unclear how the proposal would seek to integrate or respond to the settlement character and siting principles established within the existing village. If allocated, we advise that a design brief should inform what would be intended for the development layout. Existing features such as the hedgerow should be retained and appropriate improvements made to allow safe access to the rest of the settlement established. For example the provision of pavements along the main road and access connections from the site to and through Elibank Park to Station Lye should be established.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: The site is an east facing gently sloping field to the west of the minor road that connects A703 at Eddleston through the Meldons to Lyne and A72 west of Peebles. The gradients are relatively gentle and the site sits contiguous with the ancient woodland associated with Dean Burn that runs through Barony Castle (local Designed Landscape) immediately to the north. A buffer of woodland planting along the north boundary should wrap around the west and south boundaries to ensure an appropriate 'landscape fit'. As far as is practicable boundary hedges should be retained and enhanced.

Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: No response received.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: While the site lies adjacent to the settlement boundary of Eddleston, the road leading out to it from the village is restrictive in width and there is no provision for pedestrians. Any development of this site will require carriageway widening, (at key locations on the section of road between the junction with Station Lye and the site entrance) and a pedestrian link with the village including street lighting provision. Such provision will require significant engineering work and will impact on land outwith the road boundary. That said, I understand the land on the south east side of the road (Elibank Park) is Council owned so that a pedestrian route, divorced from the carriageway, could be provided through the park towards the site, but it should be noted this will impact on the tree belt

and roadside hedge and will require a footbridge over Dean Burn. From Dean Burn a new footway would be required to connect with the village footway which terminates near the bridge over Eddleston Water. The village street lighting and 30 mph speed limit would need to extend out to the site. In terms of the site itself, satisfactory access can be achieved, although a section of the roadside hedgerow would have to be removed in order to create appropriate visibility splays. In summary, I can on balance support this site being allocated for housing development, but there is a fair bit of work required for it to properly connect with the village. A Transport Statement would be required.
 PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No response received.

Right of way	TPOs	Contaminated land	Water supply	Sewerage	Gas Supply	Education provision
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Limited	Limited	No	Good

Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No response received.
 HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.
 SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. A Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network .
 SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. A Water Impact Assessment (WIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.
 OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: This site would need to have good non-vehicular links to the existing path network and recreation ground.
 CONTAMINATED LAND: There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.
 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.
 NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.
 PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.
 EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.
 NHS: No response received.

Overall assessment

MIR status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Alternative	Acceptable	40

Conclusions

The site lies to the south west of Eddleston. The site was identified as part of the 'Western Rural Growth Area: Development Options Study' which was undertaken by LUC, to identify and assess options for housing within Central Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP for the Tweeddale area, in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders.

Eddleston has good access to public transport, services and employment, given it's proximity to Peebles. Further to a site assessment, the following constraints/issues were identified, which may require mitigation;

- Foul sewerage constraints, as the site is located outwith the current sewered catchment;
- Potential surface water runoff issues;
- Ancient Woodland Inventory lies along the northern boundary of the site;
- Potential connectivity to the River Tweed SAC/SSSI;
- Protect and enhance the existing boundary features, including the beech hedgerow along the roadside;
- Potential protected species, including breeding birds within the site;
- Site lies within the 'Barony Castle' Designed Landscape (SBC);
- 2 HER records adjacent to the site;
- Pedestrian link to the village would be required;

- Planting/lanscaping along the western and southern boundary of the site, to contain the development and form a settlement edge;
- Some form of separation buffer between the development and ancient woodland to the north;
- Transport Statement required; and
- Drainage Impact Assessment and Water Impact Assessment required, in respect of WWTW and WTW.

Overall, taking the above into consideration, it is considered that there are no insurmountable planning issues and the site is proposed as an alternative housing option within the MIR, with an indicative site capacity of 40 units.

Site reference AEDDL009	Site name Land South of Cemetery	Settlement Eddleston	RGA Rest of Borders	Proposed Use Housing	Indicative Capacity 35	Ha 3.7	MIR status Alternative
-----------------------------------	--	--------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	----------------------------------

Initial assessment

Floodrisk 1:200	SAC Not applicable	SPA Not applicable	SSSI Not applicable	Ramsar Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designation constraints. However, it does fall within the 1 in 200 floodrisk maps.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Eddleston Water. Any nearby small watercourses should be investigated as there was a mill dam upslope of the site in the past to ensure there are no culverted watercourses through the site. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within the site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at increased risk of flooding.

There is the potential that development at this allocation could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard at this site.

Foul sewage from this development should be connected into the SW public foul network (although the site is outwith the currently sewerred catchment). Failing that private sewage provision would be required. The only possible discharge point would appear to be the Eddleston water for this scale of development. Further discussion would be required to determine whether such a discharge would be feasible in terms of the effluent standards required. Std comments re: SUDS.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site may be at risk of flooding from the Eddleston Water during a 1 in 200 year flood. The South part of this site is expected to flood so dependent on the outline drawings, I may require a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). However, if properties were located out with the Southern side, there would be scope for approval.

I would ask that potential surface water is considered during development due to the large capacity of the site.

Background information

Minerals and coal Not applicable	NNR Not applicable	Prime Quality Agricultural Land Not applicable	Current use/s Greenfield	Planning history references There is no planning application history on the site. The site has not been previously considered as part of a Local Plan.
--	------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	---

Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport Good	Access to employment Good	Access to services Good	Wider biodiversity impacts Moderate	Site aspect Not applicable
---	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	---	--------------------------------------

Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Moderate biodiversity risk. Site appears to be an improved pasture with beech hedgerow and treeline on boundary. Small part of site within SEPA 1 in 200 year indicative flood

risk area, potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including, badger and breeding birds. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC (Eddleston water) (3.7ha)

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the south west of Eddleston. Good bus route to Edinburgh and Peebles with connecting linkages. The village has a restaurant, hotel, village hall and a primary school. Eddleston is located 5 miles north from Peebles, on the A701 to Edinburgh.

Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area

Not applicable

Open space

Adjacent to site

Listed buildings

Not applicable

Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

Archaeology

On/adjacent to site

Garden and designed

Adjacent to site

Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: The site is remote from the village.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Spoke to the Officer who advised that there is potential for archaeology within the site.

Landscape assessment

NSA

Not applicable

SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

Wild Land

Not applicable

Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: The site presents similar issues to AEDDL008. We highlight the potential for a planted linear path or green network along the dismantled railway to the east of the site and connecting to and through Elibank Park. We recommend that if both are to be allocated in the next LDP a planning brief for both sites should be prepared.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: Site is very gently sloping, almost valley bottom of Eddleston Water. It would effectively extend Eddleston southward by .270km. Both this site and AEDDL008 are highly visible from the A703 but the visual impact could be mitigated by carefully planned structural planting along the eastern and southern boundaries, ideally overrunning into the flood plain to create a more natural edge to the development and avoid using manmade features such as the railway line as rigid boundary.

Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: No response received.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: While the site lies adjacent to the settlement boundary of Eddleston, the road leading out to it from the village is restrictive in width and there is no provision for pedestrians. Any development of this site will require carriageway widening, (at key locations on the section of road between the junction with Station Lye and the site entrance) and a pedestrian link with the village including street lighting provision. Such provision will require significant engineering work and will impact on land outwith the road boundary. That said, I understand the land on the south east side of the road (Elibank Park) is Council owned so that a pedestrian route, divorced from the carriageway, could be provided through the park towards the site, but it should be noted this will impact on the tree belt and roadside hedge and will require a footbridge over Dean Burn. From Dean Burn a new footway would be required to connect with the village footway which terminates near the bridge over Eddleston Water. The village street lighting and 30 mph speed limit would need to extend out to the site. A pedestrian/cycle link from the lower part of the site to the village via the old railway line and/or Elibank Park needs to be explored too. In terms of the site itself, satisfactory access can be achieved at a number of locations provided visibility splays and acceptable gradients are met. In summary, I can on balance support this site being allocated for housing development, but there is a fair bit of work required for it to properly connect with the village. A Transport Statement would be required.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No response received.

Right of way

Not applicable

TPOs

Not applicable

Contaminated land

Not applicable

Water supply

Limited

Sewerage

Limited

Gas Supply

No

Education provision

Good

Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No response received.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. Site is 145 meters away from the existing Scottish Water WwTw, odour and noise assessments will need to be carried out to consider the impact of the proximity. A Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network .

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. Please note there is an existing Scottish Water existing raw water main running along East and within the south edge of site. Additionally there is a 100mm water main running along East edge of site. A Water Impact Assessment (WIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Housing on this site and AEDDL008 would benefit greatly from a pavement down to the village as well as non-vehicular links to the existing path network and recreation ground.

CONTAMINATED LAND: There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

Overall assessment

MIR status

Alternative

Overall assessment

Acceptable

Site capacity

35

Conclusions

The site lies to the south west of Eddleston. The site was identified as part of the 'Western Rural Growth Area: Development Options Study' which was undertaken by LUC, to identify and assess options for housing within Central Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP for the Tweeddale area, in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders.

Eddleston has good access to public transport, services and employment, given it's proximity to Peebles. Further to a site assessment, the following constraints/issues were identified, which may require mitigation;

- Foul sewerage constraints, as the site is located outwith the current sewered catchment;
- Flood Risk Assessment required, in respect of potential flood risk and potential surface water runoff on the site;
- Potential connectivity to the River Tweed SAC/SSSI, mitigation required to ensure no likely significant effects;
- Protect and enhance the existing boundary features, including the beech hedgerow and treeline along the roadside;
- Potential protected species, including breeding birds within the site, would require mitigation;
- The site is adjacent to 'Elibank Park' key greenspace and Eddleston Cemetery;
- 2 HER records adjacent to the site, 1 overlaps the eastern boundary of the site, potential mitigation required;
- Site located adjacent to the 'Barony Castle' Designed Landscape SBC;
- Pedestrian link with the village and explore the potential to connect with the old railway line and/or Elibank Park;
- Structure planting along the eastern and southern boundaries, to mitigate any visual impacts from the A703;
- Transport Statement required;

- Drainage Impact Assessment required, in respect of WWTW; and
- Water Impact Assessment required, in respect of WTW.

Overall, taking the above into consideration, it is considered that there are no insurmountable planning issues and the site is proposed as an alternative housing option within the MIR, with an indicative site capacity of 35 units.

Site reference SEDDL001	Site name North of Bellfield II	Settlement Eddleston	RGA Rest of Borders	Proposed Use Long Term Housing	Indicative Capacity N/A	Ha 4.4	MIR status Preferred
-----------------------------------	---	--------------------------------	-------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	------------------	--------------------------------

Initial assessment

Floodrisk Not applicable	SAC Not applicable	SPA Not applicable	SSSI Not applicable	Ramsar Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designation constraints. There are Surface Water Hazards to the west of the site, however not within the site itself.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Eddleston Water. Due to the gradients on site, the majority of the site will likely be developable. Consideration should be given to the lower parts of the site adjacent to the A703. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at an increased risk of flooding.

There is the potential that development at this allocation could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard identified at the site.

Foul sewage from this development should be connected into the SW public foul network (although the site is outwith the current sewered catchment). Failing that private sewage provision would be required although this could be challenging given the site location. The only possible discharge point would appear to be the Eddleston water for this scale of development. Further discussion would be required to determine whether such a discharge would be feasible in terms of the effluent standards required. Std comments re: SUDS.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

I would, however, ask that potential surface water is considered during development due to the large capacity of the site.

Background information

Minerals and coal Not applicable	NNR Not applicable	Prime Quality Agricultural Land Not applicable	Current use/s	Planning history references There is no planning history on the site. The site has not been previously considered as part of a Local Plan.
--	------------------------------	--	----------------------	---

Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport Good	Access to employment Good	Access to services Good	Wider biodiversity impacts Minor	Site aspect Not applicable
---	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------

Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Low biodiversity risk. Site appears to be an improved pasture sloping down to old A703 with stone dyke on the boundary. Site may require cut and fill. No obvious drainage connectivity to River Tweed SAC but is just outside of 1 in 200 year flood risk area. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including badger and breeding birds. SEPA CAR construction site licence required (site >4ha) (4.36ha)

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the north of Eddleston, directly to the north of the existing housing allocation (AEDDL002). The settlement currently runs along the A703. Good bus route to Edinburgh and Peebles with connecting linkages. The village has a restaurant, hotel, village hall and a primary school. Eddleston is located 5 miles north from Peebles, on the A701 to Edinburgh.

Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area	Open space	Listed buildings	Scheduled Monument	Ancient woodland inventory	Archaeology	Garden and designed
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Adjacent to site

Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Whilst not specific Listed Building or Conservation Area issues, at first sight, this land is remote from the village. However if the site to the south were to be developed (and I think this is an allocated site) then this proposal may be worthy of further consideration, especially as it is set back from the road behind a line of mature trees lining the old road.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Spoke to the Officer who advised that there is potential for archaeology on the site.

Landscape assessment

NSA	SLA	Over 200 metres? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Over 12 degree slope <input type="checkbox"/>	Wild Land
Not applicable	Not applicable			Not applicable

Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: We note that existing allocation AEDDL002 is to have a planning brief produced and adopted. If AEDDL007 is to be allocated in the second LDP, we recommend that the proposed planning brief is extended in scope to include both AEDDL002 and AEDDL007. Allocation of this site should lead to update of site requirements for AEDDL002, particularly "New structure planting/landscaping, including woodland, to improve the setting of the areas, screen and shelter development". This requirement will need review if AEDDL007 is to be delivered as part of Eddleston rather than as a perceptually isolated extension. Consideration of the potential impact of development on the River Tweed SAC has been established through the prior assessment of AEDDL002 during preparation of the current LDP. We recommend a similar approach is adopted for this site.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: This site would effectively extend Eddleston northwards by .275km beyond the allocated but as yet undeveloped AEDDL002. The site is a sloping west facing field on the east side of the A703, the western boundary is defined by the old A703 which along this section is lined by a single line of mature lime trees. The slopes are no steeper than the allocated site to south and access could be achieved from existing access points off the A703 to the north (at Cottage Bank) and to the south along the old A703. Structure shelterbelt planting using deciduous/ mixed woodland species will be essential along the eastern elevated boundary to achieve a 'landscape fit' with potential to wrap this around the north boundary to create a structural limit extent of Eddleston.

Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity	Near a trunk road? <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	--

NETWORK MANAGER: No response received.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I am able to offer my support for housing development on this site, but the allocated site to the south (AEDDL002) would have to be developed first in order to integrate this proposed site with the settlement of Eddleston. In terms of access, I would be looking for the former section of public road, which runs along the western boundary of the site (Old Edinburgh Road), to be reinstated as a public road to provide access to the A703 to the north of Scots Pine Restaurant as well as well as to the A703 south near Bellfield Crescent. Access into the development site can be taken from a number of points on the former public road and a link from the allocated site to the south should also be a requirement.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No response received.

Right of way

Adjacent to site

TPOs

Not applicable

Contaminated land

Not applicable

Water supply

Limited

Sewerage

Limited

Gas Supply

No

Education provision

Good

Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No response received.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. A Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. This proposed site is located a considerable distance from the public network. Any installation of network from site to the public sewers must be funded and carried out by the developer. These associated costs may be notable and not fully covered by Scottish Water's Reasonable Cost Contribution (RCC) scheme.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. A Water Impact Assessment (WIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. The nearest water main is some distance away and it will be the Developers responsibility to lay their water main to existing Scottish Water network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS: Core path 146 partly runs adjacent to the west side of this proposed site. Should a road be built over this then there would need to be a footpath/pavement to maintain non-vehicular access.

CONTAMINATED LAND: There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

Overall assessment**MIR status**

Preferred

Overall assessment

Acceptable

Site capacity

N/A

Conclusions

The site is located to the north of Eddleston, directly to the north of the existing housing allocation (AEDDL002). The site was identified as part of the 'Western Rural Growth Area: Development Options Study' which was undertaken by LUC, to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Central Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP and for the future, within the Central Tweeddale area, in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders. The site currently being considered is proposed for a longer term housing development site. It should be noted that the consultation was undertaken for site code (AEDDL007), however after the consultation the site code was altered to (SEDDL001) to reflect the longer term housing proposal.

Eddleston has good access to services, employment and public transport. Further to a site assessment, the following constraints/issues were identified, which may require mitigation;

- Flood Risk Assessment required, in respect of potential flood risk and surface water runoff on the site;
- Foul sewerage constraints, as the site is located outwith the current sewered catchment;
- Protect and enhance the existing boundary features, where possible;
- Potential protected species, including breeding birds within the site, would require mitigation;
- The Designed Landscape (SBC) and Garden and Designed Landscape (HES) 'Portmore' are located to the north of the site;
- Consideration of the potential impact of the development on the River Tweed SAC/SSSI;
- Structure shelterbelt planting using deciduous/mixed woodland species will be essential along eastern elevation boundary to achieve a 'landscape fit'
- The Roads Planning Officer advised that the proposal is acceptable. (AEDDL002) would need to be developed first, in order to integrate this proposed site within the settlement. Access into the site can be taken from a number of points along the former public road and a link to (AEDDL002) would be required;
- Potential for archaeology on the site;

- Potential for Drainage Impact Assessment, in respect of the WWTW; and
- Potential for Water Impact Assessment, in respect of the WTW.

There are no insurmountable constraints, which would prevent the development of this site for housing, subject to mitigation measures. It is acknowledged that the site immediately to the south is already allocated for housing within the LDP and remains undeveloped to date. The Roads Planning Officer has confirmed that access would need to come via the allocated housing site (AEDDL002) and that the site should be developed prior to this one. Therefore, given that (AEDDL002) remains undeveloped to date, it is considered more appropriate for this site to be considered for longer term housing.

In conclusion, the longer term housing site will be taken forward as a preferred option within the MIR. It should be noted that the longer term sites will not be formal allocated within the LDP2, rather identified for potential development in the future.

Eshiels

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR status
MESHI001	Land at Eshiels I	Eshiels	Western	Mixed Use	200	19.4	Preferred

Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

Initial assessment summary

The site does not lie within any international/national designations.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Linn Burn and any small watercourses which flow through and adjacent to the site. The River Tweed may also require consideration. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site which may exacerbate flood risk. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at increased risk of flooding.

There is the potential that development on this allocation could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard on the site.

There is a water body immediately adjacent to the site. Therefore, SEPA advise that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

There is no public foul sewer in the vicinity and if this site was to be developed this would be an opportunity to provide first time sewerage provision to Eshiels, picking up existing properties also. Any private sewage provision would be likely to require to discharge to the River Tweed rather than the Linn burn. The watercourse that runs through/adjacent to the site should be protected and enhanced as part of any development. Std comments for SUDS. Depending on the use of the proposed site there may be a requirement for permissions to be sought for certain activities from SEPA.

There are co-location issues regarding this site. Peebles STW (CAR) and Eshiels community recycling centre (WML) are located across the road and to the west of the site. These sites are however unlikely to have an impact on the site from SEPA's perspective. Possible odour issues from the STW would be dealt with by SBC Env health.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with the pluvial 1 in 200 year flood extents but there is a small section at the SE side (next to the road) that is shown to flood from the River Tweed. It is unlikely that a Flood Risk Assessment would be required but this would be dependent on the layout of the development. I would ask that due to the size of the development that surface water flooding is considered. I would recommend dealing with MESHI001 and MESHI002 at the same time from a flood risk perspective.

Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	Planning consent for a dwellinghouse in the north eastern corner of the site. (16/00497/PPP). The site was considered, as part of a larger site, in the Local Development Plan (BPEEB005). The south west part of the site, was previously considered, in the Local Development Plan (BPEEB006).

Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport

Limited

Access to employment

Good

Access to services

Good

Wider biodiversity impacts

Moderate

Site aspect

Not applicable

Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Moderate biodiversity impact. Site appears to be an improved pasture with mature broadleaf treeline on boundary and field boundary within site These feature on 1st Ed OS map). Small area along A72 boundary within SEPA 1 in 200 year indicative flood risk area. Potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC via the Linn burn. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats (EPS), badger and breeding birds. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC/SSSI. SEPA CAR construction site licence required (site >4ha (19.38ha)

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located at Eshiels, which is not an identified settlement within the current Local Development Plan, rather consists of a small cluster of houses, farm buildings and a sawmill. Immediately to the east of Eshiels, is the recreational hub of Glentress, and there is further development on the south side of the A72. Eshiels is within close proximity to Peebles, which is 2 miles to the west. As Eshiels is not a settlement, there are no services or employment opportunities at present. However, the close proximity to Peebles, including the cycle path along the former railway line, provides access to a wider range of services, employment and public transport opportunities. Furthermore, Edinburgh is within commuting distance.

Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area

Not applicable

Open space

Not applicable

Listed buildings

Not applicable

Scheduled Monument

On/adjacent to site

Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

Archaeology

On/adjacent to site

Garden and designed

On/adjacent to site

Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No additional comments from those on the original proposal – a prominent site on the approach to Peebles.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Site adjacent to SM 3667 Eshiels, Roman camps 90m SSW of No 4 Eshiels. Content with the principle of development in this area but would wish to see mitigation in the form of (a) an adequate buffer zone to protect the physical remains and setting of Eshiels Roman camps, and (b) a suitable management regime for the section of the monument within or adjacent to the development area.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Spoke to the Archaeology Officer who advised that there is Scheduled Monument in the south east corner of the site. There is also a ring ditch within the site and there is potential for prehistoric burials and cemetery within the site. Justification likely against LDP policies.

Landscape assessment

NSA

Not applicable

SLA

On/adjacent to site

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

Wild Land

Not applicable

Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: This is a large and open site that is detached from the town of Peebles. There would likely be loss of openness and adverse effects on local landscape character experienced, particularly from the A72 and existing settled areas along the Linn Burn Road. If this site was to be considered (and noting the detached nature of the site) we would advise the need for a strong approach to place-making to be adopted in order ensure local identity and appropriate facilities, including green infrastructure. In this regard we advise that safe off-site active travel connections linking the site to the town should be secured in order to link the site through sustainable travel to nearby Peebles.

We also advise that a co-ordinated approach to landscape design, wider integration into setting and place design would also be needed and be set through a pre-agreed site development brief. Close consideration of landscape structure and development densities should inform this approach. Existing natural features on the site should also be safeguarded and utilised in the development of the site should it be considered appropriate for development.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: The logical development pattern for this relatively large block of land (circa 20 ha) would be industrial/business on the southernmost, more gently sloping fields with housing in the larger field to the north to take advantage of elevated views south across the valley to hills beyond. A masterplan will be necessary to establish the optimum access routes into the site, buffer planting to existing field boundary trees and the appropriate depth of shelterbelt planting along the southern boundary to mitigate the impacts of the development from sensitive receptors on A72.

Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: No response received.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: Whilst I am not against the allocation of this site for mixed use development, the main consideration will be providing adequate access from the A72 to serve a development of this size. The existing access is unsuitable to support a substantial increase in dwellings. Therefore a new junction onto the A72 will be required to the west of the existing, with the existing junction closed off. A further access point will be required and can be achieved to the west of No 6 Eshiels Holdings which will help disperse traffic movements and will aid connectivity. Junction design for access to the A72 will have to be in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges and a Transport Assessment can address the most appropriate form of junctions. The site will have to connect and integrate with the existing body of Eshiels and with Site MESH1002 if it is to be developed. Options for improvements to the existing public transport infrastructure will need to be explored as will the suitability of pedestrian provision in the A72.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No response received.

Right of way

Not applicable

TPOs

Not applicable

Contaminated land

On/adjacent to site

Water supply

Limited

Sewerage

Limited

Gas Supply

Yes

Education provision

Average

Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No response received.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. A Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network .

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. A Water Impact Assessment (WIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Requires non-vehicular links to path network and Peebles town and amenities.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed, with the exception of development in the north eastern corner of the site. The use of the buildings is not known but appear to possibly be agricultural/commercial in use. Therefore, part of the site is brownfield and its use may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURING SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: This site has potential on the southern and western edge for accommodating a new industrial / business park development. We would prefer that a separate access to this site is made from the A72 rather than from a single access which would also service any proposed residential development. More detailed feasibility work is required to ascertain the best layout and access road locations before fully defining the boundary of the site allocation.

EDUCATION OFFICER: Kingsland Primary and Halyrude RC Primary would be at full capacity if development went ahead, an extension or new school may need to be considered.

NHS: No response received.

Overall assessment

MIR status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Preferred	Acceptable	200

Conclusions

The site lies at Eshiels, on the north side of the A72. It should be noted that Eshiels is not an identified settlement within the LDP, however lies 2 miles to the east of Peebles. The site was identified as part of the 'Western Rural Growth Area: Development Options Study' which was undertaken by LUC, to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Central Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP for the Central Tweeddale area, in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders. The site currently being considered, is proposed for a mixed use development with an indicative site capacity for 200 units.

Eshiels has good access to services and employment, given it's proximity to Peebles and limited access to public transport. Further to a site assessment, the following constraints/issues were identified, which may require mitigation;

- Flood Risk Assessment required, in respect of potential flood risk and surface water runoff on the site;
- Water body immediately adjacent to the site, therefore a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6m wide must be provided between the watercourse and any built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures. This is required given the watercourse(s) which run through and adjacent to the site;
- Foul sewerage constraints, as the site is located outwith the current sewered catchment;
- Possible co location issues with the Peebles and Eshiels re cycling centres, located on the south of the A72;
- Potential connectivity to the River Tweed SAC/SSSI, mitigation required to ensure no likely significant effects;
- Protect and enhance the existing boundary features;
- Potential protected species, including breeding birds within the site, would require mitigation;
- Scheduled Monument 'Roman Camp' is located in the south east corner of the site and adjacent to the proposed site, this would require appropriate mitigation measures;
- Site is located within the 'Eshiels' Designed Landscape (SBC);
- Archaeology HER's within the site, potential mitigation required;
- The site is prominent from the approach to Peebles;
- Historic Scotland have set out mitigation requirements in respect of the proximity to the Scheduled Monument, including a) an adequate buffer zone to protect the physical remains and setting of Eshiels Roman camps, and (b) a suitable management regime for the section of the monument within or adjacent to the development area
- Located within the 'Tweed Valley' Special Landscape Area;
- There will be a requirement for a co-ordinated approach to landscape design and the wider integration into the setting and place design;
- Shelterbelt planting would be required along the southern boundary of the site, to mitigate the impacts of development from sensitive receptors on the A72;
- Roads Planning Officer advised that the existing access is unsuitable. A new junction would be required onto the A72 and the existing closed off. A further access point will be required and can be achieved to the west of No6 Eshiels Holdings;
- Transport Assessment would be required;
- The site must ensure connectivity and integration with Eshiels and the adjacent proposed site (MESH1002) should it also be taken forward;
- Potential for Drainage Impact Assessment, in respect of the WWTW;
- Potential for Water Impact Assessment, in respect of the WTW;
- Northern corner is brownfield land and potential for contamination; and
- Economic Development advise that the site has potential on the southern and western edges for accomodating a new industrial/business park development.

It should be noted that the Education Officer states that Kingsland Primary and Halrude RC Primary would be at full capacity if development went ahead, an extension or new school may need to be considered. Further investigation into this matter requires to be carried out.

Overall, taking the above into consideration, it is noted that there are a number of identified constraints within the site, however it is considered that there are no insurmountable planning issues which cannot be overcome through appropriate mitigation measures and subject to further discussions regarding school capacities. It is considered that a masterplan must be prepared, in conjunction with (MESH1002) and the site must accommodate an element of business land. Overall, the site is proposed as a preferred mixed use option within the MIR, with an indicative site capacity of 200 units.

Site reference MESHI002	Site name Land at Eshiels II	Settlement Eshiels	RGA Western	Proposed Use Mixed Use	Indicative Capacity 40	Ha 6.7	MIR status Preferred
-----------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	--------------------------------

Initial assessment

Floodrisk 1:200	SAC Not applicable	SPA Not applicable	SSSI Not applicable	Ramsar Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

Initial assessment summary

The site is not located within any international/national designation.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Linn Burn, Eshiels Burn and small watercourses which flow through and adjacent to the site. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site which may exacerbate flood risk as well as any transfer of water between catchments. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at increased risk of flooding. Site may be constrained due to flood risk.

There is the potential that development on this allocation could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard on the site.

There is a water body immediately adjacent to the site. Therefore, SEPA advise that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

There is no public foul sewer in the vicinity and if this site was to be developed this would be an opportunity to provide first time sewerage provision to Eshiels, picking up existing properties also. Any private sewage provision would be likely to require to discharge to the River Tweed rather than the Linn burn. The watercourse that runs through/adjacent to the site should be protected and enhanced as part of any development. Std comments for SUDS. Depending on the use of the proposed site there may be a requirement for permissions to be sought for certain activities from SEPA.

There are co-location issues regarding this site. Peebles STW (CAR) and Eshiels community recycling centre (WML) are located across the road and to the west of the site. These sites are however unlikely to have an impact on the site from SEPA's perspective. Possible odour issues from the STW would be dealt with by SBC Env health.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with the pluvial 1 in 200 year flood extents but there is a small section at the south side that is shown to flood from the River Tweed. It is unlikely that a Flood Risk Assessment would be required but this would be dependent on the layout of the development. I would ask that due to the size of the development that surface water flooding is considered. I would recommend dealing with MESHI001 and MESHI002 at the same time from a flood risk perspective.

Background information

Minerals and coal Not applicable	NNR Not applicable	Prime Quality Agricultural Land Not applicable	Current use/s Greenfield	Planning history references There is no planning application history. The site has not previously been considered as part of any Local Plan.
--	------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	---

Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport

Limited

Access to employment

Good

Access to services

Good

Wider biodiversity impacts

Moderate

Site aspect

Not applicable

Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Moderate biodiversity risk. Site appears to be an improved pasture with mature broadleaf treeline on boundary and field boundary within site (these feature on 1st Ed OS map). The Southern boundary is within SEPA 1 in 200 year indicative flood risk area. Potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC via the Linn burn. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats (EPS), badger and breeding birds. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC/SSSI. SEPA CAR construction site licence required (site >4ha).

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located at Eshiels, which is not an identified settlement within the current Local Development Plan, rather consists of a small cluster of houses, farm buildings and a sawmill. Immediately to the east of Eshiels, is the recreational hub of Glentress, and there is further development on the south side of the A72. Eshiels is within close proximity to Peebles, which is 2 miles to the west. As Eshiels is not a settlement, there are no services or employment opportunities at present. However, the close proximity to Peebles, including the cycle path along the former railway line, provides access to a wider range of services, employment and public transport opportunities. Furthermore, Edinburgh is within commuting distance.

Local impact and integration assessment**Conservation area**

Not applicable

Open space

Not applicable

Listed buildings

Not applicable

Scheduled Monument

Adjacent to site

Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

Archaeology

On/adjacent to site

Garden and designed

On/adjacent to site

Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No LB or CA issues. If MESH001 is developed, then , with this site as well, there will be a significant coalescence of development on the N side of the Tweed.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Site adjacent to SM 3667 Eshiels, Roman camps 90m SSW of No 4 Eshiels. Content with the principle of development in this area but have concerns that such a large allocation would require significant upgrades to access and service routes (water sewerage etc) that could have a direct physical impact on the scheduled remains. We would wish to see mitigation in the form of (a) an adequate buffer zone to protect the physical remains and setting of Eshiels Roman camps, (b) a suitable management regime for the section of the monument adjacent to the development area, and (c) any upgrades to road and service infrastructure necessitated by the development should be designed to avoid the scheduled monument.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Spoke to the Archaeology Officer who advised that there is a Scheduled Monument located to the south of the site. Also evidence of Roman Camps (unscheduled) into the site.

Landscape assessment**NSA**

Not applicable

SLA

On/adjacent to site

Over 200 metres? **Over 12 degree slope** **Wild Land**

Not applicable

Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: This is a medium sized and open site that is detached from the town of Peebles. There would likely be loss of openness and adverse effects on local landscape character experienced, particularly from the A72 and existing settled areas along the Linn Burn Road, as well as the Glentress lodges and recreational area. We note however that there is a degree of set-back on this site from the A72 and this may aid integration with local landscape character. If this site was to be considered (and noting the detached nature of the site) we would advise the need for a strong approach to place-making to be adopted in order ensure local identity and appropriate facilities, including green infrastructure. In this regard we advise that safe off-site active travel connections linking the site to the town should be secured in order to link the site through sustainable travel to nearby Peebles.

We also advise that a co-ordinated approach to landscape design, wider integration into setting and place design would also be needed and be set through a pre-agreed site development brief. Close consideration of landscape structure and development densities should inform this approach. Existing natural features on the site should also be safeguarded and utilised in the development of the site, should it be considered appropriate for development.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: This site, if constraints associated with access can be overcome, would be best suited to housing development, largely restricted to the upper ¾ of the site – the southern ¼ could be utilised for access and structure planting to mitigate effects of any development.

Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: No response received.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: Whilst I am not against the allocation of this site for mixed use development, the main consideration will be providing adequate access from the A72 to serve a development of this size. The existing access is unsuitable to support a substantial increase in dwellings. Therefore a new junction onto the A72 will be required to the west of the existing, with the existing junction closed off. Junction design for access to the A72 will have to be in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges and a Transport Assessment can address the most appropriate form of junction. The main access point into this site will need to be at the south westerly corner and the road between here and the new junction with the A72 will need to be upgraded to an appropriate standard. The site will have to connect and integrate with the existing body of Eshiels and with Site MESH10010 if it is to be developed. Pedestrian/cycle links with the Glentress Centre will be required and the merits of vehicular connectivity can be considered as part of the Transport Assessment. It should be noted that the southerly portion of this site is used as overspill parking for the Glentress Centre and any development on this site may need to take this into consideration. Options for improvements to the existing public transport infrastructure will need to be explored as will the suitability of pedestrian provision in the A72.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No response received.

Right of way

On/adjacent to site

TPOs

Adjacent to site

Contaminated land

Not applicable

Water supply

Limited

Sewerage

Limited

Gas Supply

Yes

Education provision

Good

Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No response received.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. A Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. A Water Impact Assessment (WIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Requires non-vehicular links to path network and Peebles town and amenities.

CONTAMINATED LAND: There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: This mixed use site would appear to be more appropriate for commercial / tourism based mixed use development rather than for business / industrial uses. However, some class 4 or craft workshop use, tied towards serving the Glentress Tweed Valley Forest Park development tourist visitors, may be desirable.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues raised.

NHS: No response received.

Overall assessment

MIR status

Preferred

Overall assessment

Acceptable

Site capacity

40

Conclusions

The site lies at Eshiels, on the north side of the A72. It should be noted that Eshiels is not an identified settlement within the LDP, however lies 2 miles to the east of Peebles. The site was identified as part

of the 'Western Rural Growth Area: Development Options Study' which was undertaken by LUC, to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Central Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP for the Central Tweeddale area, in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders. The site currently being considered, is proposed for a mixed use development with an indicative site capacity for 40 units.

Eshiels has good access to services and employment, given its proximity to Peebles and limited access to public transport. Further to a site assessment, the following constraints/issues were identified, which may require mitigation;

- Flood Risk Assessment required, in respect of potential flood risk and surface water runoff on the site;
- Water body immediately adjacent to the site, therefore a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6m wide must be provided between the watercourse and any built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures. This is required given the watercourse(s) which run through and adjacent to the site;
- Foul sewerage constraints, as the site is located outwith the current sewered catchment;
- Possible co location issues with the Peebles and Eshiels re cycling centres, located on the south of the A72;
- Potential connectivity to the River Tweed SAC/SSSI, mitigation required to ensure no likely significant effects;
- Protect and enhance the existing boundary features;
- Potential protected species, including breeding birds within the site, would require mitigation;
- Scheduled Monument 'Roman Camp' is located to the south of this site, this would require appropriate mitigation measures;
- Site is located within the 'Eshiels' Designed Landscape (SBC);
- Archaeology HER's within the site, potential mitigation required;
- Historic Scotland have set out mitigation requirements in respect of the proximity to the Scheduled Monument, including (a) an adequate buffer zone to protect the physical remains and setting of Eshiels Roman camps, (b) a suitable management regime for the section of the monument adjacent to the development area, and © any upgrades to road and service infrastructure necessitated by the development should be designed to avoid the scheduled monument;
- Located within the 'Tweed Valley' Special Landscape Area;
- Tree Preservation Order to the west of the site boundary;
- There is an existing Core Path which runs through the middle of the site;
- There will be a requirement for a co-ordinated approach to landscape design and the wider integration into the setting and place design;
- The existing access is unsuitable to support a substantial increase in dwellings. Therefore a new junction onto the A72 will be required to the west of the existing, with the existing junction closed off. The main access point into this site will need to be at the south westerly corner and the road between here and the new junction with the A72 will need to be upgraded to an appropriate standard;
- Transport Assessment would be required;
- The site must ensure connectivity and integration with Eshiels and the adjacent proposed site (MESH1001) should it also be taken forward;
- Non vehicular link would be required, linking to the path network and Peebles;
- Potential for Drainage Impact Assessment, in respect of the WWTW; and
- Potential for Water Impact Assessment, in respect of the WTW.

Overall, taking the above into consideration, it is noted that there are a number of identified constraints within the site, however it is considered that there are no insurmountable planning issues which cannot be overcome through appropriate mitigation measures though archaeological issues are sensitive and will require further detailed consideration. It is considered that a masterplan must be prepared, in conjunction with (MESH1001) and the site must accommodate an element of business land. Overall, the site is proposed as a preferred mixed used option within the MIR, with an indicative site capacity of 40 units.

Innerleithen

Site reference MINNE003	Site name Land West of Innerleithen	Settlement Innerleithen	RGA Western	Proposed Use Mixed Use	Indicative Capacity 50	Ha 6.8	MIR status Preferred
-----------------------------------	---	-----------------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	--------------------------------

Initial assessment

Floodrisk Not applicable	SAC Not applicable	SPA Not applicable	SSSI Not applicable	Ramsar Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

Initial assessment summary

The site is not located within any international/national designation.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the River Tweed. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within the site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. In addition, surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue and may require mitigation measures during design stage.

There is the potential that development at this allocation could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard at this site.

Foul drainage from the development must be connected to the existing SW foul sewer network. Std comments for SUDS.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with the fluvial 1 in 200 year flood extents. This site is shown to be affected by surface water flooding in some small areas in the South of the site. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk but would require that surface water runoff be considered.

Background information

Minerals and coal Not applicable	NNR Not applicable	Prime Quality Agricultural Land Not applicable	Current use/s Greenfield	Planning history references There is no planning application history on the site. Housing SG: The site was considered for housing as part of the Housing SG (AINNE008). Local Plan Amendment: The eastern part of the site was considered as part of the Housing SG (AINNE001).
--	------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	---

Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport Good	Access to employment Good	Access to services Good	Wider biodiversity impacts Moderate	Site aspect South-west
---	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	---	----------------------------------

Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Moderate biodiversity impact. Site appears to be an improved pasture with an area of scrub in the western corner and scrub and grassland along the disused railway. Provisional

Local Biodiversity Site along old railway line (Innerleithen disused railway). Redshank, oystercatcher, lapwing and curlew recorded in Tetrad NT33I in breeding season. Site adjacent to SEPA 1 in 200 year indicative flood risk area. No obvious drainage linkage but on a precautionary basis potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC/ SSSI. Protect boundary features on disused railway and mitigation for protected species potentially badger and breeding birds. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC/SSSI. SEPA CAR construction site licence required (site >4ha)

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the west of Innerleithen. Innerleithen has good access to public transport, services and employment opportunities. There is a bus stop within walking distance of this site, with good connectivity to Galashiels, Edinburgh and other settlements, including Peebles. Peebles is located 7 miles to the west, which also provides a wider range of services and employment opportunities. There is a primary school located within Innerleithen and the nearest High School is within Peebles. There are moderate biodiversity issues, which are highlighted in the consultation response from the Ecology Officer.

Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area	Open space	Listed buildings	Scheduled Monument	Ancient woodland inventory	Archaeology	Garden and designed
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific LB and CA issues – Caerlee House is listed category C but is located in woodland so development unlikely to have an impact on its setting.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Spoke to the Archaeology Officer who advised that there is evidence of archaeology within the site (Roman Camp). Would require justification against LDP policies.

Landscape assessment

NSA	SLA	Over 200 metres?	Over 12 degree slope	Wild Land
Not applicable	On/adjacent to site	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	On/adjacent to site

Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: The overall assessment in Appendix 10 of the Housing SG was that the site should be excluded for the following reason: 'It is considered that the site forms part of the setting of Innerleithen, should development occur at this location it is considered that it would result in a dominant element on the western approach into the settlement and have a negative impact on the Tweed Valley SLA. There is also the potential for the site to impact on archaeology, in addition there is already substantial allocated land within the settlement.'. We agree with the assessment of potential landscape impacts and consider that the site should remain unallocated. Partial allocation could however be considered if there was a wider or over-riding need for housing in this area. In such circumstances close attention should be paid to allocations and site briefings which allow retain open views to the wider landscape as experienced from the road and existing dwellings

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: The site is a large field to the south of A72 approaching Innerleithen from the west. The ground slopes steeply down from the A72 before levelling out in the south eastern part that borders the existing settlement boundary west of Buchan Place off Traquair Road. Careful consideration will be required to achieve a scheme of structure planting that mitigates the visual impact of the development when seen from the elevated A72 coming into Innerleithen from the west, while maintaining views southward across the Tweed valley.

Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity	Near a trunk road?
	<input type="checkbox"/>

NETWORK MANAGER: No response received.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I have no objections to the allocation of this site for mixed use. There is ample opportunity for the easterly portion of the site to be well integrated with and connected to the surrounding street network i.e. Tweed View, St Ronan's Health Centre and Angle Park. The close proximity of the multi-use path to the south of the site offers a great opportunity to provide a

pedestrian/cycle link to the site. I would not necessarily rule out direct access from the A72 into the site, however this would need to be carefully designed to ensure the appropriate gradients and visibility splays can be achieved. A strong street frontage would help have a positive impact on driver behaviour along this section of the A72. A Transport Assessment, or at least a Transport Statement, will be a prerequisite for development on this site to address matters of accessibility and sustainable transport.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No response received.

Right of way

Adjacent to site

TPOs

Not applicable

Contaminated land

Not applicable

Water supply

Limited

Sewerage

Limited

Gas Supply

Yes

Education provision

Good

Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: The site lies to the south west of the town immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary edge and would appear to be a logical extension of the town. The land slopes from the main public road A72 south to the River Tweed SAC. The site lies within the Tweed Valley Special Landscape Area. The site will be visible from main public road A72 on approach from Peebles and would become the new edge of the settlement. Landscaping would be an important consideration in order to soften the edge of any development. Low density development of high quality may appropriate for edge of settlement area. The site lies immediately north and adjacent to an area which is considered to be at a high risk of flooding from the River Tweed (SAC) and is thus a potentially vulnerable area. Surface water drainage may be an issue/would require to be considered. Potential for access from existing development may be a consideration. West end of site is steeper and located adjacent to sharp bend in the A72.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Walkerburn WWTW has sufficient capacity. A Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. Please note there is an existing 100m water main within the site boundary. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Requires non-vehicular links to path network and Peebles town and amenities.

CONTAMINATED LAND: There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Whilst the site is likely to be mainly housing, an area of mixed use of commercial / business use would be desirable adjacent to the health centre and other similar business uses.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

Overall assessment

MIR status

Preferred

Overall assessment

Acceptable

Site capacity

50

Conclusions

The site lies to the west of Innerleithen, just outwith the settlement boundary, on the south side of the A72. The site was identified as part of the 'Western Rural Growth Area: Development Options Study' which was undertaken by LUC, to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Central Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP for the Central Tweeddale area, in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders. The site currently being considered, is proposed for a mixed use development with an indicative site capacity for 50 units.

Innerleithen has good access to public transport, services and employment, given the proximity to Peebles and good links to Galashiels and Edinburgh. Further to a site assessment, the following constraints/issues were identified, which may require mitigation;

- Flood Risk Assessment required, in respect of potential flood risk and surface water runoff on the site;
- Potential connectivity to the River Tweed SAC/SSSI, mitigation required to ensure no likely significant effects;
- Protect and enhance the existing boundary features and protect boundary features on dis-used railway;

- Potential protected species, including breeding birds within the site, would require mitigation;
- Located within the 'Tweed Valley' Special Landscape Area;
- The western part of the site is constrained within the Landscape Capacity Study;
- SNH advise that the site should remain unallocated, given the potential for any development to result in a dominant element on the western approach into the settlement. However, structure planting is proposed and it is considered that this would mitigate any visual impacts of the development from the A72;
- Transport Assessment or at least Statement required;
- Evidence of archaeology within the site, therefore mitigation required. The Officer would prefer in-situ protection, full investigation would be required for the area within the Roman Camp;
- Roads Planning Officer raised no objections to the allocation;
- Potential for Drainage Impact Assessment, in respect of the WWTW;
- Potential for Water Impact Assessment, in respect of the WTW; and
- Non vehicular links to existing path network and Peebles town/amenities.

It should be noted that the site was considered as part of the Housing SG for housing development and was ultimately not included. An initial Stage 1 RAG assessment was undertaken as part of the Housing SG. It is acknowledged that concerns were raised in the conclusions at that stage, regarding the prominent location, impact upon the SLA and potential archaeology. However since that assessment, a more extensive study of the Tweeddale area has been undertaken by LUC, in order to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Tweeddale. The site was one option put forward for consideration, in respect of a mixed use site. A re-assessment has therefore been undertaken, in light of the additional information contained within the LUC Study and consultation responses. It should also be noted that there are a lack of suitable development opportunities within the Tweeddale area going forward.

Overall, taking the above into consideration, it is considered that there are no insurmountable planning issues which cannot be overcome through appropriate mitigation measures. These will be set out within the site requirements. Overall, the site is proposed as a preferred mixed use option within the MIR, with an indicative site capacity of 50 units. It should be noted that the site should accommodate an element of business land.

Oxton

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR status
AOXTO010	Nether Howden	Oxton	Rest of Borders	Housing	30	2.1	Preferred

Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designation constraints.

SEPA: OS Map indicates a sufficient height difference between site and Leader Water. Surface Water Flood Map is picking up the low point of the dismantled railway.

Foul water must be connected to the existing SW foul network. SW should confirm any capacity/network issues.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Combination	N/A

Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Good	Good	Limited	Moderate	Not applicable

Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Moderate biodiversity impact. Site consists of farm buildings and agricultural outbuildings, garden ground (mature broadleaves) and improved pasture. Potential for EPS (bats) and breeding birds to use built structures within the site. No obvious connectivity with the River Tweed SAC (Leader water). Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC. Mitigation for protected species including bats and breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the east of Oxton, just outwith the settlement boundary. Development will help sustain local services in the settlement such as the school, shop and village hall. Settlement is near the strategic public transport network on the A68(T). The site has other local services a 10 minutes driving distance away in Lauder.

Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area

Not applicable

Open space

Not applicable

Listed buildings

Not applicable

Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

Archaeology

Not applicable

Garden and designed

Not applicable

Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There are no known issues, although there is generally a low to moderate potential in the wider area. Some mitigation may be required depending on the development.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific comment.

Landscape assessment

NSA

Not applicable

SLA

Adjacent to site

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

Wild Land

Not applicable

Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to size and location.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: There are clearly issues with access that need to be addressed if the original Nether Howden building group is retained. A 10m wide belt of woodland planting along the east boundary would help to provide containment to the development from the east and separation from the farm buildings immediately to the east.

Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Additional traffic being added to junction with A68.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Possible bus stop infrastructure.

ROADS PLANNING: In order to achieve satisfactory access to this site the existing farm will have to be redeveloped and some of the farm buildings will have to be demolished. A footway and street lighting will be required from the site along the minor road to link in with Station Road (Main Street). Widening of the minor road carriageway will also be required. A secondary access from the extreme south westerly corner of the site which links into Justice Park and the possibility of a further pedestrian/cycle linkage between plots 26/27 Justice Park should be explored in the best interests of connectivity and integration of the existing street network. Depending on the scale of development a Transport Statement is likely to be required.

Right of way

Not applicable

TPOs

Not applicable

Contaminated land

On site

Water supply

Yes

Sewerage

Yes

Gas Supply

No

Education provision

Average

Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Appears to be constraint free.

HOUSING STRATEGY: No issues.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Oxton WwTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: No Comment.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: An area of the site appears to have been previously developed with agricultural buildings. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development

constraints.
ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.
PROJECTS TEAM: No issues.
EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.
NHS: No response received.

Overall assessment

MIR status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Preferred	Acceptable	30

Conclusions

The site is located to the north east of Oxton, adjacent to the existing settlement boundary. The site currently consists of farm land, buildings and agricultural buildings. Oxton has good access to public transport and employment, however limited access to services. However, it is considered that this site would assist in supporting the existing services within the settlement. It is considered that the site has the potential to integrate with the rest of the settlement. The consultation process highlighted the following constraints/issues, which may require mitigation measures;

- There is potential for breeding birds and bats, given the existing buildings on site;
- Potential connectivity with the River Tweed SAC/SSSI;
- Potential for archaeology within the site;
- The Lammermuir Hills SLA lies to the north east;
- Planting along the eastern boundary, would help to provide containment to development from the east and separation from the farm buildings to the east. The landscaping would help to assist in enhancing and enclosing the site;
- Footway and street lighting would be required, to link with Station Road;
- Access from the south west corner of the site and the possibility of further pedestrian/cycle linkage should be explored, in the best interests of connectivity and integration of existing street network;
- Transport Statement required;
- Water Impact Assessment required, in respect of the WTW network capacity; and
- Part of the site is brownfield land and may have contaminated land constraints.

Overall, it is considered that there are no insurmountable constraints, to prevent the development of this site, subject to appropriate mitigation measures being put in place. In conclusion, the site will be taken forward within the MIR as a preferred option for housing, with an indicative site capacity for 30 units.

Peebles

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR status
APEEB056	Land South of Chapelhill Farm	Peebles	Western	Housing	150	7.0	Preferred

Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

Initial assessment summary

The site does not lie within any international/national designation constraints. The River Tweed SAC lies to the east of this site.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Eddleston Water and small watercourses which flow along the southern and north eastern boundary. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site which may exacerbate flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within the site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at increased risk of flooding.

There is the potential that the development of this allocation could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard at this site.

There is a water body immediately adjacent to the site. Therefore, SEPA advise that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

Foul drainage from the development should be connected to the existing SW foul sewer network (although the site is just outwith the current sewered catchment). Std comments for SUDS. The watercourse adjacent to the site should be protected and enhanced as part of any development.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial (river) 1 in 200 year flood extents but there is a very small pocket of potential surface water impacts on the South Eastern side of the site at a 1 in 200 year flood event.

I would have no objections on the grounds of flood risk. However, I would ask that due to surface water risk and the capacity of the development that surface water flooding is considered and it is ensured that any water would be routed around the housing.

Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	There is no planning application history on this site. The southern part of this site was previously considered as part of the Local Development Plan (APEEB036). The southern part of this site, formed part of a much larger site, which was considered as part of the Local Plan 2005/06 (TP12).

Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport

Good

Access to employment

Good

Access to services

Good

Wider biodiversity impacts

Moderate

Site aspect

South

Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Moderate biodiversity risk. Site appears to be an improved pasture with treeline on parts of boundary and drystone dyke along road. Adjacent to areas within SEPA 1 in 200 year indicative flood risk area. Potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats (EPS), badger and breeding birds. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC (Eddleston water). SEPA CAR construction site licence required (site >4ha) (7.01ha).

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the north of Peebles, just outwith the settlement boundary. Peebles has good access to public transport, employment and services. There are moderate biodiversity issues associated with this site. Peebles is within commuting distance to Edinburgh, where a wider selection of employment opportunities are available.

Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area

Not applicable

Open space

Not applicable

Listed buildings

Adjacent to site

Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

Archaeology

Adjacent to site

Garden and designed

Not applicable

Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Standalane Cottage at the SW end of the site is category C listed and the proposed development may have an impact on its setting, but this can probably be addressed through mitigation. Careful consideration will be needed about the site layout as the site straddles the road – will there be a “street frontage”?

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Spoke to the Officer who advised that there is potential for archaeology on the site.

Landscape assessment

NSA

Not applicable

SLA

On/adjacent to site

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

Wild Land

Not applicable

Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: APEEB056 lies adjacent to the recent development at Standalane. The outlying and linear nature of the site is likely to result in development that is physically and perceptually detached from the rest of Peebles. The general sense of openness and the rolling nature of the topography could also accentuate these issues. In overall terms we highlight that this site, even with landscape planting and retention of stone walls, could result in a settlement extension which appears incongruous and detracts from the existing well defined and characterful landscape setting of Peebles. The western part of the site is on a slope and would appear likely to require significant cut and fill to achieve development platforms.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: This site lies on both sides of the minor road that links the A703 to Rosetta Road. The site is out with the development boundary and would extend the Peebles settlement .425km further north up the Eddleston Water valley. It would be highly visible from the A703 approaching from the north. It will be essential to achieve containment to the northern edge (by carefully designed structure planting that could extend into the flood plain along the eastern boundary) and additional planting as a backdrop (containment) along the more elevated and exposed west boundary.

Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: No response received.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: Any development at the north end of Peebles will be reliant upon improved vehicular linkage being provided over the Eddleston Water between Rosetta Road and the A703. This should ideally be provided between Kingsland Square and Dalatho Street, but there may be other acceptable opportunities further north. Third party land ownership will be an issue. Existing pedestrian and street lighting infrastructure would need to be extended out from the town to the development site. Fundamental to the development of this site is good pedestrian/cycle connectivity with the provision in Standalane View. There appears to be constraints engineering wise and land ownership wise in achieving this and it will need to be demonstrated that solutions are available before I can offer my support for this site being developed for housing. Some minor road improvement work may be required to Rosetta Road leading to the site from the town to facilitate the flow of traffic and the existing public road through the site will likely need to be modified to accommodate the development. A Transport Assessment would be required to identify and address transport impacts and to demonstrate sustainable travel is achievable.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No response received.

Right of way

Adjacent to site

TPOs

Not applicable

Contaminated land

Not applicable

Water supply

Limited

Sewerage

Limited

Gas Supply

No

Education provision

Average

Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No response received.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. A Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network .

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. A Water Impact Assessment (WIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS: requires a pavement into the town precincts and non-vehicular links to the existing path network.

CONTAMINATED LAND: There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.

EDUCATION OFFICER: Kingsland Primary and Halyrude RC Primary would be at full capacity if development went ahead, an extension or new school may need to be considered

NHS: No response received.

Overall assessment

MIR status

Preferred

Overall assessment

Acceptable

Site capacity

150

Conclusions

The site lies at Peebles, just outwith the settlement boundary to the north. The site was identified as part of the 'Western Rural Growth Area: Development Options Study' which was undertaken by LUC, to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Central Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP for the Central Tweeddale area, in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders. The site currently being considered, is proposed for a housing development with an indicative site capacity for 150 units.

Peebles has good access to services, employment and public transport. Further to a site assessment, the following constraints/issues were identified, which may require mitigation;

- Flood Risk Assessment required, in respect of potential flood risk and surface water runoff on the site;

- Water body immediately adjacent to the site, therefore a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6m wide must be provided between the watercourse and any built development. Additional water quality buffer

strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures. This is required given the watercourse(s) which run through and adjacent to the site;

- Foul sewerage constraints, as the site is located outwith the current sewered catchment;
- Potential connectivity to the River Tweed SAC/SSSI, mitigation required to ensure no likely significant effects;
- Protect and enhance the existing boundary features;
- Potential protected species, including breeding birds within the site, would require mitigation;
- Located within the Tweed Valley SLA;
- Constrained within the Landscape Capacity Study;
- Visible site from the A703;
- In order to provide containment, the north edge would need structure planting and additional planting as a backdrop;
- Would require improved vehicular linkage over the Eddleston Water between Rosetta Road and the A703 (preferred route is between Kingsland Road and Dalatho Street);
- Existing pedestrian and street lighting would be needed from the development to the town;
- Pedestrian infrastructure would need to be extended out from the town to the site. Option could include provision of access via Standalane View. This matter requires further investigation;
- Transport Assessment required;
- Potential for archaeology within the site;
- Potential for a Drainage Impact Assessment, in respect of WWTW; and
- Potential for a Water Impact Assessment, in respect of WTW.

It should be noted that the Education Officer states that Kingsland Primary and Halyrude RC Primary would be at full capacity if development went ahead, an extension or new school may need to be considered. Further investigation into this matter requires to be carried out.

Overall, taking the above into consideration, it is considered that there are no insurmountable planning issues which cannot be overcome through appropriate mitigation measures although further investigations need to be carried out regarding road/pedestrian infrastructure and school capacity. These will be set out within the site requirements. Overall, the site is proposed as a preferred housing option within the MIR, with an indicative site capacity of 150 units.

Site reference SPEEB009	Site name East of Cademuir Hill	Settlement Peebles	RGA Western	Proposed Use Long Term Housing	Indicative Capacity N/A	Ha 13.2	MIR status Preferred
-----------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------------------	--	-----------------------------------	-------------------	--------------------------------

Initial assessment

Floodrisk 1:200	SAC Not applicable	SPA Not applicable	SSSI Not applicable	Ramsar Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international or national designation constraints. The comments from SEPA and the Flood and Coastal Management Team were based on the original consultation for all 3 parcels of land (SPEEB007).

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Haystoun Burn and Crookston Burn and small watercourses which flow through and adjacent to the site. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site which may exacerbate flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at increased risk of flooding.

Development on this site, has the potential to increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard identified within the site.

Multiple watercourses throughout the site. Therefore, SEPA require a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide to be provided between the watercourse and the built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

This allocation appears to comprise 3 separate sites with no indication of number of units for each. However given the size of the sites the allocation would appear to potentially be quite large. Foul drainage from the development should be connected to the existing SW foul sewer network (although the sites are just outwith the current sewered catchment). Private foul drainage is unlikely to be feasible for this size of development as there are no major watercourses in the vicinity in which to discharge effluent. Std comments for SUDS. The watercourses adjacent/running through the site should be protected and enhanced as part of any development. The most northerly allocation appears to be close to the SW public drinking water supply works.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The Crookston Burn runs between the three sites and has an impact on small areas of all three sites. In all three of the sites, small parts of the site are shown to be at both fluvial and pluvial flood risk. It would be dependent on the layout of the development and the proposed access and egress as to whether a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) would be required. I would, however, definitely require that potential surface water is considered during development due to the large capacity of the site.

Background information

Minerals and coal Not applicable	NNR Not applicable	Prime Quality Agricultural Land Not applicable	Current use/s Greenfield	Planning history references Local Plan Amendment: Part of the site considered (APEEB010) and (APEEB013)
--	------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	---

Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport Good	Access to employment Limited	Access to services Good	Wider biodiversity impacts Moderate	Site aspect South
---	--	-----------------------------------	---	-----------------------------

Accessibility and sustainability summary

It should be noted that the response from the Ecology Officer was for the 3 parcels of land (SPEEB007), however the comments have still be used.

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site appears to be an improved pasture with mature broadleaf treeline and hedgerow on boundary and tree lined field boundary within site, (these feature on 1st Ed OS map). Records of breeding barn owl, oystercatcher and lapwing within site. Red Squirrel recorded in and adjacent to site. Areas within SEPA 1 in 200 year indicative flood risk area. Potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC/SSSI via the Crookston burn to Haystoun burn. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats (EPS), badger, red squirrel, and breeding birds. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC/SSSI. SEPA CAR construction site licence required (site >4ha).

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site lies to the south of Peebles, directly to the south of the settlement boundary. Peebles has good access to public transport, employment and services.

Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area	Open space	Listed buildings	Scheduled Monument	Ancient woodland inventory	Archaeology	Garden and designed
Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	On/adjacent to site

Local impact and integration summary

It should be noted that the responses are for the 3 parcels of land (SPEEB007), however the comments have still be used.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: There is a cluster of listed building at the end of the Bonnington Road, but these are screened by an existing woodland strip so the setting of these building is unlikely to be adversely affected. The sites on the W side of the Crookston Burn are likely to have less impact visually that that on the E side of the burn.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: No issues raised.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Spoke to the Officer who advised that there is potential for archaeology within the site, given the proximity to archaeology to the south of the site.

Landscape assessment

NSA	SLA	Over 200 metres? <input type="checkbox"/>	Over 12 degree slope <input type="checkbox"/>	Wild Land
Adjacent to site	On/adjacent to site			Not applicable

Landscape summary

It should be noted that the responses are for the 3 parcels of land (SPEEB007), however the comments have still be used.

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: (SPEEB007) is a significant potential extension to Peebles, in an area of strongly defined landscape character outwith the current settlement boundary. We are concerned that development in the three sections proposed has the potential to promote a sense of piecemeal growth to Peebles with sections physically and perceptually detached from the town. The area of Bonnington Road as it currently skirts around Cademuir Hill also acts as an important and attractive landscape approach to the nearby Upper Tweeddale National Scenic Area. Land to the west of Bonnington Road is rising and will promote a degree of landscape and visual impact both on the approach to Peebles and from wider views. We are not convinced that these three sites represent a co-ordinated or planned approach to expansion of Peebles.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: The site lies on the south side of Peebles and is made up of agricultural fields within the Haystoun Designed landscape which is characterised by tree belts separating fields in the valleys of Haystoun Burn and the neighbouring Crookstoun Burn together with blocks of planting on adjacent hills, all on a modest scale. If additional planting is developed that builds on the existing historic landscape structure, an attractive extension to Peebles could be achieved. The landscape structure must not be compromised to achieve greater number of units. A hierarchy of circulation and access should be a requirement of any layout.

Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

It should be noted that the responses are for the 3 parcels of land (SPEEB007), however the comments have still be used.

NETWORK MANAGER: No response received.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No issues raised.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: Any further development on the south side of the River Tweed is reliant on a new river crossing due to issues over capacity, High Street amenity and the reliance on a single bridge for the south side of Peebles. I am opposed to the larger southerly part of this site being zoned for development in that: Bonnington Road would be the shortest route into town and it is not of a standard suitable for serving this level of development, this land is too divorced from the town, and the gap between this part of the site and the northerly part means that there would be no opportunity for properly integrating the two areas. The smaller northerly portion of land could be zoned for longer term housing, but a Transport Assessment would be required to justify the extent of housing the road network could support. As well as a new bridge over the Tweed, a road link would be required between this site and Kingsmeadows Road via Sites SPEEB004, SPEEB003 and Whitehaugh Park. A link is then required from this road into Glen Road. This will all help disperse traffic. Some road improvements are likely to be required to Bonnington Road towards Springhill Road to assist with traffic flow.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No response received.

Right of way

Adjacent to site

TPOs

Not applicable

Contaminated land

Not applicable

Water supply

Limited

Sewerage

Limited

Gas Supply

Yes

Education provision

Good

Planning & infrastructure summary

It should be noted that the responses are for the 3 parcels of land (SPEEB007), however the comments have still be used.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No response received.

HOUSING STRATEGY: No issues raised.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. A Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. Please note there is a Raw water supply and existing water main running through the middle of site. Additionally the site is in close proximity to our existing Water treatment works. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: The development of these sites would reduce further the aesthetics of the environment and require a sensitive design in order to maintain a sense of place for residents and visitors alike which includes the path network and any new links to it.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed until the two southern land parcels were developed for mobile poultry housing units. The northern land parcel appears to have remained undeveloped greenfield land throughout. There is no evidence to indicate that this sites historic uses may present development constraints

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

Overall assessment

MIR status

Preferred

Overall assessment

Acceptable

Site capacity

N/A

Conclusions

The site lies to the south of Peebles, adjacent to the settlement boundary and to the south of Kings Muir. The site was identified as part of the 'Western Rural Growth Area: Development Options Study' which was undertaken by LUC, to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Central Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP and for the future, within the Central Tweeddale area, in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders. The site currently being considered is proposed for a longer term housing development site. It should be noted that the site was originally consulted as 3 parcels of land (SPEEB007), however further to the consultation responses, it was decided to only take the north most parcel of land forward, therefore the site was re-coded as (SPEEB009). Therefore, the consultation responses are all based on the previous site code (SPEEB007).

Peebles has good access to services, employment and public transport. Further to a site assessment, the following constraints/issues were identified, which may require mitigation;

- Flood Risk Management to assess the flood risk and surface water runoff within the site;
- There is a waterbody within the site, therefore a maintenance buffer strip will be required;
- Foul drainage should connect to SW foul sewer network;
- Watercourses within and adjacent to the sites must be protected and enhanced as part of any development;
- Potential connectivity to the River Tweed SAC/SSSI;
- Protect and enhance existing boundary features, where possible;
- Potential protected species on site, mitigation required;
- The site is located within the 'Haystoun' Designed Landscape (SBC);
- The site lies to the south of Jubilee Park Greenspace
- There are 2 HER records to the north west of the site and 1 to the south;
- There are a group of listed buildings to the north of the site;
- The site lies within the Tweed Valley SLA;
- The site lies to the east of the Upper Tweeddale NSA;
- SNH raised concerns that the 3 parcels (SPEEB007) has the potential to promote a sense of piecemeal growth to Peebles, with sections physically and perceptually detached from the town. However, it is considered that this has been taken on board and only the 1 northmost site is being assessed and considered;
- SNH state that the area of Bonnington Road acts as an important and attractive landscape approach to the nearby Upper Tweeddale NSA;
- The Landscape Officer states that if additional planting is developed that builds on the existing historic landscape structure, an attractive extension to Peebles could be achieved;
- The Roads Planning Officer raised initial concerns with the 2 southern sites being taken forward as part of (SPEEB007), however advised that the north most site could be zoned for longer term housing, but a Transport Assessment would be required to justify the extent of housing the road network could support. Therefore, the site currently under consideration is the north most site of (SPEEB007);
- Any further development on the south side of the River Tweed is dependent on a new river crossing due to issues regarding capacity of road network and the reliance on the existing single bridge;
- Road linkage would be required between this site and Kingsmeadow Road via (SPEEB004, SPEEB003 and Whitehaugh Park), a link is then required from this road into Glen Road;
- Water Impact Assessment required in respect of WTW network; and
- Drainage Impact Assessment required in respect of WWTW network.

It is acknowledged that parts of the site have previously been assessed for development and not been taken forward. Although the sites/parts of the site have previously been assessed, since these previous assessments a more intensive study of the Central Tweeddale area has been undertaken by LUC, in order to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Central Tweeddale. This site was one option put forward for consideration, in respect of a longer term housing site. The site boundary has taken cognisance of the comments from the Roads Planning Officer to (SPEEB007) and the current site under consideration (SPEEB009) is now a reduced site.

Overall, taking the above into consideration, it is considered that there are a number of constraints identified within and adjacent to the site. However, it is not considered that any of these constraints are insurmountable and could be mitigated, subject to appropriate site requirements and infrastructure. There are aspects which would require further investigation, most notably the need for a new bridge crossing over the River Tweed. However, given the longer term nature of this allocation, it is considered that this allows time to look further into the constraints and mitigation measures in more detail.

In conclusion, the longer term housing site will be taken forward as a preferred option within the MIR. It should be noted that longer term sites will not be formal allocations within the LDP2, rather areas identified for potential development in the future.

Site reference SPEEB008	Site name Land West of Edderston Ridge	Settlement Peebles	RGA Western	Proposed Use Long Term Mixed Use	Indicative Capacity N/A	Ha 19.5	MIR status Preferred
-----------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------------------	--	-----------------------------------	-------------------	--------------------------------

Initial assessment

Floodrisk 1:200	SAC Not applicable	SPA Not applicable	SSSI Not applicable	Ramsar Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designations.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Edderston Burn and tributaries which flow through and adjacent to the site. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site. The applicant would need to be mindful of the FPS to ensure there is no increase in risk elsewhere. There have been discussions regarding additional flood prevention works here which may restrict development. Due to steep topography through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further as and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Discussions should also take place with the flood prevention officer regarding the additional flood protection works that are considered in the future to ensure a holistic approach. There is the potential that development of this allocation could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard identified within the site.

There is a watercourse going through the site. There is the potential that development on this site could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard identified within the site. SEPA advise that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

Foul drainage from the development must be connected to the existing SW foul sewer network. Std comments for SUDS. The burns running through/adjacent of the site must be protected and enhanced as part of any development.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial (river) 1 in 200 year flood extents but there is a very small pocket of potential surface water impacts on the South Eastern side of the site at a 1 in 200 year flood event.

I would have no objections on the grounds of flood risk. However, I would ask that due to surface water risk and the potential capacity of the development that surface water flooding is considered and it is ensured that any water would be routed around the housing.

Background information

Minerals and coal Not applicable	NNR Not applicable	Prime Quality Agricultural Land Not applicable	Current use/s Greenfield	Planning history references There is no planning application history within the site. The site or parts of the site, have been looked at as part of a number of previous plans, these are outlined below. Housing SG: A larger site was assessed for housing (APEEB052) Housing SG: The eastern part of the site was assessed for housing (APEEB048) Housing SG: The southern triangle was part of a larger site assessed for housing (APEEB047) Local Plan Amendment: Parts of the site were assessed as part of the LPA, including (APEEB005), (BPEEB002), (APEEB016), (APEEB015), (APEEB022), (BPEEB003) and (MPEEB002). Local Development Plan: Parts of the site were assessed as part of the LDP, including (MPEEB002),
--	------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--

Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport

Good

Access to employment

Good

Access to services

Good

Wider biodiversity impacts

Moderate

Site aspect

South

Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk - Moderate impact. Site appears to be an improved pasture with mature broadleaf treeline and woodland on parts of boundary. These feature on (1st Ed OS map). Records of oystercatcher and lapwing within site. Potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC via the Edderstone burn. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats (EPS), badger and breeding birds. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC/SSSI. SEPA CAR construction site licence required (site >4ha).

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the west of Peebles, just outwith the settlement boundary. Peebles has good access to public transport, employment and services. There are moderate biodiversity issues associated with this site. Peebles is within commuting distance to Edinburgh, where there is a wider range of employment opportunities.

Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area

Not applicable

Open space

Adjacent to site

Listed buildings

Adjacent to site

Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

Archaeology

On/adjacent to site

Garden and designed

Not applicable

Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Boundary treatments will be an important element in any development. The colour and hue of any development will also need to be carefully considered as the land rises to the south and will be visible from the N of the Tweed.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Spoke to the Officer who advised that there is potential for archaeology within the site.

Landscape assessment

NSA

On/adjacent to site

SLA

On/adjacent to site

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

Wild Land

Not applicable

Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: We understand that this site has been considered on a number of occasions and has been refused due to access constraints. If those constraints are now considered likely to be overcome we advise that the proximity of the site to the Upper Tweeddale National Scenic Area should be addressed in site requirements in relation to built form and landscape design to ensure appropriate wider integration of the town within its countryside context. Appropriate recreational access routes, for example to the Manor Sware viewpoint, should also be retained or re-established in appropriate form.

The northern-most boundary of the site is also in close proximity to the River Tweed SAC, which should also be considered further prior to allocating the site.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: This site comprises a number of large sloping fields to the south west of the Peebles settlement boundary. The land and fields slope to the north east and are of a gentle gradient

appropriate for development. A scheme of structure planting will be required to create a landscape fit as well as define the limit of settlement expansion in this immediate area – this may be in response to the contours rather than existing field boundaries and should seek to protect the amenity of the existing adjacent housing as well as help to reduce the scale of the site by creating tree belts, green corridors and a hierarchy of circulation built into the landscape structure.

Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: No response received.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: Any further development on the south side of the River Tweed is reliant on a new river crossing due to issues over capacity, High Street amenity and the reliance on a single bridge for the south side of Peebles. Previously I have expressed concern on the possibility of development in this area on the grounds of the traffic capacity of the roads leading to the site i.e. Caledonian Road and South Parks. The problem with Caledonian Road is parking in the carriageway, forcing single file traffic, and the issue with South Parks is the tortuous nature of the initial length of the road off the mini roundabout. That said, there may be scope for tackling some of the capacity issues and one benefit of this land is its relative close proximity to the town centre. This favours well from a sustainable transport point of view. If this area is to be developed for mixed use development it should be dependent on measures being taken to improve the capacity of the roads leading to the site. The extent of the site suitable for development, possibly not all of it, will be dependent on the extent of off-site improvements and the findings of a Transport Assessment. Development will have to integrate and connect with the existing housing land to the east by way of access linkage with South Parks, Edderston Ridge/Edderston Ridge Park and Edderston Road. This will help with dispersion of traffic. The Sware road which runs along the southern boundary of this proposed allocation will have to be upgraded to a suitable standard. Extension of the street lighting and footways would have to be included, as would the relocation of the existing 30mph limits.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No response received.

Right of way

Not applicable

TPOs

Not applicable

Contaminated land

Not applicable

Water supply

Limited

Sewerage

Limited

Gas Supply

No

Education provision

Good

Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANGEMENT: No response received.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. A Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. A Water Impact Assessment (WIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: The development of these sites would reduce farther the aesthetics of the environment an require a sensitive design in order to maintain a sense of place for residents and visitors alike which includes the path network and any new links to it.

CONTAMINATED LAND: There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: No objections. An integrated design study is needed to ascertain the most appropriate way to integrate the various elements of the development. It would be preferable if the flattest land within this allocation could be used for any business use on the site as developing on sloping land is problematic and costly for business use

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

Overall assessment

MIR status

Preferred

Overall assessment

Acceptable

Site capacity

N/A

Conclusions

The site lies to the west of Peebles and wraps around South Park Industrial Estate and Edderston Ridge/Road. The site was identified as part of the 'Western Rural Growth Area: Development Options Study' which was undertaken by LUC, to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Central Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP and for the future, within the Central Tweeddale area, in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders. The site currently being considered is proposed for a longer term mixed use development site.

Peebles has good access to services, employment and public transport. Further to a site assessment, the following constraints/issues were identified, which may require mitigation;

- Flood Risk Assessment required, in respect of flood risk and surface water runoff potential;
- There is a watercourse which runs through the site, therefore a maintenance buffer strip is required;
- There is potential connectivity to the River Tweed SAC/SSSI
- Protect and enhance the existing boundary features, where possible
- Potential protected species, including bats and breeding birds;
- Potential archaeology within the site
- The site lies partially within the Tweed Valley SLA
- The small section of the north west corner of the site lies within the Upper Tweeddale NSA
- The south eastern triangle of the site is identified as constrained within the Landscape Capacity Study
- Structure planting and landscaping is required, to create a landscape fit as well as determine the limit of the settlement expansion within this area. This will help integrate the development into the landscape setting of the SLA and NSA
- Any additional development on the south side of the River Tweed is reliant on a new river crossing due to issues over capacity, High Street amenity and the reliance on a single bridge for the south side of Peebles. It is acknowledged that the extent of the site suitable for development, will be dependent on the extent of off-site improvements and the findings of the Transport Assessment;
- Transport Assessment required;
- Potential for archaeology within the site;
- Drainage Impact Assessment required in respect of the WWTW network capacity; and
- Water Impact Assessment required in respect of the WTW network capacity.

It is acknowledged that parts of this site/larger sites have been previously assessed for development in previous Local Plans and the site has not been taken forward. Although the site/parts of the site have previously been assessed, since these previous assessments a more extensive study of the Tweeddale area has been undertaken by LUC, in order to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Tweeddale. This site was one option put forward for consideration, in respect of a longer term mixed use site. The site boundary has taken cognisance of the landscape constraints surrounding the site, including the NSA, SLA and Landscape Capacity Study and mitigation proposed. A re-assessment has therefore been undertaken, in light of the additional information contained within the LUC Study. It should be noted that there are a lack of suitable development opportunities within the Tweeddale area going forward, including for future plans.

Overall, taking the above into consideration, it is considered that there are a number of constraints identified within and adjacent to the site. However, it is not considered that any of these constraints are insurmountable and could be mitigated, subject to appropriate site requirements. There are aspects which would require further investigation, most notably a new crossing over the River Tweed. However, given the longer term nature of this allocation, it is considered that this allows time to look further into the constraints and mitigation measures in more detail.

In conclusion, the longer term mixed use site will be taken forward as a preferred option within the MIR. It should be noted that longer term sites will not be formal allocations within the LDP2, rather areas identified for potential development in the future. It is considered that a masterplan would be required for the development of this site and the site must accommodate an element of business land.

West Linton

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR status
BWEST003	Deanfoot Road North	West Linton	Rest of Borders	Employment	N/A	1.6	Preferred

Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
1:200	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designation constraints.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourse (potentially called The Dean) which flows through the site. Consideration should be given to bridge and culvert structures which may exacerbate flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map and nearby steep topography indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff. SEPA require a flood risk assessment (FRA) to be included as a site specific developer requirement prior to any development occurring on the site, and that the findings are used to inform the scale, layout and form of development. There is the potential that the development of this allocation could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard identified within the site.

Foul must be connected to SW foul network. SW should confirm any capacity issues. There is a burn running through the site which should be protected and enhanced as part of any development. There should be no culverting for land gain. There may be a requirement for enhanced SUDS for any industrial uses.

There is a water body within, on or adjacent to the site, therefore SEPA request a developer requirement attached to the site to ensure that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents however The Dean Burn flows through the extent of the site which I would expect the applicant to consider. We may request an FRA.

Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	96/01526/FUL - Formation of new access road, car park and a single toilet - Approved subject to conditions. 96/01503/AGN - Erection of 3 polytunnels and 1 portacabin - Approved.

Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Good	Limited	Good	Moderate	South

Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Moderate biodiversity impacts. Site appears to be improved grassland with mixed amenity woodland, field margin and garden ground on the boundary and burn along western boundary. Records of oystercatcher, lapwing and curlew during the breeding season. Potential connectivity with River Tweed SAC (Lyne water). Protect boundary features and water course and mitigation for protected species including potentially badger breeding birds and mitigation to ensure no adverse impacts on River Tweed SAC.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is outside the development boundary. West Linton has a range of services, facilities and has a potential employment opportunity.

Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area	Open space	Listed buildings	Scheduled Monument	Ancient woodland inventory	Archaeology	Garden and designed
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	On/adjacent to site	Not applicable

Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Outwith the current settlement in a visible location especially from the main Edinburgh Road at a higher level.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There is potential for previously unrecorded archaeology, particularly prehistoric lithic artefacts and associated features. Evaluation will be required.

Landscape assessment

NSA	SLA	Over 200 metres? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Over 12 degree slope <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Wild Land
Not applicable	Not applicable			Not applicable

Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to size and location.

LANDSCAPE COMMENT: Small scale units suited to rural environment. Well screened with woodland belts as per adjacent site and zEL18.

The Landscape Capacity Study considered this area to be marginal for development. It also suggested areas for landscape enhancement within the site.

Planning and infrastructure assessment

Physical access/road capacity	Near a trunk road? <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	--

NETWORK MANAGER: Access should be restricted to via Robinsland roundabout and A72.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No Comment.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No issues raised.

ROADS PLANNING: Although I have previously confirmed I would be unable to support housing on this site due to road infrastructure constraints, I may be able to support some small scale low key employment use in line with the needs of the village. The road infrastructure would have to extend out to the site. A Transport Statement is likely to be required.

Right of way	TPOs	Contaminated land	Water supply	Sewerage	Gas Supply	Education provision
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Yes	Limited	No	

Northern HMA

West Linton

BWEST003

Planning & infrastructure summary

The settlement of West Linton already has an allocated Business and Industrial site allocated within the Local Development Plan. However, that site is constrained by ownership. Following a public meeting within the community, it was noted that there is a desire to identify another site in order to assist in meeting local demand until the current allocated site zEL18 can come forward.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: There is an employment allocation to the south (zEL18) which is smaller and hasn't been taken up. This is a larger site so would that be likely to be taken up?

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. Depending on the flow demand will determine if further investigation is required.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Roseberry WTW has sufficient capacity. Depending on the flow demand will determine if further investigation is required.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Non-vehicular links required to existing pavements to give safe non-vehicular access in to West Linton.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No issues raised.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: We have no objections to this allocation but would require the input from the roads authority on the acceptability of such a large allocation and its effect on the road network. It may be that access could be taken further up Robinsland Drive to reduce the impact of business traffic on the remaining residential area. The site is relatively flat and there is an unsatisfied demand for sites and premises from businesses in this locale. Additional work may be necessary to investigate the feasibility of this further.

Overall assessment

MIR status

Preferred

Overall assessment

Acceptable

Site capacity

N/A

Conclusions

The site is located to the north east of West Linton. The site is considered to be acceptable for inclusion within the MIR as a preferred option for a business and industrial allocation. There is a desire to see some additional Business and Industrial land come forward to assist in meeting local need. West Linton has good access to public transport and services and limited access to employment opportunities. Further to a site assessment, the following constraints/issues were identified, which may require mitigation:

- Flood Risk Assessment required, in respect of potential flood risk and surface water runoff;
- There is a water body within, on the boundary or adjacent to the site, therefore a maintenance buffer zone is required;
- There is potential for connectivity with the River Tweed SAC/SSSI;
- Protect and enhance the existing boundary features, where possible;
- Potential for protected species, including breeding birds within the site;
- Potential for archaeology within the site, therefore mitigation required;
- The site is within a visible location, especially from the main Edinburgh road. However, the site can integrate well, if planting was established to create a well defined setting and visual containment;
- The Roads Planning Officer can support some small scale low key employment use on the site, in line with the needs of the village;
- Transport Statement required;
- Possible investment required in respect of the WWTW; and
- Non vehicular links required to existing pavements to give safe non vehicular access to West Linton.

Overall, it is considered that there are no insurmountable planning constraints to the development of this site, subject to mitigation measures. Therefore the site will be included within the MIR as a preferred option for business & industrial use.

Report 2: Extract of Site Assessment Database - Excluded sites

Berwickshire HMA

Allanton

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AALLA001	West of Blackadder Drive	Allanton	Eastern	Housing	40	1.9	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was previously considered as part of the Housing SG. An initial stage 1 RAG assessment was undertaken for the proposal, however it was concluded that the site should not be taken forward for inclusion within the Housing SG.

There are a number of natural and built environment constraints, which were identified through the consultation process, including the following;

- Presence of an Ancient Woodland Inventory within the site, which results in a major biodiversity risk;
- Prime Quality Agricultural land within the site;
- Adjacent to the River Tweed SAC and SSSI;
- Flood Risk Assessment would be required;
- Adjacent to the Conservation Area;
- Limited access to public transport and employment;
- Roads Planning Officer cannot support the proposal; and
- Potential for EPS (bats and breeding birds).

Overall, taking the above into consideration, it is not considered that the proposal would be in keeping with the existing linear settlement pattern evident within Allanton, nor would respect the character of the existing village or the Conservation Area. There is potential that such an allocation would result in an adverse impact upon the natural and built environment as highlighted above. Furthermore, the Roads Planning Officer cannot support such a proposal. Therefore, given the above constraints within and adjacent to the site, the site will not be taken forward as a preferred/alternative option within the Main Issues Report.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AALLA002	Land south of Allanton I	Allanton	Eastern	Housing	5	0.3	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the 'Call for Sites' process for housing development, with an indicative site capacity for 5 units.

The site lies to the south of Allanton. The western part of the site is currently sited within the development boundary for Allanton, while the eastern part of the site is outwith and breaks into the field.

There are a number of constraints regarding the development of this site, including the following;

- A Flood Risk Assessment would be required for any development;
- The site is located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural Land;
- Mitigation would be likely for protected species;
- The site is located adjacent to the Conservation Area; and
- The trees and boundaries within the site should be protected.

However, the main concern is that the proposal pushes back the eastern settlement boundary and would not be consistent with the existing linear development pattern. Furthermore, the western part of the site is currently included within the settlement boundary and should a planning application come forward for housing, could be assessed against the Infill Policy contained within the LDP, to ascertain whether it complied. It is not considered that the extension of housing eastwards would respect the existing settlement pattern boundary or current development pattern. In conclusion, for the reasons outlined above, it is not considered that the proposed site should be taken forward for inclusion within the MIR as either a preferred or alternative site.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AALLA003	Land south of Allanton II	Allanton	Eastern	Housing	10	0.6	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the 'Call for Sites' process for housing development, with an indicative site capacity for 10 units.

The site lies to the south of Allanton. The north west corner is currently sited within the development boundary for Allanton, while the eastern and southern part of the site is outwith and breaks into the field.

There are a number of constraints regarding the development of this site, including the following;

- A Flood Risk Assessment would be required for any development;
- The site is located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land'
- Mitigation would be likely for protected species;
- The site is located adjacent to the Conservation Area; and
- The trees and boundaries within the site should be protected.

However, the main concern is that the proposal pushes back the eastern and southern settlement boundary and would not be consistent with the existing linear development pattern. Furthermore, the western part of the site is currently included within the settlement boundary and should a planning application come forward for housing, could be assessed against the Infill Policy contained within the LDP, to ascertain whether it complied. It is not considered that the extension of housing eastwards and southwards away from the existing settlement boundary would respect the existing settlement pattern boundary or current development pattern. In conclusion, for the reasons outlined above, it is not considered that the proposed site should be taken forward for inclusion within the MIR as either a preferred or alternative site.

Auchencrow

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AAUCH001	Land to west of Auchencrow	Auchencrow	Eastern	Housing	5	1.4	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the 'Call for Sites' process and is located to the north west of Auchencrow. Auchencrow is not an identified settlement within the Local Development Plan, therefore occupies a countryside location. Ultimately, the allocation of a housing site at such a location, would not comply with the principles of the LDP. It is therefore not appropriate to allocate this site for housing. Should the applicant wish to pursue this matter, a planning application could be submitted for consideration against Policy HD2: Housing in the Countryside, contained within the Local Development Plan.

A number of constraints were identified, through the consultation process, which include:

- Flood Risk Assessment would be required for any development;
- The site lies within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Protect trees and boundary features;
- Mitigation for protected species including breeding birds;
- Potential archaeological mitigation;
- Cumulative landscape concerns regarding the landscape character and village setting;
- The site gradually falls down from the south to the north; and
- The proposed development would not respect or be in keeping with the existing linear development pattern evident within Auchencrow.

In conclusion, taking the above into consideration, it is not considered that the site should be taken forward for inclusion within the MIR, as either a preferred or alternative option.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AAUCH002	Land to east of Auchencrow	Auchencrow	Eastern	Housing	5	0.6	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the 'Call for Sites' process and is located to the north east of Auchencrow. Auchencrow is not an identified settlement within the Local Development Plan, therefore occupies a countryside location. Ultimately, the allocation of a housing site at such a location, would not comply with the principles of the LDP. It is therefore not appropriate to allocate this site for housing. Should the applicant wish to pursue this matter, a planning application could be submitted for consideration against Policy HD2: Housing in the Countryside, contained within the Local Development Plan.

A number of constraints were identified, through the consultation process, which include:

- Flood Risk Assessment would be required for any development;
- The site lies within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Protection of trees and boundary features;
- Mitigation for protected species including breeding birds;
- Archaeological mitigation is likely;
- There are cumulative landscape concerns regarding the potential allocation of this site along with others put forward within Auchencrow, as part of this process; and
- The Roads Planning Officer is unable to support this development on the grounds that a safe vehicular access cannot be achieved.

In conclusion, taking the above into consideration, it is not considered that the site should be taken forward for inclusion within the MIR, as either a preferred or alternative option.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AAUCH003	Land to north of Auchencrow	Auchencrow	Eastern	Housing	5	0.3	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the 'Call for Sites' process and is located to the north west of Auchencrow. Auchencrow is not an identified settlement within the Local Development Plan, therefore occupies a countryside location. Ultimately, the allocation of a housing site at such a location, would not comply with the principles of the LDP. It is therefore not appropriate to allocate this site for housing. Should the applicant wish to pursue this matter, a planning application could be submitted for consideration against Policy HD2: Housing in the Countryside, contained within the Local Development Plan.

A number of constraints were identified, through the consultation process, which include;

- Flood Risk Assessment would be required for any development;
- The site is located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Protection for trees and boundary features;
- Mitigation for protected species including breeding birds;
- Archaeological mitigation is likely;
- There are cumulative landscape concerns regarding the potential allocation of this site along with other put forward within Auchencrow, as part of this process; and
- The Roads Planning Officer is unable to support this development on the grounds that a safe vehicular access cannot be achieved.

In conclusion, taking the above into consideration, it is not considered that the site should be taken forward for inclusion within the MIR, as either a preferred or alternative option.

Birgham

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
ABIRG005	Land south east of Treaty Park	Birgham	Rest of Borders	Housing	15	1.7	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was submitted for consideration through the 'Call for Sites' process. The site lies to the north of the Birgham settlement boundary.

It should be noted that this site formed part of a larger site, which was considered as part of the Local Plan, Local Plan Amendment and Local Development Plan. The larger site considered, included an additional area to the north of the proposed site. The larger site was rejected by the Reporter at the Local Plan Inquiry, where the Reporter agreed with the Council's assessment. However, the Reporter stated that the site is capable of accepting development and this potential could always be considered, if appropriate, in a future review of a Local Plan.

However, this is a slightly different site currently under consideration, which has to be assessed on its own merits. There were a number of constraints identified through the consultation, which are outlined below;

- Flood investigations would be required;
- Site is located on Prime Agricultural land;
- Potential archaeology evaluation would be required; and
- Roads Planning Officer is unable to support the proposal, due to the absence of a suitable vehicular access point.

The Roads Planning Officer expanded and advised that the 2 locations proposed, would fail to provide appropriate junction visibility requirements due to a combination of factors such as the geometry of the road and the position of adjacent buildings. The site could be satisfactorily accessed from Main Street via the ground immediately to the west of the car park serving the Fisherman's Arms Public House, however this land is outwith the site boundary. In conclusion, taking the above into consideration, the site will not be taken forward for inclusion within the MIR as either a preferred or alternative option.

Burnmouth

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
ABURN005	Land to west of Lyall Terrace	Burnmouth	Eastern	Housing	15	1.2	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was submitted for consideration, as part of the 'Call for Sites' process. This site was previously assessed as part of a larger site, as part of the Local Plan Inquiry 2006. The eastern part of this site was assessed as part of the Local Plan Amendment (ABURN004), however on both occasions the site was not included. The site is assessed overall as doubtful because development of this extended site would create a large housing area out of proportion with the small cluster of the settlement to the east and change its character when viewed from the A1. The site would extend the settlement in a linear fashion to the north west into the countryside, which currently forms its setting. The site is also sited within the Berwickshire Coast SLA and there is the potential that this site would impact upon the setting of the coastline. The Roads Planning Officer does not object to the proposal, stating that access must be taken from the existing allocation to the east (ABURN003). Therefore, this site would be reliant on the delivery of (ABURN003) in the first instance before it could be developed. Consideration would also need to be given to any surface water runoff. There are also potential school capacity issues.

In conclusion, taking the above into consideration, it is considered that the site should not be taken forward for inclusion within the MIR as either a preferred or alternative option. There is currently an existing housing allocation within Burnmouth for 10 units, which remains undeveloped to date. It is not considered that this site would be an acceptable addition to the settlement for the above reasons, especially given it would be reliant on the delivery of a currently undeveloped site.

Cockburnspath

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
ACOPA006	Land west of Callander Place	Cockburnspath	Rest of Borders	Housing	40	1.5	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was submitted for consideration as part of the 'Call for Sites' process. The land owner has indicated that a RSL is interested in developing this site for affordable housing. The proposed site extends to the west of the existing settlement boundary, beyond Callander Place. The LDP states that development into the open fields to the west should be avoided to maintain the settlement form. It is therefore considered that this site would not maintain or respect the existing settlement form of Cockburnspath. There are a number of constraints identified, which are outlined below;

- Consideration would need to be given to surface water runoff;
- Surface Water Hazard identified at the site;
- Site located within Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Protect the hedgerow and boundary features;
- Mitigation for protected species including breeding birds;
- Archaeology mitigation may be required;
- Drainage Impact Assessment would be required in respect of WWTW;
- Water Impact Assessment would be required in respect of WTW; and
- The Roads Planning Officer cannot support development on this site, given that the existing public road infrastructure is not of a sufficient standard to accommodate the traffic associated with such a development.

In conclusion, taking the above into consideration, it is not considered that the site should be included within the MIR, as either a preferred or alternative option. Furthermore, it should be noted that the existing established land supply within the settlement is 111 units, which includes 2 large housing allocations. Therefore, it is considered that Cockburnspath has sufficient housing allocations for the LDP2 period. The suitability for allowing RSL housing on this site could be tested via a planning application.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
MCOPA002	Land opposite Dunglass Park	Cockburnspath	Rest of Borders	Mixed Use	40	5.3	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was considered as part of the Housing SG, however was not included. The site was most recently submitted as part of the 'Call for Sites' process for consideration. The proposal is for a mixed use development on the east side of the A1, outwith the Cockburnspath settlement boundary. The LDP states that development into the open fields to the west should be avoided to maintain the settlement form. It is considered that development on this site would be detached from the existing settlement boundary and separated by the road. There is no connectivity or linkage from the proposed site into the existing settlement boundary. Furthermore, the LDP outlines that the preferred area for any expansion within Cockburnspath is to the north.

There are a number of other constraints identified which are outlined below:

- Transport Statement would be required;
- Drainage Impact Assessment for WWTW required;
- Water Impact Assessment for WTW required;
- Potential ponding;
- Site is within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- SNH raised concerns regarding the potential adverse impact on the natural heritage and advise that reasonable alternatives should be considered;
- Potential for archaeological mitigation; and
- Protection of trees and hedgerow boundary features, mitigation for protected species.

In conclusion, taking the above into consideration, it is not considered that the site should be taken forward for inclusion within the MIR as either a preferred or alternative option. Furthermore, it should be noted that the existing established land supply within the settlement is 111 units (2017 HLA), which includes 2 large housing allocations. Therefore, it is considered that Cockburnspath has sufficient housing allocations for the LDP2 period.

Coldingham

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
ACOLH005	Land north west of Creel House	Coldingham	Eastern	Housing	5	0.8	Excluded

Conclusions

This site is not located within or adjacent to the settlement of Coldingham. The site is in fact detached, by approximately 3 miles from Coldingham and is located at Coldingham Sands. Therefore, the site occupies a countryside location. Ultimately, the allocation of a housing site at such a location, would not comply with the principles of the LDP. It is therefore not appropriate to allocate this site for housing. Should the applicant wish to pursue this matter, a planning application could be submitted for consideration against Policy HD2: Housing in the Countryside, contained within the LDP. Furthermore, there are a number of constraints regarding this site, which are outlined below;

- Consideration of potential surface water run-off;
- Protect hedgerow boundary features;
- Mitigation for protected species;
- Lies within the Berwickshire Coast SLA; and
- The Roads Planning Officer is supportive of the proposal, as long as it is for no more housing than is permitted off a private access. Furthermore, they would require some road improvements to the existing road.

It should be noted that although the site is located within the SLA, the site is relatively contained and not readily visible from the surrounding area. Therefore, some form of development could be accommodated within the site. However, notwithstanding the above, the site is ultimately not within or adjacent to an existing settlement boundary and is ultimately housing in the countryside. Such a proposal would require to be assessed against Policy HD2. In conclusion, taking the above into consideration the site will not be included within the MIR as either a preferred or alternative option.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
ACOLH006	Land to west of Reston Road	Coldingham	Eastern	Housing	20	1.1	Excluded

Conclusions

This site was previously assessed as part of a larger site, as part of the previous Local Development Plan (ACOLH002) and was not included.

The site lies to the south west of the existing Coldingham settlement boundary and is immediately adjacent to the Conservation Area. There are concerns that the development of this site could allow for backland development, which could affect the overall status of the Conservation Area of the town. There is a drop in levels between the road and the eastern boundary of the site. Therefore, the development of the site would likely result in the loss of a large portion of mature trees and retaining wall, to allow an access to be formed. This has the potential to have an adverse impact upon the landscape and visual character of the area. Furthermore, the Roads Planning Officer cannot support the development of this site, given the limitations of the site. The Officer states that the retaining wall and the level difference between the road and the field would result in significant engineering works to achieve the necessary gradients and visibility splays. Secondly, the absence of a footway in Bridge Street (A1107), and inability to provide one, make it difficult to integrate the proposed site into the hub of the community and raises the question of pedestrian safety. There are a number of other constraints to development of this site, which are outlined below;

- Flood Risk Assessment would be required;
- Maintenance buffer strip required, in respect of the water body within/adjacent to the site;
- Drainage Impact Assessment would be required in respect of the WWTW;
- Water Impact Assessment would be required in respect of the WTW;
- Consideration would need to be given to surface water runoff; and
- The site is located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land.

In conclusion, taking the above into consideration, it is not considered that this site be taken forward for inclusion within the MIR, either as a preferred or alternative option.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
ACOLH007	Land to south east of Homefield Cottage	Coldingham	Eastern	Housing	5	0.3	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was assessed as part of a larger site, as part of the Local Plan (BCL8) and was not included within the Local Plan. The site lies to the east of Coldingham, however is detached from the existing settlement boundary on the northern side of the road and does not have a clear connection to the existing settlement boundary/development pattern. There is currently no development on the southern side of the road beyond the settlement boundary and this site would extend housing along the road eastwards away from the boundary.

The site lies within the Berwickshire Coast SLA and there is the potential that any development on this site could impact the landscape and visual amenity of the wider area. The site would be a linear extension of the development boundary and have the potential to impact upon the landscape and visual amenity of the wider area.

The Roads Planning Officer is unable to support development on this site for the following reasons. The site is divorced from the main body of Coldingham and would offer little scope for integration with the existing street network. The detached nature of the site means it suffers from an absence of street lighting, pedestrian provision and a 30mph speed limit and so does not stack up well from a sustainable transport point of view.

There are a number of other constraints, identified as part of the consultation, which are outlined below:

- Sited within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Protection of hedgerow boundary features required;
- Mitigation for protected species and breeding birds required;
- Within the Special Landscape Area 'Berwickshire Coast'; and
- Drainage Impact Assessment required in respect of the WWTW.

In conclusion, taking the above development constraints into consideration, it is not considered that the site should be taken forward for inclusion within the MIR, as either a preferred or alternative option.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
ACOLH008	Land to south east of Law House	Coldingham	Eastern	Housing	7	0.5	Excluded

Conclusions

A slightly larger site than this was considered as part of the Local Development Plan for mixed use development (MCOLH002) and was not included within the previous LDP. The site is detached from the edge of the existing settlement boundary at Coldingham. Development on this site would change the character at the end of the village, however it may be possible that screen planting would compensate. However, there are a number of constraints to development on the site, which are listed below;

- The site is on Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) would be required in respect of the WWTW;
- Any development would need to ensure that it respects the C listed building 'Law House'; and
- The Roads Planning Officer cannot support the development of this site, given that the site is divorced from the main body of the settlement and would offer limited scope for integration with the existing street network.

It should be noted that the Roads Planning Officer could not support this site when previously considered as part of the LDP (MCOLH002) either. Therefore, there has been no change in circumstances since that time. In conclusion, taking the above into consideration, it is not considered that the site should be taken forward for inclusion with the MIR, either as a preferred or alternative site.

Coldstream

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
ACOLD012	Land to south of Former Cottage Hospital	Coldstream	Rest of Borders	Housing	100	6.0	Excluded

Conclusions

The site lies to the south west of Coldstream. There is an existing strong woodland belt on the western edge of Coldstream, which forms a pronounced finish to the town. There is a large intervening open field, between the site and the aforesaid woodland belt. Therefore, the site is too remote from the well defined development boundary of Coldstream to the west and does not relate well to the existing Coldstream settlement boundary. There are a number of constraints regarding the development of this site, which are outlined below;

- Site lies adjacent to the River Tweed SSSI and SPA;
- Protect and enhance the existing boundary features, where possible;
- Potential flooding constraint, further investigation required;
- Prime Quality Agricultural Land on and adjacent to the site;
- SBC Designed Landscapes adjacent to the site (Hirsel to the north and Lees to the east);
- Hirsel Garden and Designed Landscape lies to the north;
- Drainage Impact Assessment required for WWTW & Water Impact Assessment required for WTW;
- Archaeology record within the site for the Cottage Hospital; and
- Historic Scotland Scheduled Monument within the site for the Cottage Hospital in the south west corner.

Historic Environment Scotland state that the development of this site may raise issues of national significance, given the proximity to the enclosed settlement Cottage Hospital. Any development would need to avoid the monument entirely. The Archaeology Officer has advised that there should be no development within the Scheduled Monument or an area of at least 50m around it and recommends that the site is not taken forward.

The Roads Planning Officer advises that although there is a satisfactory access, they raise concerns regarding the detachment of the site from Coldstream. The Officer states that only the eastern portion of this site should be considered for development, but only if and when the intervening land is developed first.

In conclusion, taking the above into consideration, it is not considered that the site will be taken forward for inclusion within the MIR.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
ACOLD013	Hillview North II	Coldstream	Rest of Borders	Housing	200	10.2	Excluded

Conclusions

The entire site forms part of the longer term housing site (SCOLD001), which is identified within the LDP. The southern part of the site was allocated as part of the Housing SG (ACOLD011) in November 2017 for 100 units. The site would integrate well into the settlement with appropriate landscaping and protection should be given to the existing boundary features, where possible. There are good infrastructure and connectivity opportunities, including road access from the adjacent employment allocation, existing housing allocation (ACOLD011) and Hill view, with a minor link from Priory Bank. A Transport Assessment would be required for the development of this site. The following must also be taken into consideration when developing this site; mitigation for breeding birds, archaeology, buffer protection zones along the southern boundary, landscaping along the western/northern boundary, open space provision, buffer zone between the site and allocated employment site and the future integration with the potential longer term housing site to the west. Consideration must be given to incorporating a pedestrian link to the Core Path which joins Duns Road to the west and A6112 to the east.

It should be noted that this site excludes a portion of (SCOLD001), along the northern and western boundary. Another site is also under consideration (ACOLD014) for housing. The site boundary for (ACOLD014) is the remaining part of (SCOLD001) which is not yet allocated. This site is smaller and excludes the indicative landscaped area. Although there are no constraints to developing this site, it is considered that any future allocation should include the full remainder of (SCOLD001).

In conclusion, this site will not be taken forward for inclusion within the MIR. However, the larger site (ACOLD014) will be taken forward as an alternative option within the MIR.

Duns

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
ADUNS024	Land North of Peelrig Farm	Duns	Eastern	Housing	100	4.1	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was considered recently as part of the Housing SG, however was not included. Although the site is preferred in respect of the Landscape Capacity Study, there are a number of constraints associated with the development of this site. These constraints are outlined below;

- Flood Risk Assessment would be required for any development, to investigate flood risk and surface water runoff issues;
- Waterbody within the site, therefore maintenance buffer strip would be required;
- The site is located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Drainage Impact Assessment for WWTW and Water Impact Assessment for WTW;
- Historic Environment Record, 'Mill Dam' lies adjacent to the site; and
- The key greenspace (Duns Railway Line) lies adjacent to the site.

Economic Development have advised that this field may be better served as a future employment land expansion site. There is no obvious access for housing expansion, from within the existing housing estates, and will make any vehicular access lengthy and confusing. The Roads Planning Officer has also raised concerns regarding the access and are unable to support this development. The surrounding road network, including the junction of Trinity Park and Station Road, is not of a standard suitable for serving a significant level of development such as this. The industrial estate road to the south is not appropriate for shared use with residential traffic.

In conclusion, taking the above into consideration, it is considered that the site will not be taken forward for inclusion within the MIR.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
ADUNS027	Land north of Preston Road	Duns	Eastern	Housing	7	1.9	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was submitted for consideration as part of the 'Call for Sites' process. The site was previously submitted for consideration as part of the Housing SG and was not taken forward. It is acknowledged that the applicant/agent has submitted additional supporting information, to address the points raised within the Housing SG RAG assessment. At the Housing SG stage only an initial stage 1 RAG assessment was undertaken. In light of the recent submission and additional information submitted, a full site assessment has been undertaken as part of this process, including internal and external consultation. Further to the site assessment, a number of constraints were identified which are outlined below;

- The site is located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Consideration to surface water runoff;
- The site is located within the Designed Landscape 'Duns Castle';
- The site is located within the SBC Designed Landscape 'Duns';
- The site is constrained within the Landscape Capacity Study;
- There are a number of Historic Environment Records identified within the site;
- The site lies adjacent to the Category C listed building, 'Wellfield Cottage'; and
- Archaeological investigations are required.

Further information has been submitted by the agent, regarding the designed landscape, including photographs. In respect of landscape and visual impacts, the bank rises up steeply and therefore, any development would be quite a prominent addition to the settlement in terms of visual impact. It is therefore doubtful how well the site would integrate within the landscape. A slightly smaller site boundary was considered as part of the Local Plan Inquiry, where the Reporter endorsed the Council's assessment that its development would have an adverse impact on the views, character and setting of Duns and would unnecessarily elongate the town away from local services and facilities.

There are currently 6 housing allocations, 3 re-development allocations and 1 longer term mixed use site within Duns, as contained within the Local Development Plan. This totals 330 units within the established housing land supply, as contained within the most recent HLA (2017). It is considered that there is limited capacity for an additional housing allocation within Duns, given the number of housing units currently available for development within the land supply. In respect of the further information submitted regarding the deliverability of existing allocations, it should be noted that all existing allocations have been reviewed as part of the MIR process.

In conclusion, taking the above into consideration, the site will not be taken forward for inclusion within the MIR.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
MDUNS003	Land South of Earlsmeadow	Duns	Eastern	Mixed Use	180	11.2	Excluded

Conclusions

The site forms part of the longer term mixed use site (SDUNS001) which is currently identified within the LDP. The entire mixed use site (MDUNS004) and a phase of the site (MDUNS005) are also being considered as part of this process. It should be noted that all 3 of the sites were recently considered for inclusion within the Housing SG and none were taken forward as part of that process.

The site has good access to public services, employment and public transport. Furthermore, the site would result in minimal visual impact from the entrance to Duns. The site has good integration and connectivity with the existing settlement. The following constraints and mitigation would be needed to be considered as part of any development;

- A Flood Risk Assessment would be required to assess any potential flood risk and mitigation as required;
- There is a lack of opportunities for connectivity and integration to the north east of the site, given the omission of the corner of the longer term mixed use site within the LDP;
- Drainage Impact Assessment (WWTW) and Water Impact Assessment (WIA);
- The site leaves a gap between the potential developable site and the existing housing allocation (ADUNS010) and (BD4B) to the east, therefore there is a lack of integration and connectivity;
- Potential archaeology within the site, HER record identified for 'Grueldykes', therefore appropriate investigations and mitigation would be required;
- Structure planting would be required along the southern and western boundary to mitigate any adverse visual impacts within the wider area;
- The opportunity to connect into the existing path network is restricted due to omitting the north east part of the larger site;
- The site is located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural Land; and
- There is a current requirement as part of the LDP for the provision for a tourism events area to facilitate tourism events which must be met.

In conclusion, it is considered that there are constraints with the site boundary proposed, with the omission of the north east/east part of the site, which results in a lack of integration and connectivity. This also presents issues in terms of connecting in with the existing path networks. Therefore, taking everything above into consideration, the site will not be taken forward as a preferred or alternative site within the Housing SG. However, (MDUNS005) will be taken forward as an alternative option.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
MDUNS004	South of Earlsmeadow	Duns	Eastern	Mixed Use	200	16.1	Excluded

Conclusions

The site is currently identified within the LDP for longer term mixed use development potential (SCOLD001). A phase of this site is also being considered as part of this process (MDUNS005) to the north and (MDUNS003) which occupies an area to the west. It should be noted that all 3 of these sites were recently considered for inclusion within the Housing SG and none were taken forward as part of that process.

The site has good access to public services, employment and public transport. Furthermore, the site would result in minimal visual impact from the entrance to Duns. The site has good integration and connectivity with the existing settlement. The following constraints and mitigation would need to be considered as part of any development;

- Flood Risk Assessment would be required;
- There is an existing wetland area in the north east corner of the site, there would be a requirement to safeguard this;
- The site is located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Potential archaeology within the site, HER record identified for 'Grueldykes', therefore appropriate investigations and mitigation would be required;
- Structure planting and landscaping would be required along the southern and western boundaries of the site;
- Should this site be delivered, there would be school capacity constraints;
- There is a current requirement as part of the LDP for the provision for a tourism events area to facilitate tourism events which must be met;
- Drainage Impact Assessment for WWTW and Water Impact Assessment for WTW;
- Minor drainage issues which would need to be addressed and
- Respect the area of greenspace adjacent to the site, 'Duns Park.

The Roads Planning Officer raised no objections to the development of this site, with the main access being taken from the A6015 through the housing allocation (ADUNS023), with a potential minor link through Station Avenue to the south east. A Transport Assessment would be required for any development.

In conclusion, taking into consideration the number of units already allocated within Duns, it is considered that the release of Phase 1 (MDUNS005) if any, would be sufficient for the purposes of the LDP2. There are currently 330 established units within the land supply (HLA 2017), 151 of these are considered to be effective while the remainder are post year 5. This would allow the southern part of the site, to be retained for potential future mixed use development and released in subsequent Local Plans. Therefore, this site will not be taken forward as a preferred or alternative site within the Housing SG.

Eyemouth

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AEYEM001	Land West of Eyemouth	Eyemouth	Eastern	Housing	120	5.4	Excluded

Conclusions

This site was previously considered for inclusion as part of the Housing SG, however was not taken forward for inclusion. There are a number of constraints identified with the development of this site, which are highlighted below;

- A Flood Risk Assessment would be required;
- There is a water body within/adjacent to this site;
- Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) for WWTW and Water Impact Assessment (WIA) for WTW;
- Consideration would need to be given to the identified Surface Water Hazards within the site;
- The site is located within Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- The site would have limited visual impacts on the settlement itself, however would be prominent from the approach road which leads in from Ayton; and
- The Roads Planning Officer raised concerns with the site, on the grounds that there is not a suitable access point. Therefore, recommend that the site is not included as an option within the MIR.

The applicant submitted further supporting information since the Housing SG, in respect of existing undeveloped allocations within Eyemouth. It should be noted that all existing allocations within the LDP were subject to review as part of this MIR process. However notwithstanding this, taking the above into consideration, it is considered that the site should not be included as an option within the MIR, given the constraints identified above. There is no suitable access point, therefore, this matter alone prohibits the development of housing on this site.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
MEYEM002	Land to North West of Eyemouth	Eyemouth	Eastern	Mixed Use	200	10.5	Excluded

Conclusions

This site was considered as part of the Housing SG and was not included. It is considered that there is an already adequate housing land supply through the allocated sites (BYE2B & BEY15B) within Eyemouth, given the slow take up of sites recently due to the market conditions.

There are a number of constraints with the development of this site, including;

- Requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment;
- Surface Water Hazards within the site;
- There is a water body within/adjacent to the site;
- The site is located in an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Drainage Impact Assessment for WWTW and Water Impact Assessment for WTW;
- There is archaeological constraints within the site. As a result, the Archaeology Officer has advised that the site is not taken forward for inclusion within the MIR as an option;
- The site is constrained within the Landscape Capacity Study. The LCS states that development on this site would be visually prominent and exposed. The site is constrained by the lack of shelter and likely visual impact of development, which would breach the ridges and skyline which provides strategic containment for the settlement;
- The Roads Planning Service raised concerns regarding the extension of the development westwards; and
- A Transport Assessment would be required for any development.

The applicant submitted further supporting information since the Housing SG, in respect of existing undeveloped allocations within Eyemouth. It should be noted that all existing allocations within the LDP were subject to review as part of this MIR process. However notwithstanding this, taking the above into consideration it is not considered that this site should be taken forward for inclusion within the MIR as an option. It is considered that development in such a location has the potential to result in adverse impacts upon the wider landscape and visual context of the area.

Gordon

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AGORD005	Land to west of Station Road	Gordon	Rest of Borders	Housing	20	1.8	Excluded

Conclusions

The site has been submitted for consideration, for 20 units. The site is located to the north of the existing settlement boundary, located to the north of Manse Road. There is an existing housing allocation directly adjacent to the west of this site. Manse Road lies to the south and Station Road to the east. The following constraints are identified within the site;

- The site is on the list of potential Local Biodiversity sites (not yet assessed), Gordon Station Plantation Meadow. The site is included within the SNH grassland survey and Berwickshire BSBI site register. The SBC Ecology Officer predicts that development on this site would result in a major biodiversity impact and the site is potentially unsuitable;
- The site is located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- There are mature trees located within the site and along Station Road, a number of which have Tree Preservation Orders 'Coronation Trees';
- The Roads Planning Officer advised that access is possible solely from Manse Road serving the site, however the preference would be to have an additional access from Station Road;
- The formation of an access from Station Road may result in the loss of some trees. An access served from Manse Road would require the loss of trees on the corner of the road for road widening; and
- A Transport Statement would be required for any development.

There are a number of constraints identified within this site including; access, TPO's and Gordon Station Plantation Meadow. There is also an existing housing allocation within Gordon adjacent to this site, for 18 units. On balance, it is considered that there is another more suitable site, without constraints (AGORD004) also under consideration. Therefore, taking into consideration the above, on balance this site will not be included within the MIR as option for housing.

Greenlaw

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
SBGRE001	Greenlaw Development Boundary Amendment	Greenlaw	Rest of Borders	Development Boundary	N/A	0.3	Excluded

Conclusions

The alteration to the Greenlaw Development Boundary was submitted as part of the Call for Sites process. It proposes to extend the settlement boundary northwards on the eastern side of Halliburton Road. The applicant indicates that the site could accommodate an infill opportunity for between 3 and 5 houses.

It is not considered appropriate to expand a settlement boundary merely in order to provide infill opportunities within the settlement itself, without a formal allocation. The number of units the site could accommodate would not be large enough for a formal housing allocation. Furthermore, there is a plentiful supply of housing land within Greenlaw at present and from other larger sites being proposed within the MIR. Therefore, in conclusion the settlement boundary alteration will not be included within the MIR.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
MGREE004	Poultry Farm	Greenlaw	Rest of Borders	Mixed Use	N/A	2.3	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was previously considered for housing as part of the Housing SG (AGREE007), however was not included within the Adopted Housing SG. It should also be noted that the site is also under consideration for housing as part of the LDP2 MIR process (AGREE009). Further to this, a planning application (16/01360/PPP) was granted planning consent, subject to appeal by the Scottish Government. Therefore, the principle of housing on this site has been established through this consent.

The site is directly adjacent to the existing settlement boundary therefore the site provides a logical extension to Greenlaw and would integrate well with the existing settlement. There are no insurmountable planning constraints regarding the development of this site. The site is brownfield land currently disused poultry units. Development on this site would be welcomed. However, through the consultation process, the following constraints/mitigation were identified:

- The site is brownfield land, therefore potential contamination should be investigated and mitigated;
- Floor Risk Assessment likely required;
- The site is located within Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Protection for boundary features;
- Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC/SSSI;
- Assessment of ecology impacts and provision of mitigation, where appropriate; and
- Early engagement with Scottish Water in respect of the waste water treatment works capacity and water treatment works.

In conclusion, there are no insurmountable planning constraints to the development of this site, subject to appropriate mitigation. However, given the recent approval by the DPEA for housing on this site, the mixed use proposal (MGREE004) will not be included within the MIR. Rather, the housing site (AGREE009) will be taken forward as a preferred option.

Hutton

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AHUTT003	Land East of Hutton	Hutton	Eastern	Housing	15	1.7	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the Call for Sites process for housing. Further to a site assessment and consultation, the following constraints were identified;

- Site is located within Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Protection for boundary features;
- Mitigation for protected species;
- Potential archaeology within the site; and
- Adjacent to a listed building.

The proposal is for 15 units on a large site to the east of Hutton. It is not considered that there are insurmountable planning constraints to this site being developed. However, the LDP currently identifies a housing allocation within Hutton (BHU2B) for 11 units, which has not been developed to date. The site was only allocated within the Local Plan 2008, therefore is considered to be a relatively recent allocation. Furthermore, taking into consideration the fact that the economy crashed soon after the allocation and the housing completion rate has never recovered within the Borders. It is therefore considered the existing allocation is sufficient for the LDP2 period. In conclusion, the site will not be taken forward as an option within the MIR.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AHUTT004	Land to South of Hutton	Hutton	Eastern	Housing	7	1.0	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was submitted for consideration as part of the Call for Sites process. The site is under consideration for 7 units and is located to the south of the Hutton settlement boundary. Further to the site assessment and consultation process, the following constraints were identified;

- The site is located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Flood Risk Assessment would be required, in respect of flood risk and surface water runoff;
- There is a water body within/adjacent to the site, therefore maintenance buffer strip would be required;
- Potential co-location issues with the site and Hutton STW;
- The Ecology Officer states that the site is recorded as semi-neutral grassland with hedgerow and trees on the boundary. There is the potential for connectivity with the River Tweed SAC/SSSI and appropriate mitigation would be required;
- Protect the boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds;
- The site is not well related to the existing properties within Hutton and the site appears detached from them;
- Potential archaeology mitigation required;
- Site location is a further linear extension of the settlement southwards; and
- The Roads Planning Officer is unable to support this proposal, advising the site is somewhat detached from the rest of the village and does not allow for proper integration into the surrounding street network.

The LDP currently identifies a housing allocation within Hutton (BHU2B) for 11 units, which has not been developed to date. The site was only allocated within the Local Plan 2008, therefore is considered to be a recent allocation. Therefore, at this point in time it is not considered any additional housing allocations are required in Hutton for the new plan period. Furthermore, there are a number of identified constraints on the site, including the Roads Planning Officer who is unable to support the proposal. Therefore, in conclusion the site will not be included within the MIR.

Preston

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
APRES004	Land north east of Preston	Preston	Eastern	Housing	5	0.5	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the Call for Sites process. The proposal is for the allocation of the site for housing, with an indicative site capacity for 5 units. The site is located to the north of 'The Forge' in Preston. Further to the site assessment and consultation process, the following constraints were identified during the consultation process;

- Site is located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural Land;
- Protect boundary features and provide mitigation for protected species including breeding birds;
- Preston has a linear settlement. The site would not respect the existing settlement pattern or character of Preston; and
- Any development must ensure that it protects the natural heritage assets and links in with the wider biodiversity;

The Roads Planning Officer advises that access must be taken from 'The Forge', given that the access to the west is not a suitable means of vehicular access. This would require access via the field to the east of 'The Forge', which is currently outwith the proposed site boundary.

There is an existing re-development site allocated within Preston for 45 units. However, the site is proposed to be removed as part of the MIR process, given that the site is currently an operational farm. It is proposed that it remains within the settlement boundary of Preston. Although the site is being removed, Berwickshire has a healthy housing land supply going forward into the LDP2. Therefore, it is not considered that a replacement site within Preston itself is needed to meet the housing land requirements for the next plan. The site currently under consideration is owned by the same land owner as the site proposed for removal (zRO16). However, it is not considered that the allocation of (APRES004) would respect the existing settlement pattern or character of Preston itself. Therefore, notwithstanding the potential access constraint which requires the field to the east of 'The Forge', it is not considered that housing on this site would respect the existing settlement pattern or character of Preston, given its linear nature.

In conclusion, the site will not be included within the MIR as either a preferred or alternative option.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
APRES005	Land north of Preston	Preston	Eastern	Housing	21	2.1	Excluded

Conclusions

This site was submitted as part of the Call for Sites process. The proposal is for the allocation of the site for housing, with an indicative site capacity for 21 units. The site is located to the north of existing residential properties along the B6355, Law View and The Anvil. The following constraints were identified through the consultation process;

- The site is located within Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Consideration must be given to surface water runoff within the site;
- Protection should be given to the existing boundary features and mitigation provided for protected species including breeding birds;
- The site would appear to be backland development and would not respect the existing pattern of development or the character of Preston, given the linear nature;
- Any development must consider linkages with the wider surrounding landscape and features;
- A Transport Statement would be required for any development; and
- The Roads Planning Officer is only able to support this site, if the adjacent site (APRES004) to the east is also allocated, as vehicular access to the site will have to be taken via (APRES004). It should be noted that the existing access track to the east of the site is not suitable as a means of vehicular access.

There is an existing re-development site allocated within Preston for 45 units. However, the site is proposed to be removed as part of the MIR process, given that the site is currently an operational farm. It is proposed that it remains within the settlement boundary. Although the site is being removed, Berwickshire has a healthy housing land supply going forward into LDP2. Therefore, it is not considered that a replacement site within Preston itself is needed to meet the housing land requirements for the next plan. The site currently under consideration, is owned by the same land owner as the site proposed for removal (zRO16). However, it is not considered that the allocation of (APRES005) would respect the existing settlement pattern or character of Preston itself. It is noted that there are also potential access constraints regarding the delivery of (APRES004) to the east, which is also under consideration. Furthermore, (APRES005) relies on the delivery of (APRES004) before it can be delivered.

In conclusion, it is not considered that housing on this site would respect the existing settlement pattern or character of Preston, given its linear nature. Furthermore, taking the above into consideration, the site will not be included within the MIR as either a preferred or alternative option.

St Abbs

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
ASTAB001	Land to east of Northfield Farm Buildings	St Abbs	Eastern	Housing	9	0.9	Excluded

Conclusions

The site under consideration is for housing, with an indicative site capacity of 9 units. The following constraints were identified as part of the consultation;

- There is the potential for archaeology within the site and therefore mitigation may be required;
- Waterbody adjacent to the site, therefore maintenance buffer strip required;
- Private foul drainage would be required;
- The site is detached from St Abb's and offers high amenity value on the approach to the Conservation Area;
- The proposed site does not respect the existing settlement pattern of St Abb's, the Conservation Area and would not integrate well with the existing village;
- The site is located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- The site falls within the Berwickshire Coast SLA;
- Protection must be given to the existing boundary features;
- Mitigation for protected species including breeding birds;
- Flood Risk Assessment would be required;
- The site is very sensitive in respect of landscape and visual impacts; and
- The Landscape Officer does not support the development of this site, as the site is very visible on the approach to St Abb's and coastal path to the north.

Overall, taking into consideration the above, it is re-iterated that the site is visually sensitive and detached from St Abb's. The development of this site has the potential to result in landscape and visual impacts. In conclusion, the site will not be taken forward for inclusion within the MIR.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
ASTAB002	Land to west of St Abbs	St Abbs	Eastern	Housing	5	0.5	Excluded

Conclusions

The site lies to the west of St Abb's and is currently being considered for a housing allocation, with an indicative site capacity for 5 units. The site has limited access to public transport and good access to services and employment, given the proximity of Eyemouth and other nearby settlements. Following the consultation process, the following constraints were identified on the site;

- Protection would be required for the existing boundary features;
- Mitigation for protected species, including breeding birds;
- Site is adjacent to the St Abb's Conservation Area and any development must take cognisance of this;
- Site is adjacent to the identified key greenspace 'The Briery', sited to the east and any development must take cognisance of this;
- There is potential archaeological mitigation required;
- The site lies within the 'Berwickshire Coast' SLA; and
- The Roads Planning Officer cannot support the proposal, given the inability of Creel Road to cater for the additional traffic movements.

It is noted that the site relates well to the existing settlement boundary and it is not considered that any development would be readily visible from the majority of St Abb's. Given the rolling nature of the hills, St Abb's being set down into the cliff, the site would not be visible from the approach road from the west either.

In conclusion, taking the above into consideration, given the fact that the Roads Planning Officer cannot support such a proposal, the site will not be included within the MIR as either a preferred or alternative option for development.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
ASTAB003	Land to south of St Abbs	St Abbs	Eastern	Housing	10	1.4	Excluded

Conclusions

The proposal is for a housing allocation, with an indicative site capacity for 10 units. The site is located outwith the settlement boundary of St Abb's. The site is located adjacent to the Berwickshire Coast SSSI, Berwickshire and North Northumberland Coast SAC and St Abb's Head to Fast Castle SPA. The site has moderate biodiversity risk. The site has limited access to public transport and good access to services and employment, given the proximity of Eyemouth and other nearby settlements. Any development would need to ensure that the boundary features are protected and mitigation would be required where necessary, in respect of breeding birds and bats. There is the potential for archaeological mitigation within the site. Furthermore, the site lies within the Berwickshire Coast SLA.

The proposed site does not respect the existing settlement pattern of St Abb's and would not integrate well into the settlement. The proposal would extend the settlement further along the coastline, within close proximity to the SSSI, SAC and SPA. The site also occupies a very prominent position along the headland, impacting upon the setting of St Abb's. It is further considered that the development of this site would impact upon the landscape and visual amenity of the area. The Landscape Officer has also recommended that the site is not included within the MIR, the reasons included the potential impacts upon the SLA and coalescence between Coldingham Bay and St Abb's.

In addition to this, the Roads Planning Officer is unable to support this proposal, given the inability of Creel Road to cater for additional traffic movements. Therefore, taking all of this into consideration, the site will not be included within the MIR as a preferred or alternative option.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
RSTAB001	Northfield Farm Buildings	St Abbs	Eastern	Redevelopment	9	0.9	Excluded

Conclusions

The site lies to the north west of St Abbs, outwith the settlement boundary. The site has limited access to public transport, however good access to services and employment opportunities given the proximity to Eyemouth and other nearby settlements. There are a number of existing agricultural steading buildings on site at present and the proposal is to convert these into dwellings. Given the existing buildings on site, there is the potential for breeding birds and bats, therefore appropriate mitigation would be required. The site is somewhat detached from St Abbs and does not relate well to the existing settlement boundary or integrate into the existing settlement pattern. There is also the potential for archaeological mitigation on the site. The site is located within the 'Berwickshire Coast' SLA and any development would need to ensure careful design, to ensure there is no significant impact upon the SLA. There is limited water supply and no connection to sewers available.

Overall, the site is detached from St Abbs and does not relate to the existing settlement or integrate into the existing settlement pattern. Therefore, the allocation for a re-development site at such a location would not comply with the principles of the Local Development Plan. It is therefore not appropriate to allocate this site for re-development. There is a planning history on this site for conversions and new build housing, which were assessed under the Housing in the Countryside policy at the time. Should the applicant wish to pursue the current proposal, this would be best pursued by a planning application for consideration against Policy HD2: Housing in the Countryside.

In conclusion, the site will not be included within the MIR as either a preferred or alternative option.

Swinton

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
ASWIN002	Land north east of Main Street	Swinton	Rest of Borders	Housing	30	2.4	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was submitted for consideration as part of the Call for Sites process. The proposal is for 30 units at the site, which is located to the north of Swinton. The site extends out northwards from the settlement boundary down towards the River Tweed. The following constraints were raised throughout the consultation process;

- Located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- There is potential connectivity to the River Tweed SAC/SSSI and mitigation would be required, to ensure there is no significant effect on the River Tweed SAC;
- Flood Risk Assessment would be required;
- Mitigation is likely to evaluate potential archaeology within the site;
- Drainage Impact Assessment for the WWTW;
- Boundary features should be protected and mitigation provided for protected species;
- Development on this site would break into a field to the rear of the existing settlement. It is not considered that the site would be well related or integrated with the existing settlement, given the extent that the site extends towards the north; and
- The Roads Planning Officer is unable to support this proposal, regarding visibility and the proximity of the proposed access to an existing junction.

It is acknowledged that the site would not be visible from the approach road to the north east, Coldstream Road or from the west along Main Street. However, given the sloping nature of the site, it may be visible from the northern approach road along Duns Road. As stated above, Swinton has an existing linear development pattern. The proposed site would not represent the existing development pattern. Furthermore, it is not considered that the site would be well related or integrated with the existing settlement, given the extent of the site towards the north. It is considered that the proposed access point currently provides an area of amenity value for the wider community and includes a seating area which is enclosed by mature trees.

Taking the above into consideration, the site will not be included within the MIR as either a preferred or alternative option. It is worth also noting that there are 51 units within the established land supply in Swinton, which include an allocated housing site (BSW2B for 25 units) and a mixed use allocation (MSWIN002 for 25 units). Notwithstanding the above assessment, it is considered that there are sufficient allocations within Swinton for the LDP2 plan period.

Westruther

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AWESR009	Land to south east of Kirkpark	Westruther	Rest of Borders	Housing	3	0.4	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the Call for Sites process for housing. The site lies to the south of Westruther, directly to the south of the existing housing allocation (AWESR005), which is allocated for 5 units. The proposal is to extend the housing allocation (AWESR009) to include an additional small area of land to the south. However, it is considered too small to formally allocate through this process and sites should be able to comfortably accommodate at least 5 units. Therefore will not be included within the MIR as a proposed option.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AWESR010	Land to north of Westruther	Westruther	Rest of Borders	Housing	5	0.5	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was put forward for housing as part of the Call for Sites process, with an indicative site capacity for 5 units. The landowner has put forward 4 housing sites and 1 employment site for consideration. Further to a site assessment the following constraints were identified on the site;

- Flood Risk Assessment would be required;
- Potential for protected species, including breeding birds on the site, mitigation would be required;
- Existing boundary features should be protected and enhanced where possible;
- Potential for archaeology within the site;
- The allocation of this site would have a reliance on the delivery of the site to the south first, otherwise the site would be detached from the existing settlement boundary and Edgar Road;
- Transport Statement would be required; and
- Early engagement with Scottish Water in respect of the WWTW and WTW capacities.

It is acknowledged that there are no insurmountable planning constraints to the development of this site for housing. However, the site does rely on the site to the south (AWESR002) being developed first. The site is currently separated from the settlement boundary along Edgar Road, therefore without the development of the field to the south first (AWESR002), the site would not respect the existing development pattern. Therefore, it is proposed to take forward the site (AWESR002) within the LDP2 for housing. Once developed, this site could be taken forward in the future for housing and the site would form a logical extension to Westruther once (WESR002) is developed. Therefore, in conclusion, the site will not be taken forward for inclusion within the MIR.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AWESR011	Land to south of Mansefield House	Westruther	Rest of Borders	Housing	9	0.9	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was submitted for consideration as part of the Call for Sites process for housing. The site is being considered for housing with an indicative site capacity for 9 units. The land owner has put forward 4 housing sites and 1 employment site for consideration as part of the MIR process. Following consultation and site assessment, the following constraints have been identified on the site;

- Flood Risk Assessment required;
- Potential trees would need to be felled within the site;
- Potential archaeology within the site; and
- Early discussions with Scottish Water regarding the WWTW and WTW capacities.

Notwithstanding any constraints on the site, there is 1 existing housing allocation within Westruther within the LDP. It is not considered that an additional 2 are required as part of the LDP2 process. The site (AWESR002) under consideration is the preferred option for the first release of any additional sites out of the 4 submitted by the landowner. This is taking into consideration it's location adjacent to the existing settlement boundary and Edgar Road and lack of constraints within the site. This site could be looked at again in the future and assessed at that point in time, should other sites within Westruther be developed. In conclusion, the site will not be included within the MIR.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AWESR012	Land to north of Westertown	Westruther	Rest of Borders	Housing	6	0.6	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was submitted for consideration as part of the Call for Sites process for housing. The site is being considered for housing with an indicative site capacity for 9 units. The land owner has put forward 4 housing sites and 1 employment site for consideration as part of the MIR process. Following consultation and site assessment, the following constraints have been identified on the site;

- Development of a former brownfield site;
- Site respects the visual pattern of Westruther;
- Potential archaeology within the site;
- Early discussions with Scottish Water regarding the WWTW and WTW capacities; and
- Potential contamination due to the former use of the site.

Notwithstanding any constraints on the site, there is 1 existing housing allocation within Westruther within the LDP. It is not considered that an additional 2 are required as part of the LDP2 process. The site (AWESR002) under consideration is the preferred option for the first release of any additional sites out of the 4 submitted by the landowner. This is taking into consideration it's location adjacent to the existing settlement boundary and Edgar Road and lack of constraints within the site. This site could be looked at again in the future and assessed at that point in time, should other sites within Westruther be developed. In conclusion, the site will not be included within the MIR.

Whitsome

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AWHIT003	Herriot Bank Farm	Whitsome	Eastern	Housing	8	0.5	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was assessed as part of the Housing SG for 8 units. An initial stage 1 RAG assessment was undertaken, however concluded that the site should not be taken forward as part of the Housing SG. The proposal currently under consideration has not altered since and is for the same proposal.

Whitsome is a linear settlement which follows an east to west direction and commands significant views over the Merse and Cheviots to the South. Therefore, given the linear nature, there is limited scope for further capacity within the settlement. The northern section of the site lies within the settlement boundary and could come forward through the development management process and considered against the infill policy. However the southern part of the site protrudes beyond the existing settlement boundary to the south and does not respect the existing settlement/development pattern evident within Whitsome. The site is brownfield land and there may be potential contamination within the site. Furthermore, there is potential archaeological mitigation on the site.

The site formed part of a larger site which was also considered as part of the Local Development Plan and it was concluded that there were other more suitable sites within the housing market area. There are limited services and amenities within Whitsome and there is a reliance on other nearby settlements to provide local services and amenities.

Therefore, taking the above into consideration, it is not considered that the site should be included as a preferred/alternative site for housing within the MIR.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AWHIT004	Land at Whitsomehill	Whitsome	Rest of Borders	Housing	5	0.6	Excluded

Conclusions

This site was assessed as part of the Housing SG. An initial stage 1 RAG assessment was undertaken which ultimately concluded not to take the site forward as part of the Housing SG.

The site is located within a countryside location, outwith any defined settlement boundary. The site does not relate to any existing settlement boundary. The agent for the landowner has indicated that given the number of houses at Whitsomehill, it should now be treated as a settlement. However, there are other rural locations which have a number of dwellings within proximity to each other and it is considered to be a common characteristic of the rural nature of the Scottish Borders.

The allocation of a housing site at such a location would not comply with the principles of the Local Development Plan. It is therefore not appropriate to allocate this site for housing. Should the applicant wish to pursue the matter, a planning application could be submitted for consideration against the Council's Housing in the Countryside Policy.

Furthermore, the Roads Planning Officer has indicated that they cannot support a proposal for a housing allocation at this site. The following constraints were also identified through the consultation process;

- There is no SW foul sewer network, investigation into a private connection would be required;
- The site is located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Protection should be given to the existing boundary features; and
- Mitigation for protected species including breeding birds.

Overall, taking the above into consideration, the site will not be taken forward within the MIR.

Central HMA

Charlesfield

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
ACHAR004	Charlesfield West II	Charlesfield	Central	Housing	50	0.1	Excluded

Conclusions

An allocation of 50 units here would be undesirable. The problems with this site primarily arise from its detachment from any existing settlement and the neighbouring industrial uses. The Roads Planning Team have raised some serious concerns around the need to upgrade Charlesfield Road to connect the site with St Boswells. This is likely to be prohibitively expensive. In design and sustainability terms there are real issues with allocating what would be a new small settlement in an isolated location where a large industrial estate is the main neighbouring use which has a range of uses on-site that may be undesirable for new residents. Education have raised concerns around primary schools capacity constraints and the likely need for an extension or new school in the area. This site does not have the basic ingredients for placemaking principles and a marketability issue could possibly be associated with this.

Clovenfords

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
ACLOV004	Land west of Bowland Road	Clovenfords	Central	Housing	130	13.0	Excluded

Conclusions

A smaller part of this site has been considered previously (within the south eastern area of the site, adjacent to the settlement boundary) through the Local Development Plan 2016 and the Local Plan Amendment 2009 (ACLOV001). It was not considered that the site was required to meet the strategic housing requirement in the Central Borders Strategic Development Area. Furthermore, the site was considered to be doubtful in terms of landscape capacity and access.

A number of constraints were identified, through the consultation process, which include:

- The site is detached in nature from the rest of the village and is unable to integrate with the existing street network.
- Elevated on the skyline.
- A Drainage Assessment and information in respect of SUDS would be required.
- SEPA would require a FRA and consideration of surface water run-off.
- Mitigation measures would be required to protect trees and boundary features. Protect stone dyke feature and incorporate into design.
- The Council's Landscape Architect strongly recommended that for landscape and visual reasons only the lower part of the site should be developed for housing.

In conclusion, taking the above into consideration, it is not considered that this site is acceptable for a housing allocation and should be excluded from the Main Issues Report/Local Development Plan 2.

Darnick

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
ADARN003	Bankhead	Darnick	Central	Housing	30	2.6	Excluded

Conclusions

The proposed site sits within a sensitive and prominent area of the CAT policy area, where coalescence between Darnick and Tweedbank is a concern. Preventing coalescence between settlements is one of the main purposes of the CAT policy. The CAT policy does not preclude all development within the CAT area, but the development of this site would result in unacceptable coalescence between Darnick and Tweedbank being on a prominent open space between the settlements. The site is also considered to relate too poorly to the settlement of Darnick to be considered further, extending across the busy B6374.

The development would be expected to result in potential adverse impacts upon the setting of Darnick, its conservation area, and Listed Buildings in the vicinity of the site, and potentially on the Eildon and Leaderfoot National Scenic Area, whilst potential impacts on the River Tweed SAC and River Tweed SSSI would require assessment. Furthermore, the site is in the core of the Inventory Battlefield of Darnick.

The site is also problematic from a roads point of view in respect of access. In conclusion, it is not considered that this site is appropriate for allocation for housing within the Main Issues Report/LDP2.

Earlston

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
MEARL004	Georgefield & East Turrford	Earlston	Central	Mixed Use	700	69.9	Excluded

Conclusions

Part of this site is already allocated in the Scottish Borders LDP 2016, AEARL010 (40 units) and AEAR011 (120 units). The proposal is to increase the number of units on those existing allocations to 255 units in what is roughly the plan period through bringing forward phasing and to reallocate 27 acres of land which is currently broadly identified for Structure Planting/ Landscaping within a wider 'longer term mixed use' allocation SEARL006 for housing instead. In total this development proposal seeks, in the long term, to allocate 796 units on the sites AEARL010; AEAR011; and SEARL006.

There are no plans to remove sites AEARL010 (40 units) and AEAR011 (120 units) from the LDP. These sites are still considered to meet the objectives of the LDP and represent a suitable and deliverable expansion of Earlston. However, there is no basis for increasing the amount of development on these sites. Additionally there is no basis for altering what is a broad Long Term Expansion allocation and specifying both 796 units and the replacement of areas of the site currently broadly identified for Structure Planting/ Landscaping for housing instead.

It should be noted at this point that the proposal submitted is vague on the location of development and the specifics of what is proposed. It provides no tangible case for the changes proposed. The argument that is made is, strangely, based on a basic site layout dating from 2009 with frequent reference made to the long out of date Scottish Borders Consolidated Local Plan (2011).

Eckford

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
RECKF002	Easter Wooden Steading	Eckford	Rest of Borders	Redevelopment	5	0.7	Excluded

Conclusions

The LDP would not allocate an area of land in a rural setting for a proposal which would be tested via a planning application under the Council's Housing in the Countryside policy. The site should not be included within the MIR/LDP2.

Ednam

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AEDNA012	Land east of Keleden	Ednam	Rest of Borders	Housing	6	0.4	Excluded

Conclusions

Since the Roads Planning Team commented, planning consent was recently given for a house on the northern part of this site which in turn may have implications for access to the site. It may be possible an access to the southern part of the site could be formed through this plot. An alternative access could likely to be formed over land to the east which is understood to be outwith the applicant's control. The Roads Planning Team also have concerns relating to the pedestrian and street lighting connectivity with the rest of the village and the carriageway of the minor public road to the north would require to be widened to 5.5m.

Comments from the biodiversity officer are still awaited with regards to any potential impact upon the River Tweed SAC. The major issue with this site is that the LDP does not allocate land for development of less than five units. It is not considered the site can comfortably achieve this and would be out of character with the low density of surrounding detached properties. It is considered there are more appropriate sites tabled for consideration as part of the MIR site submission process.

Galashiels

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
BGALA005	Easter Langlee Renewable Park	Galashiels	Central	Business and Industrial	N/A	67.8	Excluded

Conclusions

Conclusion from LDP 2016 site assessment: The site is physically separated from the town by existing woodland. Impact on biodiversity is considered to be moderate due to scale but the following should be conserved: trees & hedges, adjacent woodland.

There is considerable archaeology within the north east corner of the site which would require to be avoided. The site is identified as being constrained in the Landscape Capacity Study as it is in a valley which is detached from the settlement; it is separated by a lip of land from the Tweed valley; the proximity of the waste disposal site and the overhead lines which currently fragment the site with wayleaves. The development of this site would require significant improved road access which would require land outwith the control of the applicant but could be considered for longer term development purposes.

The following would require detailed investigation: ROW to S, the potentially contaminated land of the waste disposal site to the east, the gas hazard pipelines and their protection zones, electricity pylons. It is not considered the site should be included within the MIR/LDP2.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AGALA038	Easter Langlee Mains II	Galashiels	Central	Housing	400	25.0	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was considered through the process 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 was as follows:

This site is located outwith the settlement boundary and is separated from nearby housing by a mature shelter belt. The site is constrained by the detachment from Galashiels, compounded by distance from the town centre and the barrier created by the 'lip' of land which separates the area from the Tweed Valley. The site has good access to services and facilities and is served by an acceptable level of public transport including the proposed Borders Railway. The potential impact on biodiversity is minor. The section of the Langshaw road adjacent to the site will require upgrading, in terms of carriageway widening and extending the footway and lighting infrastructure out from the town, and the northern part of the road may require realignment in order to facilitate safe access to it. A major hazard pipeline runs through the site and the Easter Langlee landfill site is located immediately to the east of the site. It is considered that other, more appropriate sites are available within the housing market area to meet the shortfall. This site would not represent a logical extension of the built up area as it would extend the settlement beyond an existing mature shelter belt to the north of Coopersknowe. This would prejudice the character and natural built up edge of the settlement to the detriment of the landscape setting. Furthermore, the proximity of the site to the existing landfill site would be contrary to prevailing national policy leading to unacceptable adverse impacts on the residential amenity of the proposed dwellings as result of noise and odour nuisance from the adjacent landfill site.

The southern part of this site was considered for housing as part of the Local Development Plan Examination (LDP 2016), the Reporter made the following comments in relation to housing site (AGALA030): "Approaching the site from the north, the land to the west of the road has a pleasant countryside appearance and the crest of the hill provides a distinct entrance to Galashiels. The construction of the houses, as proposed, would have a marked visual impact and severely detract from the local importance of this land within the landscape setting of the town. Whilst the proposed community allotments would be unlikely to have a significant impact, the construction of even a small number of houses at this location would not be acceptable in either visual or landscape character terms. Irrespective of the location of the site within the landscape, the proximity of the Easter Langlee landfill operation is a practical concern. The distance between the proposed residential development and the landfill site would be less than 100 metres. Noting the guidance in Scottish Planning Policy I agree with the council that this would not be acceptable".

Since the aforesaid proposals were considered, it is now established that the landfill site will be capped in the near future. Despite this, it remains the understanding of our section that the Waste Manager would remain concerned by any proposed housing within close proximity of the landfill site due to potential leakage. The additional overriding issue with any development of this site is that Langshaw Road would require significant upgrading involving land outwith the control of the applicant.

Due to the aforementioned reasons it is not therefore considered appropriate to allocate this site for housing.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AGALA039	Land at Winston Road	Galashiels	Central	Housing	114	2.5	Excluded

Conclusions

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 within the eastern boundary of the site. A Flood Risk Assessment would be required by SEPA. There is moderate biodiversity risk. Assessment 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. It is considered that for the aforesaid conflicts, this is not a desirable location for residential development.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
RGALA007	St John's Manse	Galashiels	Central	Redevelopment	6	0.1	Excluded

Conclusions

Development of the site for residential purposes is regarded as acceptable in principle. This is an appropriate infill site within the settlement boundary. The Council would not, however, allocate a site which cannot accommodate less than 5 units. The eastern part of the site is occupied by a traditional dwellinghouse and it is unclear if it would be the intention to demolish the dwellinghouse or retain it. It is therefore unclear if the site in question can accommodate 5 or more properties. Regardless of this, the site in question is located within the settlement boundary and would offer an opportunity for infill development through the planning application process. Given the uncertainty relating to the capacity of the site, it is considered that this proposal is better considered through the planning application process as infill development.

Gattonside

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AGATT013	Gateside Meadow/Castlefield	Gattonside	Central	Housing	60	19.7	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was identified as constrained in the Development and Landscape Capacity Study for the following reasons: development across the 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.

It should also be noted that this site formed part of the 2006 Local Plan Inquiry and the Local Development Plan 2016 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. 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.

The site is located within the CAT policy area which aims to ensure the high quality living environment is protected and to prevent piecemeal development, which would detract from the area's environment. The scale of the development within this elevated and prominent position would not adhere to the requirements of the CAT policy.

The issues raised by the Council's Roads Planning Team appear to be insurmountable given the land requirements are outwith the ownership of the applicant.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AGATT016	Lower Gateside	Gattonside	Central	Housing	70	5.5	Excluded

Conclusions

The site subject to this assessment is for housing with an indicative capacity of 70 units. The site is located immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary of Gattonside to the west of the village. Access would be from the B6360 to the south where the existing road layout is problematic. The site would extend the village beyond an existing well established landscape buffer which exists within the garden ground of a residential property known as 'Woodlands' to the south east of the site. It would be difficult to assimilate a development of the size proposed into Gattonside and would look out of place and out of character with the existing pattern of development of Gattonside and the wider north side of this section of the Tweed Valley, especially when seen from elevated locations on the other side of the valley. SNH has objected to the allocation of the site due to the likely detrimental impact upon the existing settlement pattern, landscape character, visual amenity and the NSA.

The site is located within the CAT policy area which aims to ensure the high quality living environment is protected and to prevent piecemeal development, which would detract from the area's environment. The scale of the development within this elevated and prominent position would not adhere to the requirements of the CAT policy.

Whilst Gattonside is well located in terms of access to services being located within the Central Borders, there are difficulties relating to the access at the site. The Roads Planning Officer has objected to the allocation of the site in respect of its poor relationship with the village in respect of pedestrian connectivity. There appears no obvious means of resolving this issue other than by way of affecting third party land. Vehicular access would have to be directly from the B6360 outside the village towards the western end of the site. Whilst appropriate junction visibility splays are likely to be achievable, particularly since the introduction of 'Designing Streets' and the reduced sight-line requirements therein, the access would be onto a section of road tortuous in nature and the access point would be slightly remote from the village.

It is not therefore considered that this site should be allocated for housing.

Hawick

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AHAWI019	Land west of Crumhaugh House Hospital	Hawick	Rest of Borders	Housing	10	0.1	Excluded

Conclusions

Whilst the development of this site appears to be acceptable in principle subject to the retention and protection of TPO'd trees within and adjacent to the site and also subject to care being taken to protect the character and setting of the category B listed former Cottage Hospital, the Roads Planning Officer is unable to support development due to the vehicular access onto the A7 Trunk Road which is constrained. Furthermore, the majority of the site is excessively steep in nature so it is unlikely that a public road could meet gradient requirements. Even if it could, it would inevitably have to be over engineered. Works to the access would invariably require works to existing protected trees. A Flood Risk Assessment would also be required. Any development at this location would be small scale and would be best considered through the development management process.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AHAWI024	Former Stonefield Quarry	Hawick	Central	Housing	1	0.5	Excluded

Conclusions

The site is separated from the settlement by the former railway embankment. It is a relatively secluded site located within a former quarry on the east site of the dismantled Waverley Line and has a poor relationship with the settlement and is not consistent with the general pattern of development in the area. There would be low impact on the wider settlement but the site does not integrate well into the surrounding area. This site may be at risk of flooding during a 1 in 200 year pluvial event and there is also a steep gradient from Hardie's Hill to the East of the site where surface water management may also be required. There are no known archaeological issues.

The access serving this site is inappropriate for the vehicles associated with housing development in terms of gradient and surfacing. A right of way (BR113) crosses the site from east to west.

The site was considered by the Reporter during the process of the Local Development Plan 2016 who agreed to exclude the site for the following reasons:

1. The written submission simply requires the site of the former Stonefield Quarry to be included within the plan. The accompanying drawing is entitled "Proposed House at Quarry Site, Stonefield."
 2. I share the council's opinion that the embankment of the former railway line provides a very well-defined settlement boundary in this part of Hawick. Access to the site would be via an existing bridge through the embankment with an incline from Stonefield, the nearest public road. The embankment and the means of access would ensure development of the site would be largely unconnected with the settlement of Hawick both visually and physically. In turn, development would not contribute to place-making, a central principle of Scottish Planning Policy.
 3. In addition, I believe that the confines of the site, located within a former quarry and bounded to the north by the high embankment, would not lead to a residential ambience of high quality.
 4. As it appears only one house is intended within the former quarry, there is no strategic significance in the potential development of the site.
 5. All-in-all, I conclude that the land of the former Stonefield Quarry should not be allocated for residential development, be it a single house or a small group of houses. Similarly, the settlement boundary should not be adjusted at this location. As pointed out by the council, any formal proposal would be assessed against the relevant policies of the local development plan.
-

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AHAWI028	Land at West Lees	Hawick	Central	Housing	15	1.5	Excluded

Conclusions

The LDP would not allocate areas of land in rural locations such as this for a proposal which would otherwise be tested under the Council's Housing in the Countryside policy.

A Flood Risk Assessment would be required for any development at the site. The proposal is unacceptable from a roads point of view due to the site's remote nature in respect of service provision. Developments need to be in locations that allow accessibility to local amenities by sustainable transport modes such as walking and public transport. The level of development proposed would require a new public road to serve it. The private track serving this site is single track and the gradient steeper than would normally be acceptable for a public road. Access onto the existing public road is problematic due to it being situated on the inside of a bend where visibility is restricted due to the horizontal alignment of the road and a bridge parapet to the east. The site is located within a prominent rural location.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AHAWI029	Land at Appletreehall	Hawick	Central	Housing	10	1.7	Excluded

Conclusions

The LDP would not allocate areas of land in rural locations such as this for a proposal which would otherwise be tested under the Council's Housing in the Countryside policy.

A Flood Risk Assessment would be required for any development at the site. From a roads point of view, the allocation of this site for housing would not be acceptable due to its remote nature in respect of service provision. Developments need to be in locations that allow accessibility to local amenities by sustainable transport modes such as walking and public transport. The road network in and around Appletreehall is constrained and lacking in appropriate infrastructure to support such a development. The proposed access point is of some concern due to the presence of the adjacent building which would impact on junction visibility.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AHAWI030	Land at Former Allotments, Braid Road	Hawick	Rest of Borders	Housing	20	1.1	Excluded

Conclusions

The site is unacceptable from a roads point of view due to the excessive gradient of Wellogate Brae. Furthermore, the site is allocated within the Local Development Plan 2016 as a protected Key Greenspace. The site has been previously used as allotments although this use has now ceased and the site is now a grazing field. The submission notes that there was a lack of interest in allotment holders coming forward. Whilst no response has been received from Neighbourhood Services in this respect, there is an insurmountable constraint in respect of access to the site in any event.

Heiton

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AHEIT003	Sunlaws (Phase 2)	Heiton	Central	Housing	42	7.3	Excluded

Conclusions

This is an isolated location for 42 units. There is little relation to the surrounding settlements, and Heiton and Roxburgh themselves are not very sustainable and accessible settlements. However, safe pedestrian connectivity is already provided to Heiton and a quiet cul de sac back road connects to Roxburgh. Also Heiton itself has been deemed suitable for an allocation in recent plans.

The existence of previous planning permissions and a masterplan related to a broader project in the area does not mean that this site should be allocated. However, there is a proven market for this type of development - as Sunlaws 1 demonstrates. The site is a distinctive rolling form of landscape but is broadly protected from surrounding viewpoints by virtue of this topography and by surrounding hedgrows and mature trees.

There are no physical constraints to development here. However, the site is detached from any settlement and is not therefore considered acceptable.

Jedburgh

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AJEDB017	Land east of Howdenburn Court	Jedburgh	Central	Housing	15	0.8	Excluded

Conclusions

The boundaries of this site have been extended and are now considered under AJEDB018. This proposal is therefore superseded and excluded.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
MJEDB002	Land east of Hartrigge Park	Jedburgh	Central	Mixed Use	N/A	27.3	Excluded

Conclusions

There is no requirement for allocations for housing and/or business and industrial land on this scale in Jedburgh.

An allocation at this site - at this scale - cannot be supported by SB Roads. The site is also within Hartrigge Designed Landscape area and the Alison Grant landscape assessment notes a 'constraint': 'Remnant Policies and Fringe Farmland'; Physical and perceptual distance from the existing settlement'. Around half the site is made up of long-established deciduous tree plantations and these would need to be retained. This leaves around half the site developable. However the site is detached from Jedburgh and there would be limited scope for integration.

The site might be suitable for future business and industrial land in Jedburgh. At present it is likely to be the case that there is a plentiful supply of such land in the town so no such allocation is required. As a housing site it is unsuitable for a number of reasons. First, there is a generous supply of housing land in Jedburgh on sites that are far better located. Second the site is too isolated and detached from the current settlement. Third, it is surrounded by industrial use and actually includes a poultry use - which is a very unsuitable neighbouring development. Fourth, the site contains a significant amount of deciduous woodland which would need to be retained and this makes the site quite a difficult future development area.

Depending on the situation in terms of employment land supply, part of the site could be suitable for a future employment allocation. There is no need for a housing allocation here as there are better sites available.

Kelso

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AKELS024	Land adjacent to Harrietfield Cottages	Kelso	Central	Housing	12	0.6	Excluded

Conclusions

The location does not relate to any designated settlement. As such, housing here would create a new small settlement. The proposal should be tested under the Council's Housing in the Countryside policy. Roads service have raised serious concerns. It is unlikely that junction improvements of the scope required could viably be provided through the scale of development. This site is not acceptable for a housing allocation.

Kirkhope (Nr Ettrickbridge)

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
RKIRK001	Site at Old Kirkhope Steading	Kirkhope (Nr Ettrickbridge)	Rest of Borders	Housing	6	0.6	Excluded

Conclusions

The LDP would not allocate areas of land in rural locations such as this which should otherwise be tested under the Council's Housing in the Countryside policy. The site is detached from public transport, services and employment.

Issues relating to contamination, flooding, biodiversity and drainage would require to be investigated further as part of any application submission.

Lanton

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
ALANT002	Land east of Lanton Village	Lanton	Central	Housing	6	1.1	Excluded

Conclusions

Lanton is characterised by a largely linear form of development with properties being arranged around the public roads. The Scottish Borders Local Development Plan 2016 states that development beyond the plan period in Lanton should be kept to a minimum and limited to small scale infill. Development which would negatively impact on the character and setting of the village will be resisted. It is considered that development at the location proposed would not integrate well with the character and setting of the village.

There are issues in terms of obtaining an acceptable visibility splay from the site on to the main road. The location of the access would require to be remote from the settlement. There are moderate biodiversity issues to be addressed as well as archaeology matters to be considered.

Maxton

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AMAXT003	Land and buildings at East End Farm	Maxton	Central	Housing	25	2.0	Excluded

Conclusions

While there is no ecological constraints associated with the proposal, there is a question around the overall sustainability of allocating 25 units in a village with no services. The allocation would be made up of two existing allocations brought together through one new allocation which is currently made up of redundant modern agricultural buildings as well as two farmhouses/dwellings which would be retained. There is an issue regarding education capacity which needs to be clarified. Otherwise, there are no constraints which rule out development. The market for 25 units in Maxton over the course of the plan period is questionable, however it could be argued that this re-allocation would make delivery more likely as the single site will be simplified, roads access improved, and there will be potential for an improved development in design terms. The proposal would remove some large agricultural buildings which have no design value, but the development would still have to address potential impact on the Tweed Lowlands SLA; boundary treatments might include planting of hedgerows.

Having considered the case for the reallocation, no change is necessary because the farm buildings already fall within the envelope of the settlement boundary and could be redeveloped as infill development in any case. The 25 unit allocation over two separate sites should simply remain and there is nothing stopping a proposal incorporating all sites coming forward through the planning application process.

Melrose

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AMELR008	Land at Dingleton Mains	Melrose	Central	Housing	50	3.2	Excluded

Conclusions

This site was the subject of an objection at the 2006 Local Plan Inquiry and was considered as part of the Local Plan Amendment process. The site is identified as constrained within the Landscape Capacity Study. The Reporters assessment at the Inquiry was that the site should not be developed because it would have an adverse impact on the National Scenic Area. This site is unacceptable because the site would have an adverse impact on the landscape of the National Scenic Area and the setting of the settlement.

The site is located within the CAT policy area which aims to ensure the high quality living environment is protected and to prevent piecemeal development, which would detract from the area's environment. The scale of the development at this location would not adhere to the requirements of the CAT policy.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AMELR012	Bleachfield	Melrose	Central	Housing	40	3.2	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was considered as part of the Housing SG which concluded that the site was unacceptable.

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. Furthermore, development at this location would have a detrimental impact upon the setting and sense of arrival to Melrose; an unacceptable impact upon the Eildon and Leaderfoot National Scenic Area; a detrimental impact upon the character of the Melrose Conservation Area; and a potential adverse impact upon the special qualities of the Eildon & Leaderfoot Hills NSA.

In summary, it is not considered that this site is acceptable for development.

Midlem

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AMIDL003	Townhead	Midlem	Central	Housing	5	0.5	Excluded

Conclusions

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, this remains relevant to this current site assessment:

Midlem has little in the way of service or employment provision and has limited public transport options. The site is located on the western edge of the village beyond recently built housing. Allocating this site would extend the settlement further west at an elevated location and result in the site being prominent within the landscape; in addition, it was judged that the site was not suitable for roads access and that a pedestrian route would not be able to be provided from the site to the rest of the village.

It should be noted that this site formed part of the recent Local Development Plan Examination. The Reporter stated "development at this location would not integrate well with the village in terms of appearance and character. Significantly, I believe it would not contribute to "place-making", a central guiding principle in Scottish Planning Policy". The Reporter goes on to state that "extending the development boundary at this location would provide the potential for additional development over currently vacant land with little relationship to the Conservation Area. Indeed, as the council argues, the land is elevated and would be prominent in the landscape. This could reduce the value of the setting of the Conservation Area within the wider landscape".

The Roads Officer could only support two dwellinghouses at this location. This is too low for a housing allocation which would normally be 5 units or more.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AMIDL004	West of Springfield	Midlem	Central	Housing	1	0.1	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was considered at the Local Development Plan Examination in 2016 under site code SBMID001. The Reporter stated that "development at this location would not integrate well with the village in terms of appearance and character. All-in-all, I find little merit in extending the settlement boundary as proposed". This position has not changed however the site was re-considered as part of the Housing SG Call for Sites and an initial stage 1 RAG assessment was undertaken, the site assessment concluded that the site should not be taken forward as part of the Housing SG. The conclusion of the assessment was as follows and remains relevant:

This site would potentially accommodate a single dwellinghouse, however, a dwellinghouse on the site would not relate well to the generally linear form of the village. Although the site adjoins the existing settlement boundary, the proposed boundary does not follow any distinct physical or natural features on the ground and is not therefore regarded as a logical extension of the settlement.

It is also not the purpose of the Local Development Plan to identify single plots for development only sites with a capacity of five or more units will be allocated.

In view of the above, it is not considered that this proposal can be supported.

Morebattle

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AMORE002	Land west of Primary School	Morebattle	Central	Housing	8	1.1	Excluded

Conclusions

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 was as follows:

"A large proportion of this site is allocated as a district business and industrial site and remains undeveloped although the safeguarded site to the west is fully developed and is in use. This site allows for potential expansion of the business and industrial site in the future. Although the majority of the site is Prime Agricultural Land, the site is relatively free of constraints. There are also two undeveloped housing allocations within Morebattle, one of which was allocated as part of the Local Plan Amendment. It is not considered that there is a requirement for an additional housing site within the settlement at this point in time."

The arguments set out in the RAG 1 Assessment still hold. Although the landowner/proposer has been unable to attract industrial/business development on allocation BMORE001, this does not mean it should be reallocated for housing. There appears to be a lack of developer interest in Morebattle. In recent years only very small scale development has taken place. This might be expected for a small settlement outside the rural growth area. There is no developer identified for the proposed allocation and there is no reason to believe that there will be market interest in the site (located adjacent existing industrial development) than the existing more suitably allocated sites in Morebattle. This proposal would involve the reallocation of BMORE001 for housing development, but there is no good case for such a reallocation. This would involve the loss of a future employment/business opportunity in a rural area for housing, when there are already two existing sites, RMO6B and AMORE001 offering a plentiful supply of housing in Morebattle. The development for housing would mean the westerly linear development of the village and would require appropriate access to the village through footpaths, lighting and redesignation of the village's 30mph zone. Such work is not required at the existing allocations.

Newmill (Nr Hawick)

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
RNEWM001	Site at Newmill Steading	Newmill (Nr Hawick)	Rest of Borders	Housing	8	0.1	Excluded

Conclusions

The allocation of a re-development site at such a location would not comply with the principles of the Local Development Plan as it is not appropriate to allocate the site for re-development which should otherwise be tested under the Council's Housing in the Countryside policy. Should the applicant wish to pursue the matter, a planning application could be submitted for consideration against the Council's Housing in the Countryside Policy.

Newstead

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
ANEWS007	Newstead East	Newstead	Central	Housing	18	0.9	Excluded

Conclusions

Development at this location would have an adverse impact upon the form of the settlement as it would elongate it and cross the existing boundaries formed by roads. It is considered that any development of the site would affect the rural setting of the conservation area, west of it. The site was previously rejected by the Reporter at the examination of the Local Development Plan on the following grounds:

'... I believe that the site is a valuable element in the landscape setting of Newstead. Indeed, in this respect, I concur with the Newstead settlement profile in stating that the fields to the east should be protected from future development as they are considered to form part of the character of the village'. 'Despite the planning permission granted for some limited development at the eastern edge of Newstead, I believe the boundary at this location to be clear and worthy of retention. The current sense of entry to the village would be lost should the suggested development take place. This would be contrary to the principle of place-making set out in Scottish Planning Policy'.

Overall, it is not considered that this site can be accepted for a housing allocation.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
ANEWS008	Newstead North I	Newstead	Central	Housing	25	1.2	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was considered through the process of the Housing SG under ANEWS006. The notable changes are now an increased proposed capacity of 25 units (from 23) and the demolition of the existing Tweedwood Cottage and the incorporation of a small area of garden ground of 14 Rushbank in order to achieve access.

The following site assessment from the earlier Housing SG proposal still remains relevant to the assessment of this site (ANEWS006):

The site sits on the northern periphery of Newstead, partly within the settlement boundary. Similarly the site is partly within both Newstead Conservation Area, and partly within the Countryside Around Towns (CAT) policy area. The CAT policy does not preclude development, and this particular part of the CAT is less sensitive than other areas, as the risk of coalescence in this location is minimal.

The settlement's relationship with Newstead Conservation Area is a key consideration. The site is large relative to the size of the settlement and sensitive integration into the settlement would be essential. The site sits on the edge of Eildon & Leaderfoot National Scenic Area (NSA) and adjacent to the River Tweed SSSI and SAC. The applicant has submitted an indicative site layout proposing 23 units. Due to the need to protect healthy trees on the site it is likely if the site was to be allocated this figure would be reduced considerably.

A portion of the proposed site was considered and rejected on access grounds at the time of the Local Plan Amendment. Roads access has been reassessed and is not opposed in principle by the Council's Road section, as in this instance further investigation is being sought with regards to the possibility of forming a road link between Rushbank and Eddy Road. However, key issues remain to be resolved: significant upgrading work is required in the public road known as Rushbank; and the private road known as Eddy Road needs to be upgraded to an adoptable standard. In both cases third party land owners are directly affected. For the whole site to be developed, access would be required from both. It remains to be seen whether the developer is in a position to address these points and that the Council can consequently be satisfied the requirements can be resolved. A Transport Statement would also be required for any development.

The applicant has not demonstrated that the requisite road improvements can be implemented as they involve land outwith their control. In view of this, it is not considered that this proposal can be supported.

Nisbet

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
ANISB002	East of Nisbet	Nisbet	Central	Housing	6	0.3	Excluded

Conclusions

Nisbet is located within the Central Borders Rural Growth Area and is a village which has in recent times seen successful development of new housing which has been sympathetic to the Conservation Area status of the village.

The access roads issue raised is surmountable, and development of over 4 units with an associated adoptable road would not represent undue urbanisation. SEPA requires a FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourse which is potentially culverted through the site. SEPA do not support development located over a culvert that is to remain active. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there are flooding issues at the site. That flood risk covers around on third of the site area on its northern, street facing, part of the site. The developer's suggested layout accounts for the planning and infrastructure issues that have been raised. Two quarries were previously recorded on site, both of which appear to have been infilled, this requires further investigation, but the affected area is likely to be left as open space in any case. The developable part of the site does sit within a relatively prominent position in the village, but landscaping could help mitigate this.

While development here is not likely to be absolutely constrained by any particular issue and the site is within the Central Borders RGA, Nisbet is a very small village without services and one that has recently absorbed a relatively large scale of development. The allocation of a further 6 units could be seen to have negative cumulative impact.

The Roads Planning Team would only be able to support a maximum number of four units on the site. This is below the minimum number of five units required for allocation.

Oxnam

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AOXNA002	Land to west of Oxnam Road	Oxnam	Rest of Borders	Housing	20	2.9	Excluded

Conclusions

Oxnam is not a recognised settlement. It is not considered necessary or sustainable to make an allocation for up to 20 self build plots in this location. The deliverability of such an allocation is doubtful. There are very few existing services and new residents would have to drive to Jedburgh for all basic daily services. There is a moderate biodiversity risk in this location because of the proximity of the River Tweed SAC. The settlement has been able to grow through development in the countryside policies in recent times. Further organic growth could take place this way or through the inclusion of a development boundary and/or a small allocation for future growth, possibly even on a portion of this site, but 20 units and a site of this size represents significant over-development. This allocation should not be included in the MIR, but there is potential to include a portion of it as part of a wider consultation on the possibility of providing a development boundary for the settlement through the LDP process. The site is located within a rural setting and does not relate to any existing settlement. It is therefore considered that this site should be excluded.

Selkirk

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
ASELK030	Land to west of Calton Cottage	Selkirk	Central	Housing	100	6.1	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was considered as part of the Housing SG. An initial stage 1 RAG assessment was undertaken, however concluded that the site should not be taken forward as part of the Housing SG. The conclusion of the assessment is as follows and remains relevant to this proposal:

This site is located outwith Selkirk, but partially borders the settlement boundary. Although partially adjacent to the settlement boundary, the site is notably detached from the built up parts of the town.

There are two existing housing allocations nearby, Philiphaugh North and Philiphaugh Steading. Another site has been proposed through the SG process at the Angle's Field. It would be preferable for some or all of these allocated sites to be developed before any land beyond the settlement boundary in this part of Selkirk was considered.

Overall, the site's poor relationship with Selkirk prevents the site from progressing to Stage 2 assessment.

Furthermore, the site is unacceptable from a roads point of view given the detached location of the site. The site is out on a limb and difficult to integrate with other housing developments within Selkirk. Furthermore, it is unlikely that an acceptable access arrangement could be achieved and the existing road network does not have the required pedestrian facilities that a development of this size would require.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
ASELK031	Land north of Bannerfield	Selkirk	Central	Housing	130	12.0	Excluded

Conclusions

The site area and capacity was reduced for the purposes of the consultation process during the process of the Housing SG 2017 as it was considered that a reduced area/capacity was worth exploring.

There is a small area within the site that may be at risk of surface water flooding which would require investigation as well as surface water run off from the nearby hills. There are no significant biodiversity issues relating to the site. Whilst this area of Selkirk is some distance from the town, there are facilities within the vicinity, including Philiphaugh Primary School.

The site is located adjacent to the settlement boundary of Selkirk, to the north of Bannerfield. Part of the site has been considered previously in 2006, and was discounted for the reason that "the site is detached from the settlement by a steep, tree covered bank". However, the Scottish Borders Development and Landscape Capacity Study (February 2007) states that "there is potentially scope for several houses to be located to extend the existing pattern of individual house development north east of Levenlea, sited behind the belt of woodland which extends along the roadside. These proposals were not, however, interpreted as offering a serious expansion opportunity for Selkirk, as this area, while technically part of Selkirk, feels very detached from the main settlement". It is therefore considered that the principle of residential development at this location may be acceptable. However, the extent of the site from that submitted during the 'Call for Sites' was significantly reduced for the consultation process during the Housing SG 2017. Consideration would need to be given to the location of the site within a Special Landscape Area. Detached villa development would be most appropriate to the location.

However, it is not possible to achieve an appropriate access into the site due to topography and the elongated nature of the site. It is not therefore considered that this proposal can be supported from a roads point of view.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
ASELK032	Philiphaugh Nursery	Selkirk	Central	Housing	10	0.6	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was considered as part of the Housing SG. An initial stage 1 RAG assessment was undertaken, however concluded that the site should not be taken forward as part of the Housing SG. The conclusion of the assessment is as follows, this remains relevant to this current assessment:

The site is safeguarded as a Key Greenspace within the Local Development Plan 2016 and is not therefore considered appropriate for a housing allocation. Issues relating to the registered battlefield (Philiphaugh) would require to be investigated further.

Furthermore, the proposal is not supported by the Roads Planning Team as the site does not relate particularly well to the existing settlement offering little in the way of scope for integration with the existing street network. Furthermore, access to it is problematic in terms of visibility due to the horizontal alignment of the A708 along this section.

Whilst the Roads Officer may be in a position to support a reduced size, this would not overcome the fact that the site is a Key Greenspace.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
MSELK003	Land west of Heather Mill	Selkirk	Central	Mixed Use	5	0.1	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was considered as part of the Housing SG. An initial stage 1 RAG assessment was undertaken, however concluded that the site should not be taken forward as part of the Housing SG. The conclusion of the assessment is as follows:

Although the site is currently allocated within the Local Development Plan 2016 as a business and industrial site, this is a local designation which gives a low level of protection for this particular use. It is accepted that this site may be acceptable for residential use in the future, there is currently however the potential for a conflict of uses due to the fact that the land to the immediate south can still be utilised for business/industrial purposes. This potential conflict has also been identified by the Roads Planning Team. SEPA has also raised concerns relating to residential development behind a flood scheme.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
MSELK004	Land and buildings at Whinfield Mill	Selkirk	Central	Mixed Use	33	1.3	Excluded

Conclusions

The site is designated as a district business and industrial site within the Local Development Plan 2016. Due to the existing character and nature of uses within the immediate vicinity of the site, it is not considered that a mixed use development would be acceptable at this location. The development of the site for mixed use purposes would lead to the loss of business/industrial land and raise a potential conflict in uses at this location.

Smailholm

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
ASMAI001	Land adjacent to Village Hall	Smailholm	Central	Housing	7	1.0	Excluded

Conclusions

Only development that allows for an organic growth of the village would be appropriate. There is a need to protect the conservation area status of the village. While there is a need for sensitivity and there is a greater degree of complexity in terms of identifying land for the future expansion of Smailholm, this does not rule out development. The land could be identified in the LDP for housing development, but it would have to be of a layout and design that is in keeping with the conservation area status of the village at this location. This means that a lower density of housing would only be appropriate on this site in order to follow the character of surrounding properties. It is difficult to envisage how this site could be sensitively developed with 5 or more properties. It is perhaps more likely that a lesser scaled development might be achievable at this location. In any event, the site is located within the settlement boundary of Smailholm and it is therefore considered that this proposal would be best considered through the planning application process.

St Boswells

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
MSTBO001	Land north west of Garage	St Boswells	Central	Mixed Use	N/A	2.9	Excluded

Conclusions

There are landscape issues in relation to the NSA and the potential issues of coalescence to consider. Aside from this there have been no issues that pose a threat to potential development. Having said that, this site is the subject of a planning application process, and is related to the existing garage site.

It would be premature to allocate this in the LDP2. Instead this should be treated as a DM issue and the subsequent LDP updated to reflect this.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
RSTBO001	Garage Site	St Boswells	Central	Redevelopment	40	0.5	Excluded

Conclusions

This site would be suitable as a brownfield development opportunity. This would not strictly have to be allocated in the development plan as it already lies within the development boundary. An allocation here needs to be considered as interrelated with the landowner's plans to expand their operations on the west of St Boswells (MSTBO001). This site (RSTBO001) is, according to the landowner, no longer fit for purpose. As such this creates a brownfield development opportunity. So, allocating this site for housing effectively adds weight to the need for an employment and industrial use expansion at MSTBO001.

Considered alone, there is quite a strong planning case for the redevelopment of this current garage and filling station site for housing, should it become redundant (however, 40 units may be too high a density). Aside from the complications around the interrelation with MSTBO001, there are (resolvable) contamination issues and trunk road access issues to consider. This site should not be included in the MIR but would be supported as redevelopment in future if it was to become redundant through the planning application process.

Stichill

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
ASTIC003	Land north west of Eildon View	Stichill	Rest of Borders	Housing	16	1.0	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was considered as part of the Housing SG. An initial stage 1 RAG assessment was undertaken, however concluded that the site should not be taken forward as part of the Housing SG. The conclusion of the assessment is as follows:

The site was previous considered in the preparation of the Local Plan. The site was rejected on roads access grounds.

The site sits within Central HMA but is outwith the SDAs. There are no current allocations within the settlement, but there has been recent development within Stichill following the erection of 8 dwelling houses at land south of the B6364. The proposed 16 units at this site would represent further relatively large scale development for a small settlement such as Stichill.

The site is situated within the SBC designated Stichill Designed Landscape, which relates to the now-demolished Stichill House. The site is located within close proximity to two C Listed Buildings, including the gates to Stichill House.

There are no known key services provided in Stichill. The nearest primary school is located in nearby Ednam. Stichill is considered to have poor local service accessibility.

The site submission does not confirm ownership of the road and consequently the Council is not able to confirm that the access road can be formed to the required adoptable standard. Consequently it is considered at this point in time that the proposal is premature and cannot be confirmed as being effective within this SG process. If the access issue can be addressed and resolved at a later point in time it consequently may be considered for allocation within a future LDP taking cognisance of any other relevant matters.

Overall, it is considered that there are better sites available in the Central Housing Market Area and the site should not be considered further."

OVERALL CONCLUSION 2018

The sustainability of a 16 unit allocation in a village with no daily services is very questionable. In terms of the details, the issue of using the shared access has still not been resolved. It is not in the landowners ownership and so the viability of the site's development is undermined. Related to this, that access point would likely require a major impact on or the demolition of the C listed gated entrance to the former Stichill House estate. Comment from HES is required in this regard but it is highly unlikely that this would be supported. The alternative routes suggested do get around this problem technically, but lead to other issues in terms of feasibility and impact on the surrounding area. These alternative accesses need to be assessed further. For the aforesaid reasons, it is not considered that this site can be brought forward for housing within the MIR/LDP2.

Tweedbank

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
MTWEE003	Lowood II	Tweedbank	Central	Mixed Use	300	38.0	Excluded

Conclusions

This submission proposes an area of land to the north of the River Tweed and a small area of land at the eastern access of the site in addition to the area of land (MTWEE003) which was allocated for mixed use development through the process of the Housing SG 2017. The additional land proposed, in particular the land to the north of the River Tweed, is inappropriate for a mixed use allocation. This area of land is both detached from the site at Lowood and is an important green corridor both visually and environmentally. It is not considered that the additional land supported can be included. MTWEE002 will, however, remain an allocation within the LDP2.

The following is the summary of MTWEE002 as contained within the assessment for the Housing SG 2017, which otherwise remains relevant:

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 (PPC) and WML 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 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 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.

Yetholm

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
BYETH001	NW of Deanfield Place	Yetholm	Rest of Borders	Business and Industrial	N/A	1.0	Excluded

Conclusions

The issues raised by the Roads Planning Service are enough to rule out an allocation of this site in the MIR. There is no footway access to the village and the site cannot be accessed from plan allocation RY1B.

Northern HMA

Broughton

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
ABROU002	South west of Dreva Road	Broughton	Rest of Borders	Housing	25	3.2	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was submitted for consideration as a 'Call for Site'. The same site was recently considered as part of the Housing SG and was not taken forward. If developed, the site would integrate well into the settlement. It is noted that the site is already included within the Housing Land Audit (HLA) and had a recent consent for 25 units (now lapsed). Nevertheless, there is an extant planning consent from the 1970's. It should also be noted that this site remains within the Broughton Development Boundary. The most recent 2017 Housing Land Audit shows that there are 51 units within the established housing land supply, over 4 sites within Broughton. It is considered that the current allocations and extant planning consent are sufficient for the LDP2 plan period. In conclusion, the site will not be taken forward for inclusion within the MIR for housing.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
ABROU003	Old Kirkyard Field	Broughton	Rest of Borders	Housing	10	2.2	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the 'Call for Sites' process for consideration, for housing. The site has limited access to public transport, services and employment.

SNH raised issues regarding the location of the site within the National Scenic Area, but did not make a formal objection. The Landscape Officer did not make any formal objection to the proposal and advised that the site is partially contained by hedgerow and mature trees along the B7016, which should be retained and enhanced with additional tree planting along the hedgerow. This in addition to broad woodland belt to the south west corner and along the western boundary would help to contain development in the views.

It should be noted that there are already 2 allocated housing sites within Broughton and an extant planning consent from the 1970's. The most recent 2017 Housing Land Audit shows that there are 51 units within the established housing land supply, over 4 sites. It is considered that the current allocations and extant planning consent are sufficient for the LDP2 plan period. In conclusion, the site will not be taken forward for inclusion within the MIR for housing. However, could be considered in the future should land be required.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
ABROU004	Village Park Site	Broughton	Rest of Borders	Housing	10	2.4	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the 'Call for Sites' process for consideration, for housing. The site has limited access to public transport, services and employment.

SNH raised issues regarding the location of the site within the National Scenic Area, but did not make a formal objection. However the Landscape Officer advised that if the site is allocated, sites should be developed in smaller pockets/phases rather than as a large single block. Furthermore, the existing hedgerow and mature trees should be retained and enhanced and additional tree/hedge planting would be essential to help contain this development.

It should be noted that there are already 2 allocated housing sites within Broughton and an extant planning consent from the 1970's. The most recent 2017 Housing Land Audit shows that there are 51 units within the established housing land supply, over 4 sites. It is considered that the current allocations and extant planning consent are sufficient for the LDP2 plan period. In conclusion, the site will not be taken forward for inclusion within the MIR for housing. However, could be considered in the future should land be required.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
ABROU005	Land adjacent to Broughton Cemetery	Broughton	Rest of Borders	Housing	12	0.9	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the 'Call for Sites' process for consideration, for housing. It should be noted that there are already 2 allocated housing sites within Broughton and an extant planning consent from the 1970's. The site has limited access to public transport, services and employment.

Further to a site assessment, the Roads Planning Officer has advised that they cannot support the proposal, for the following reasons, 'The allocation of this site would expand the settlement boundary in linear nature along the A701, stretching it beyond the existing 30mph. An objective of any principal road is to effectively contain the speed restrictions for settlements and allow the safe and expeditious movement of longer distance traffic'.

The site is immediately adjacent to the east wall of the churchyard, which Historic Environment Scotland state may raise issues of national significance, in relation to the setting of the monument. The Archaeology Officer also raised concerns that this is likely the site of a medieval village, with moderate to high archaeological potential. Furthermore, the site lies adjacent to the Category B listed building 'Old Broughton Parish Church' and care would be needed in any development, to respect the scale and setting of the remains of the Church.

In conclusion, taking into consideration the objection raised from the Roads Officer and the above constraints, the site will not be included within the MIR.

Cardrona

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
ACARD001	South of B7062	Cardrona	Western	Housing	25	3.5	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the 'Call for Sites' process for consideration, for housing. The site has good access to public transport, services and employment.

The site is separated from the rest of the settlement of Cardrona by the B7062. A site at this location (albeit a larger site) was previously considered by the Local Plan Reporter, who stated that development should not extend south of the B road. The Reporter also commented that "The new building frontage would be obvious to those passing through on this road, as it would form what would be essentially ribbon development ... far from improving the character of the road, I consider that this would be very unwelcome and out of character on what is essentially a very scenic rural road, not a housing access."

It is noted that this site (ACARD001) was considered as part of the Housing SG and was not included. The same site is currently under consideration and it is noted the applicant has submitted a Site Appraisal/Development Proposal. However, the proposal remains the same as the Housing SG proposal. Therefore, in conclusion, the site will not be included within the MIR for the reasons outlined above.

Eddleston

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AEDDL006	Temple Hill East	Eddleston	Rest of Borders	Housing	50	2.4	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the 'Call for Sites' process for consideration, for housing. The site has good access to public transport, services and employment. The site lies to the south east of Eddleston.

LUC undertook a study as part of the MIR process, 'Western Rural Growth Area: Development Options Study', to identify and assess options for housing within the Central Tweeddale Area. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP for the Central Tweeddale area in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders. As part of this study, 34 search areas were identified and explored in more detail. Search Area number 4: Eddleston south east, included the proposed site (AEDDL006). The study concluded that development within this search area would be separate from, and would contrast with, Eddleston's historic valley location. Furthermore, as part of the site assessment, the proposal is not supported by either SNH or the Council's Landscape Architect.

As part of the LUC Study 3 potential housing options were identified within Eddleston. It is considered that these sites are more suitable and appropriate for housing development. Therefore, taking the above into consideration, this site will not be included within the MIR.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AEDDL007	North of Bellfield II	Eddleston	Rest of Borders	Housing	35	4.4	Excluded

Conclusions

The site is located to the north of Eddleston, directly to the north of the existing housing allocation (AEDDL002). The site was identified as part of the 'Western Rural Growth Area: Development Options Study' which was undertaken by LUC, to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP and for the future, within the Tweeddale area, in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders. The site currently being considered is proposed for housing development site.

Eddleston has good access to services, employment and public transport. Further to a site assessment, the following constraints/issues were identified, which may require mitigation;

- Flood Risk Assessment required, in respect of potential flood risk and surface water runoff on the site;
- Foul sewerage constraints, as the site is located outwith the current sewered catchment;
- Protect and enhance the existing boundary features, where possible;
- Potential protected species, including breeding birds within the site, would require mitigation;
- The Designed Landscape (SBC) and Garden and Designed Landscape (HES) 'Portmore' are located to the north of the site;
- Consideration of the potential impact of the development on the River Tweed SAC/SSSI;
- Structure shelterbelt planting using deciduous/mixed woodland species will be essential along eastern elevation boundary to achieve a 'landscape fit'
- The Roads Planning Officer advised that the proposal is acceptable. (AEDDL002) would need to be developed first, in order to integrate this proposed site within the settlement. Access into the site can be taken from a number of points along the former public road and a link to (AEDDL002) would be required;
- Potential for archaeology on the site;
- Potential for Drainage Impact Assessment, in respect of the WWTW; and
- Potential for Water Impact Assessment, in respect of the WTW.

There are no insurmountable constraints, which would prevent the development of this site for housing, subject to mitigation measures. It is acknowledged that the site immediately to the south is already allocated for housing within the LDP and remains undeveloped to date. The Roads Planning Officer has confirmed that access would need to come via the allocated housing site (AEDDL002) and that the site should be developed prior to this one. Therefore, given that (AEDDL002) remains undeveloped to date, it is considered more appropriate for this site to be considered for longer term housing. It should be noted that this site is therefore also being considered as a longer term housing option (SEDDL001).

In conclusion, it is considered more appropriate to take forward this site as a longer term housing option, taking the above into consideration. Therefore, this site will not be taken forward within the MIR as a housing option, however the longer term option (SEDDL001) will be taken forward.

Innerleithen

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AINNE008	South of Peebles Road	Innerleithen	Western	Housing	75	6.8	Excluded

Conclusions

The site lies to the west of Innerleithen, just outwith the settlement boundary, on the south side of the A72. The site was submitted as part of the 'Call for Sites' process, for consideration as housing. It should be noted that the site was considered as part of the Housing SG for housing development and was ultimately not included. An initial Stage 1 RAG assessment was undertaken as part of the Housing SG. It is acknowledged that concerns were raised in the conclusions at that stage, regarding the prominent location, impact upon the SLA and potential archaeology.

However since that assessment, a more extensive study of the Central Tweeddale area has been undertaken by LUC, in order to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Central Tweeddale. The site was one option put forward for consideration, in respect of a mixed use site. A re-assessment has therefore been undertaken, in light of the additional information contained within the LUC Study and consultation responses. It should also be noted that there are a lack of suitable development opportunities within the Tweeddale area going forward. It is acknowledged that the landowners provided the following additional information as part of the Call for Sites process; Access Appraisal, Archaeology Appraisal, Constraints & Opportunities Plan and Development Framework Plan.

Innerleithen has good access to public transport, services and employment, given the proximity to Peebles and good links to Galashiels and Edinburgh. Further to a site assessment, the following constraints/issues were identified, which may require mitigation;

- Flood Risk Assessment required, in respect of potential flood risk and surface water runoff on the site;
- Potential connectivity to the River Tweed SAC/SSSI, mitigation required to ensure no likely significant effects;
- Protect and enhance the existing boundary features and protect boundary features on dis-used railway;
- Potential protected species, including breeding birds within the site, would require mitigation;
- Located within the 'Tweed Valley' Special Landscape Area;
- The western part of the site is constrained within the Landscape Capacity Study;
- SNH advise that the site should remain unallocated, given the potential for any development to result in a dominant element on the western approach into the settlement. However, structure planting is proposed and it is considered that this would mitigate any visual impacts of the development from the A72;
- Transport Assessment or at least Statement required;
- Evidence of archaeology within the site, therefore mitigation required. The Officer would prefer in-situ protection, full investigation would be required for the area within the Roman Camp;
- Roads Planning Officer raised no objections to the allocation;
- Potential for Drainage Impact Assessment, in respect of the WWTW;
- Potential for Water Impact Assessment, in respect of the WTW; and
- Non vehicular links to existing path network and Peebles town/amenities.

Overall, taking the above into consideration, it is considered that there are no insurmountable planning issues which cannot be overcome through appropriate mitigation measures. However, given the existing pressures to find business & industrial land within the Tweeddale area, it is considered that a mixed use allocation on this site (which accommodates an element of both housing and employment land) would be the most appropriate way for the site to be developed. Therefore this proposal for housing (AINNE008) will not be taken forward as an option within the MIR.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AINNE009	Kirklands II	Innerleithen	Western	Housing	80	7.6	Excluded

Conclusions

It should be noted that this site was initially coded as (AINNE011) however it became evident that the site boundary was actually the same as (AINNE009) which was previously considered. Therefore, the consultation responses will all have the reference (AINNE011). It should be noted that the site was recently submitted for consideration as part of the Housing SG. An initial stage 1 RAG assessment was undertaken, however concluded that the site should not be taken forward as part of the Housing SG.

This site is identified within the Local Development Plan for longer term housing (SINNE001). However, Innerleithen currently has 3 housing allocations and 1 mixed use allocation, with a total indicative site capacity of 245 units, with no completions on any site to date. Furthermore, the 2017 Housing Land Audit states that the total established housing land supply within Innerleithen is 275 units. It is considered that there are sufficient housing allocations within Innerleithen for the LDP2 plan period. Furthermore, as the Roads Planning Officer has indicated this site (AINNE009) would rely on the development of the existing housing allocation (AINNE004) in order to provide a link to the site. It should be noted that (AINNE004) has not yet been commenced.

Therefore, taking the above into consideration, the site will not be included within the MIR as a housing option. However, it will be retained as a potential longer term housing option for the future.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AINNE010	Upper Kirklands	Innerleithen	Western	Housing	40	5.0	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was submitted for consideration as part of the Call for Sites process. The site is located to the north west of the existing housing allocation (AINNE004).

There is some archaeological potential within the site, which would require further investigation. The site is constrained within the Landscape Capacity Study and the site is located within the Tweed Valley SLA. It is considered that development of this site would result in unacceptable encroachment further up the hill which could negatively impact on the settlement. Furthermore the Roads Planning Officer is unable to support development at this site. The Officer advised that whilst access can be achieved from the allocated site (AINNE004), the gradient of the site is such that a suitable layout is unlikely to be achieved. Therefore, there are significant constraints which would prevent this site from being developed.

Innerleithen currently has 3 housing allocations and 1 mixed use allocation, with a total indicative site capacity of 245 units, with no completions on any site to date. Furthermore, the 2017 Housing Land Audit states that the total established housing land supply within Innerleithen is 275 units. It is considered that there are sufficient housing allocations within Innerleithen for the LDP2 plan period.

Therefore, taking the above into consideration, the site will not be included within the MIR as a housing option.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
MINNE002	Traquair Road East	Innerleithen	Western	Mixed Use	12	0.1	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the 'Call for Sites' process, for a mixed use. The site is currently allocated within the LDP for business and industrial land. The majority of the site submitted is for housing, with the mixed use element being a part of the site already developed. The area immediately to the west is allocated as safeguarded business and industrial land. There are pressures to find new business and industrial land within the Tweeddale area. As part of the MIR process, LUC have undertaken a study to identify business and industrial opportunities within the Tweeddale area. The development of housing at this location, would ultimately lead to the loss of allocated business and industrial land, would not be supported. This is the only un-developed business and industrial allocation within the LDP for Innerleithen. Furthermore, it is not considered that development here would relate well with the existing industrial estate.

Furthermore, the Roads Planning Officer has concerns for a mixed use on this site. Economic Development state that housing on this site would be impractical.

In addition, Innerleithen already has 3 allocated housing sites and 1 mixed use site allocated within the LDP, amounting to an indicative capacity of 245 units.

In conclusion, taking the above into consideration, the site will not be taken forward for inclusion within the MIR.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
RINNE003	St Ronans Terrace/Hall Street	Innerleithen	Western	Redevelopment	9	0.1	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was submitted for consideration as part of the 'Call for Sites' process, with an indicative site capacity of 9 units (social rent/retirement units). There is an existing bungalow on the site at present. It is considered that development of the site for residential purposes is regarded as acceptable in principle. However, the site is small and it is considered that development for 9 units, as submitted, would represent over development of the site. Whilst redevelopment of the site could be supported, it is unlikely that an allocation for 5 units or more could be achieved within the site. The Council would not allocate a site which cannot accommodate less than 5 units. The site is located within the Innerleithen settlement boundary and could offer an opportunity for infill development through the planning application process. Given the uncertainty relating to the capacity of the site, it is considered that this proposal is better considered through the planning application process, as a potential infill development. Therefore, the site will not be included within the MIR as an option for redevelopment.

Lauder

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
ALAUD008	Maitland Park (Phase 2)	Lauder	Rest of Borders	Housing	60	4.3	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the Call for Sites process for consideration for housing.

There is flood risk on substantial part of site along southerly edge. The settlement has limited access to services and potentially a moderate impact on biodiversity. The site contributes to the immediate setting of the settlement. Development at this location would also result in elongating the settlement. The site is constrained within the Development and Landscape Capacity Study and it is considered that development of the site would impact negatively on the settlement approach from south. Lauder has already two allocated housing sites with an indicative capacity of 130 units. The Reporter at a previous Local Plan Inquiry stated "development at this location would be less suitable than development on the west side of Lauder".

At this point in time, it is not considered that there is any need for a further allocation within Lauder. It is likely that the site will continue to be submitted again for consideration in the future and although it is acknowledged that there are major landscape issues to be addressed regarding this site, future other options around the town boundary are limited. Therefore, the site will not be included within the MIR although it will likely be re-considered in the future.

Nether Blainslie

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
ANETH002	Nether Blainslie East	Nether Blainslie	Rest of Borders	Housing	20	2.5	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the Call for Sites process, for consideration as housing. The site has limited public transport and the nearest services are located at Earlston and Lauder. The site benefits from a southerly aspect. The site is an extensive site to the east of the settlement that appears disconnected. The site also contributes to the setting of the settlement. Furthermore, the Roads Planning Officer is unable to support the allocation of this site. Therefore, taking the above into consideration the site will not be included within the MIR.

Oxton

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AOXTO009	South west of Oxton	Oxton	Rest of Borders	Housing	25	1.5	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was submitted for consideration as part of the Call for Sites process, for housing development. The site lies to the south west of Oxton. The settlement of Oxton has limited access to services. It is considered that development at this location would not integrate well with the rest of the settlement. The Roads Planning Officer is unable to support development at this location. Part of the site is affected by the HSE zoning. Therefore, taking the above into consideration, the site will not be included within the MIR.

Peebles

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
SBPEE001	Peebles Development Boundary Amendment	Peebles	Western	Development Boundary	N/A	5.5	Excluded

Conclusions

This proposal was submitted as part of the Call for Sites process. The proposal put forward is to extend the existing settlement boundary of Peebles to include the area directly to the west of the existing mixed use allocation (MPEEB006). It should be noted that the proposal is merely for the extension to the existing settlement boundary and does not include any use or indicative site capacity. Therefore, the consultation responses are based on the settlement boundary expansion and not on any proposed use on the site.

It is acknowledged that the northern part of this site currently forms part of the Rosetta Caravan Site, alongside the area to the east, within the settlement boundary. Furthermore, there is a pending planning application (13/00444/PPP), covering the housing allocation (APEEB044), mixed use allocation (MPEEB006) and this area in question. The indicative proposals show a mixed use development over the housing and mixed use allocations, with the relocation of the caravan park on the site proposed. However, it should be noted that this application remains pending subject to the conclusion of a Section 75 Legal Agreement.

The applicant's submission states that the indicative masterplan submitted as part of (13/00444/PPP) shows the improved holiday park is proposed to the west of (MPEEB006) allocation. They request that the location of the improved holiday park, is identified within the settlement boundary for leisure purposes.

The Local Development Plan does not allocate sites specifically for leisure uses. It is considered that the most appropriate way to deal with such a proposal adjacent to the settlement boundary is through the planning application process, assessing proposals against the relevant policies within the LDP. At this point in time the application including the improved holiday park remains pending and the majority of the site remains open fields. Therefore, it would not be considered appropriate to extend the settlement boundary of Peebles at this point in time. Therefore, the proposed settlement boundary extension will not be included within the MIR.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
APEEB038	Langside Farm	Peebles	Western	Housing	40	8.6	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the 'Call for Sites' process, for consideration as a housing site.

Further to the site assessment, there are a number of constraints regarding the development of this site. The site is located outwith the extent of the town. There is strong, mature landscaping to the south of the site and the site contributes to the setting of the town. The site is constrained within the D&LC Study. The Roads Planning Officer has stated they are unable to support the current extent of the site as it is.

As part of the MIR process, the Central Tweeddale Study was undertaken by LUC to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP and for the future, within the Central Tweeddale area. As part of this study a number of housing and mixed use sites (including longer term) have been put forward. These sites have also been subject to consultation and site assessment. It is considered that the Central Tweeddale Study identified more suitable sites in comparison to this one. Therefore, this site (APEEB038) will not be included within the MIR.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
APEEB045	Venlaw	Peebles	Western	Housing	26	7.2	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the Call for Sites process for housing development. The proposal was recently submitted and considered as part of the Housing SG, however was not taken forward. The site was also considered as part of the LDP Examination and the Reporter did not bring the site forward. The main concern related to landscape fit. The Reporter stated that 'I must pay particular regard to this as the site is located within a Special Landscape Area. I agree with the Council that the existing settlement is well-contained at this point by rising topography to the east. I found that to be a very attractive feature of this important vehicular entrance to the town. Development of the site is likely to lead to the appearance of urban sprawl ascending the higher land to the east. 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'.

Furthermore, there has been a recent planning application (17/00015/PPP) for housing development on this site. The application was refused by a Reporter at appeal. It should be noted that the reason for refusal relating to the principle of housing outwith the settlement boundary and never touched on any other potential constraints with the site.

It is considered that the site contributes greatly to the setting of the settlement. Development at this location would result in a negative impact on the wider settlement and not just to the immediate area. The topography of the site would affect the ease of access particularly for walking and cycling. The Category B listed building 'Castle Venlaw' is located to the south east of the site, and the Category C listed 'North Lodge' to the north. The entire site falls within the SBC Designed Landscape 'Venlaw'. The Cultivation Terraces are sited within the site boundary. There is potential for archaeology on the site. The site is also within the SLA and would negatively impact on it.

The site is also constrained by access into the site. The Roads Planning Service are unable to support the development of the site.

Taking all of the above into consideration, it is not considered that the site will be taken forward for consideration as part of the MIR.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
APEEB047	South west of Edderston Road	Peebles	Western	Housing	200	11.0	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the Call for Sites process, for consideration as housing. The site lies to the west of Peebles. This site (APEEB047) was considered as part of the Housing SG and an initial stage 1 RAG assessment was undertaken.

It is acknowledged that parts of this site/larger sites have been assessed for development in previous Local Plans and the site has not been taken forward. Although the sites/parts of the site have previously been assessed, since these previous assessments, as part of the MIR process a more extensive study of the Central Tweeddale area has been undertaken by LUC, in order to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Central Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP and for the future, within the Central Tweeddale area, in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders. 24 search areas were identified within the study and this site (APEEB047) was part of search area number 12 'Southpark and Edderston Park'. Ultimately, part of the area on the north side of the road was included within a site put forward for consideration as part of the study, however the area to the south of the road was not. The site put forward as part of the Central Tweeddale Study took into consideration the landscape constraints surrounding the area, including the NSA, SLA and Landscape Capacity Study and mitigation proposed.

The site assessment identifies a number of constraints regarding this site, including; potential archaeology, development at this location would become detached from Peebles, the site is constrained within the Landscape Capacity Study and the site is dependent upon a new River crossing. As discussed above, further to previous assessments of this site, the Central Tweeddale Study looked at the wider area and ultimately identified a number of housing and mixed use opportunities for the area, which have taken into consideration constraints.

Overall, there are constraints to developing this site, including the requirement for a new river crossing over the River Tweed, which would require further investigation. However, ultimately it is considered that better sites have been identified through the LUC Study, this includes a longer term mixed use site (SPEEB008), which includes part of this site and a larger area to the north, wrapping around Edderston Ridge and Southpark Industrial Estate. Therefore, this site will not be taken forward for inclusion within the MIR.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
APEEB049	South west of Whitehaugh	Peebles	Western	Housing	106	4.1	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the Call for Sites process. This site was recently considered as part of the Housing SG and was not taken forward. The site takes in almost all of the longer term housing site (SPEEB003) identified within the LDP, with exception of the plot of land where a new house has already been constructed.

Whilst the site is an acceptable site for development, SEPA have stated that a flood risk assessment would be required. The site would have a potential minor impact on biodiversity; the site is located on the edge of the settlement and has good access to services and facilities; consideration should be given to the design of the overall site to take account of the Special Landscape Area, the adjacent SBC Garden and Designated Landscape and the setting of the the adjacent Scheduled Monument. Additional landscape enhancement would also be required along with buffers to existing and proposed landscaping. Mitigation measures are required to prevent any impact on the River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Further assessment on nature conservation interest will also be required and mitigation put in place. Development should not take place in the required buffer area of the Scheduled Monument but rather that area should be left as open space. Enhancement of the footpath would also be required.

Roads Planning also state that development in this location is reliant on a new crossing over the Tweed, vehicular linkage between the end of Glen Road and the roundabout at the southern end of Whitehaugh Park as well as the upgrading of Glen Road adjacent to Forest View.

As part of the MIR process, LUC have undertaken a study in order to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP and for the future, within the Tweeddale area, in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders. A number of housing and mixed use sites, including additional longer term sites have been identified. It is considered that there are constraints to the development of this site, which require further investigation, for example the river crossing. Therefore, it is considered that more suitable sites have been identified as part of the Tweeddale Study which could be included within the MIR as options for the LDP2. This site will remain as an identified longer term option for housing in the future, and allow time for further investigations regarding a river crossing.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
APEEB052	South west of Peebles	Peebles	Western	Housing	100	43.0	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was submitted for consideration as part of the Call for Sites process, for housing development.

It is acknowledged that parts of this site have been assessed for development in previous Local Plans and the site has not been taken forward. Although the site/parts of the site have previously been assessed, since these previous assessments, as part of the MIR process a more extensive study of the Central Tweeddale area has been undertaken by LUC, in order to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Central Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP and for the future, within the Central Tweeddale area, in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders. 24 search areas were identified within the study and this site (APEEB052) was part of search area number 12 'Southpark and Edderston Park'. Ultimately, a small part of this site was identified as part of an option within the study for mixed use development. The site put forward as part of the Central Tweeddale Study took into consideration the landscape constraints surrounding the area, including the NSA, SLA and Landscape Capacity Study and mitigation proposed. Therefore, a re-assessment of this site has been undertaken, taking into consideration the information contained within the LUC Study.

The site assessment identifies a number of constraints regarding this site, including; potential archaeology, SLA, NSA, the site is constrained within the Landscape Capacity Study and the site is dependent upon a new River crossing. As discussed above, further to previous assessments of this site, the Tweeddale Study looked at the wider area and ultimately identified a number of housing and mixed use opportunities for the area, which have taken into consideration constraints.

Overall, there are constraints to developing this site, including the requirement for a new river crossing over the River Tweed, which would require further investigation. Ultimately it is considered that better sites have been identified through the LUC Study. This includes the mixed use site (SPEEB008), which forms part of this site, wrapping around Edderston Ridge and Southpark Industrial Estate, which takes into consideration the surrounding landscape constraints. However, there are still outstanding constraints regarding access with (SPEEB008), including the requirement for a new river crossing, therefore that option will be a longer term mixed use opportunity. This will allow time for further investigations regarding a new bridge. This site (APEEB052) will not be included within the MIR.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
APEEB053	Rosetta Road II	Peebles	Western	Housing	30	6.4	Excluded

Conclusions

This site is currently allocated for mixed use development within the LDP (MPEEB006), with an indicative site capacity for 30 units. The site was recommended for inclusion within the LDP by the Reporter. The indicative site capacity was added through the Housing Supplementary Guidance. The site was again submitted as part of the Call for Sites process, however for consideration solely as a housing allocation. The landowner requests that the site allocation is altered to reflect the planning application (13/00444/PPP) indicative masterplan.

This site was recently included within the LDP by the Reporter for a mixed use development, which included no indicative site capacity at that time. The Reporter also included within the LDP the adjacent housing allocation (APEEB044) with an indicative site capacity of 100 units. As part of the Housing SG, an indicative site capacity was added to the existing mixed use allocation (MPEEB006). This reflected the ability of this site to accommodate an element of housing in the future.

The landowner states that the reason for requesting that this site is allocated for housing, rather than mixed use development, is to reflect the masterplan included within planning application (13/00444/PPP). The indicative proposals show a mixed use development covering the housing and mixed use allocations, with the relocation of the caravan park on the site adjacent site to the west. However, it should be noted that this application remains pending subject to the conclusion of a Section 75 Legal Agreement. Therefore, there is nothing to say for definite that the masterplan included within the pending planning application will actually be developed.

Given the recent allocation for the mixed use by the Reporter, it is not considered appropriate to alter this allocation so soon. Furthermore, there is an indicative housing capacity within the mixed use allocation. It would be for the applicant to test an increased housing capacity through the planning application process. Furthermore, the planning application which the applicant refers to remains pending. Once the Section 75 Legal Agreement has been resolved, this issue could perhaps be re-visited further down the line. However taking into consideration the above, it is not considered that the housing proposal will be included within the MIR, rather retained as a mixed use allocation with an indicative site capacity of 30 units.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
APEEB054	East of Kittlegairy View	Peebles	Western	Housing	200	20.9	Excluded

Conclusions

The western part of the proposed site forms part of a larger site (SPEEB005), identified for potential longer term mixed use development within the LDP. However, the eastern part of the proposed site is not identified for longer term development. The site was put forward as part of the Call for Sites process, for consideration as housing development. Parts of the site have previously been considered for mixed use/housing development in previous Local Plans. Most recently as part of the Housing SG (MPEEB004 and MPEEB008) were considered for mixed use development, however not taken forward.

There are a number of constraints regarding the site. SEPA have raised flood risk issues and request that the site is removed from the LDP. The Ecology Officer advises that there are major biodiversity risks. There is potential archaeology constraints within the site. In respect of landscape, the site is located within the Tweed Valley SLA and is constrained within the Landscape Capacity Study.

The Roads Planning Officer has advised that development in this location is reliant on a new crossing over the River Tweed, but some development could be brought forward to meet a need for employment land.

It is acknowledged that the site within the LDP is identified for potential mixed use development which could incorporate a mixture of housing and employment uses. The site put forward is solely for housing development and omits a small parcel of land, which the applicant states could be for future employment use. Given the lack of employment land within the Central Tweeddale area it is considered more appropriate to retain this as a mixed use allocation, which would allow the provision of both housing and employment opportunities in the future.

Taking into consideration the above constraints, including the requirement for an additional river crossing, the site will not be included within the MIR. However, it will be retained in the LDP as a potential longer term mixed use site. This will allow time for further investigations to be undertaken regarding the flood risk concerns and new bridge crossing requirement.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
APEEB055	Standalane	Peebles	Western	Housing	50	2.6	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the Call for Sites process, for housing. The site lies to the north of Peebles, adjacent to the existing housing allocation (APEEB044) and mixed use allocation (MPEEB006).

Further to the site assessment and consultation, the Roads Planning Officer is unable to support the proposed development for housing. The main reasons for this being the topography of the site and proposed access route. The excessive gradient represents a significant problem in terms of achieving a suitable road layout. In addition Rosetta Road would have to be upgraded from the entrance to the Violet Bank development to the access. Links to the allocated housing and mixed use sites site at the caravan park (MPEEB006 and APEEB044) would also have to be incorporated into any layout, which would involve structures to cross Gill Burn. Any development at the north end of Peebles will be reliant upon improved vehicular linkage being provided over the Eddleston Water between Rosetta Road and the A703. This should ideally be provided between Kingsland Square and Dalatho Street, but there may be other acceptable opportunities further north.

Taking into consideration the above comments from the Roads Planning Officer and the infrastructure constraints, the site will not be included within the MIR.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
SPEEB007	Land East of Cademuir Hill	Peebles	Western	Long Term Housing	N/A	19.5	Excluded

Conclusions

The sites lie to the south of Peebles, adjacent to the settlement boundary and to the south of Kings Muir. The sites were identified as part of the 'Western Rural Growth Area: Development Options Study' which was undertaken by LUC, to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Central Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP and for the future, within the Central Tweeddale area, in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders. The sites currently being considered are proposed for longer term housing development.

It is acknowledged that parts of the site(s) have previously been assessed for development and not been taken forward. Although the sites/parts of the site(s) have previously been assessed, since these previous assessments a more extensive study of the Tweeddale area has been undertaken by LUC, in order to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Tweeddale. This site was one option put forward for consideration, in respect of a longer term housing site.

The Roads Planning Officer was not supportive of the development of the southern 2 sites, as Bonnington Road would be the shortest route into town and it is not of a standard suitable for serving this level of development. However they advised that the northern site has potential subject to a new bridge crossing over the River Tweed.

In conclusion, this site will not be taken forward with the inclusion of all 3 parcels of land. However, taking on board the comments from the Roads Planning Officer, a reduced site (SPEEB009) which only includes the northern site will also now be considered.

Stow

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
ASTOW029	West of Crunzie Burn	Stow	Rest of Borders	Housing	5	1.4	Excluded

Conclusions

This site was submitted for consideration as part of the Call for Sites process for housing. A larger site was previously assessed as part of the Housing SG, however not included.

Further to a site assessment and consultation, there are a number of constraints regarding the development of this site for housing. The site forms an important part of the setting of the settlement, and is constrained within the Development and Landscape Capacity Study. In addition, development at this location would result in extending higher into the hill than all other development. The Roads Planning section have raised concerns and are only able to support a minimum amount of development. Anything over 4 units will require the road to be brought up to an adoptable standard and it is not envisaged that this could be achieved. This is likely to include the provision of a possible new bridge over the Crunzie Burn and the access route via Earlston Road is narrow will a considerable level of on street parking and is not suitable to serve more houses. It should be noted that developments of less than 5 units will not be allocated within the LDP.

Taking the above into consideration, the site will not be included within the MIR.

West Linton

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AWEST019	North East of Robinsland Farm	West Linton	Rest of Borders	Housing	100	3.2	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the Call for Sites process for housing development.

Development of this site would have a moderate impact on the local ecology. West Linton has a range of services and facilities and access to a potential employment site. The majority of the site is flat, exposed and open in character. Potential for archaeology on the site. The site is constrained within the Development and Landscape Capacity Study undertaken for the settlement.

The Roads Planning Officer is unable to support the site, for the following reasons. The road infrastructure in West Linton, and in particular Main Street, is not capable of supporting further development in the village unless some relief can be afforded. As such, any further housing in West Linton should be immediately to the east of Broomlee Crescent and will rely on street connectivity between Deanfoot Road and Station Road. Such linkage would offer some relief for Main Street.

Taking into consideration the above constraints, the site will not be included within the MIR.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AWEST020	Deanfoot Road	West Linton	Rest of Borders	Housing	30	2.6	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the Call for Sites process, for consideration to housing development. The site has previously been considered for housing as part of the Local Plan Amendment (AWEST008) and the Local Development Plan (AWEST015) and not taken forward. The site is located to the north east of West Linton adjacent to the settlement boundary.

Further to a site assessment and consultation, there are a number of constraints on the site. Development would have a moderate impact upon ecology, therefore mitigation would be required. There is potential for archaeology on the site and mitigation would be required. The Development and Landscape Capacity Study considered this area to be marginal for development. The site is within a visible location from the main Edinburgh Road. However, the site can integrate well, if planting was established to create a well defined setting and visual containment. The Roads Planning Officer is unable to support housing at this site for the following reason. The road infrastructure in West Linton, and in particular Main Street, is not capable of supporting further development in the village unless some relief can be afforded. As such, any further housing in West Linton should be immediately to the east of Broomlee Crescent and will rely on street connectivity between Deanfoot Road and Station Road. Such linkage would offer some relief for Main Street.

Given the above constraints from the Roads Planning Officer it is not considered that housing can be supported on this site. Therefore, the site will not be included within the MIR. However, the Roads Planning Officer can support an employment use on this site. Consequently the site has also be considered for a business & industrial use (BWEST003) and is subject to a separate site assessment.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AWEST021	North of West Linton	West Linton	Rest of Borders	Housing	180	12.3	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the Call for Sites process, for housing development. The site was recently assessed as part of the Housing SG (AWEST016 and AWEST018) and was not taken forward for inclusion.

Further to a site assessment and consultation, a number of constraints were identified with the site. The site is highly visible when approaching the settlement from the north. There is also potential for archaeology onsite. The site is identified as constrained within the Development and Landscape Capacity Study, and is located within the Special Landscape Area.

The Roads Planning Officer is unable to support the allocation of this site and provided the following comments. The road infrastructure in West Linton, and in particular Main Street, is not capable of supporting further development in the village unless some relief can be afforded. As such, any further housing in West Linton should be immediately to the east of Broomlee Crescent and will rely on street connectivity between Deanfoot Road and Station Road. Such linkage would offer some relief for Main Street. Furthermore, this site in particular is somewhat disconnected from the rest of the village. There are too many constraints with the private road known as The Loan so that sole means of vehicular access would likely be from a new roundabout on the A702 Trunk Road outside the village (subject to Transport Scotland approval). The A702 Trunk Road through the village operates to a degree as a bypass and the site sits on the opposite side of it from the village services. A development of this scale would be expected to integrate well with the existing street network and there is very little opportunity for this.

In conclusion, taking the above constraints into consideration, the site will not be included within the MIR for housing.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AWEST022	The Loan	West Linton	Rest of Borders	Housing	10	1.0	Excluded

Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the Call for Sites process for housing development.

The site would have a moderate impact on the ecology of the area, and West Linton has a range of services and facilities. The Roads Planning Officer is unable to support the allocation of this site for the following reasons - The vertical and horizontal constraints of the Loan. The Loan is currently a private road and any further development which utilises this access would require the road to be upgraded to an adoptable standard. Whilst the running surface could be improved the horizontal constraints and vertical alignment of this road is such that I do not believe the road could be upgraded to a suitable standard for adoption. The access onto the A702 would be a matter for Transport Scotland to comment.

Taking on board the above comments, the site will not be included within the MIR for housing. There are more suitable sites identified through the Central Tweeddale Study which will be put forward for consideration.

Southern HMA

Newcastleton

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
ANEWC004	North of Station House	Newcastleton	Rest of Borders	Housing	22	1.1	Excluded

Conclusions

The Roads Planning Team has objected to the allocation of the site on the grounds of the former railway line which extends along the eastern edge of the site and is safeguarded under Policy IS4 of the Local Development Plan 2016. The site lies adjacent to the Conservation Area of Newcastleton which is characterised by a grid building pattern. The site is detached from the settlement by the former railway line and it is difficult to envisage how it could be developed in keeping with the character of the Conservation Area. For these reasons, it is not considered that this site can be accepted. Any development of the site would require to be the subject of a Flood Risk and Drainage Assessment.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
ANEWC012	Land north of Copshaw Place	Newcastleton	Rest of Borders	Housing	19	1.0	Excluded

Conclusions

The site is located within the 1 in 200 year floodplain of the Liddel Water, this is one of the most at-risk sites in Newcastleton. New development within this area is therefore viewed as unacceptable.

Report 3: Extract of Site Assessment Database - Redevelopment sites

Berwickshire HMA

Eyemouth

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
REYEM007	Former Town Hall	Eyemouth	Eastern	Redevelopment	N/A	0.1	Redevelopment

Conclusions

This site was identified through the duration of the MIR process, via consultation working groups. The site is a vacant former Town Hall, located within Eyemouth.

The site will be included within the MIR for consultation as a potential re-development site.

Central HMA

Hawick

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
RHAWI017	Former Peter Scott Building	Hawick	Central	Redevelopment	N/A	0.1	Redevelopment

Conclusions

The site was identified through the duration of the MIR process, via consultation working groups. No consultation/SEA has yet been undertaken for this site. The site is a vacant former mill building, located within the Hawick town centre.

The site will be included within the MIR for consultation as a potential re-development site.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
RHAWI018	Bucleuch Mill	Hawick	Central	Redevelopment	N/A	0.1	Redevelopment

Conclusions

The site was identified through the duration of the MIR process, via consultation working groups. No consultation/SEA has yet been undertaken for this site. The site is a vacant former mill building, located close to the town centre of Hawick.

The site will be included within the MIR for consultation as a potential re-development site.

Jedburgh

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
RJEDB003	Howdenburn Primary School	Jedburgh	Central	Redevelopment	N/A	2.2	Redevelopment

Conclusions

In line with a brownfield-first strategy, the site should be given as much policy support as possible. There are no constraints on this site. As such, the site should be allocated as a redevelopment opportunity. Policy support for this should be provided through a Preferred MIR allocation.

The site is quite exposed but is partly developed and is surrounded by residential development, so there is a clear precedent for development here. Development would lead to a loss of amenity in terms of a reduction in the amount of greenspace that is currently on site. New development would have to be at a suitable scale in order to integrate with the surrounding housing areas and would need to retain a suitable portion of the greenspace.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
RJEDB004	Parkside Primary School	Jedburgh	Central	Redevelopment	N/A	2.2	Redevelopment

Conclusions

The site is relatively well contained, nestled behind established deciduous trees and a small hilltop. The site could accommodate development but should recognise the surrounding uses. This is a brownfield site and an allocation for redevelopment would further encourage its redevelopment.

There have been suggested uses at this point. Redevelopment for car parking for the intergeneration campus and residential use both supported by the Roads Planning Team. Either use could be accommodated and there are no significant constraints.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
RJEDB005	Former Tennis Court/Ski Slope	Jedburgh	Central	Redevelopment	N/A	1.3	Redevelopment

Conclusions

Redevelopment for housing is classed as doubtful overall. Its location, adjacent the Jed Water, leaves around half the site affected by 1:200 flood risk and a smaller part of the site is constrained by slope gradient. This only leaves a relatively small proportion of the site as developable for many uses.

The land could revert to white land, and be considered for appropriate infill development, rather than forming a specific redevelopment allocation for housing. If redevelopment is allocated then the plan should highlight the limitations imposed by the flood risk on site.

It should be noted that the alternative to an allocation for redevelopment would be to imply that the site is to be left to fall into disuse and disrepair. Accordingly a redevelopment opportunity with important caveats on the site constraints would be appropriate.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
RJEDB006	Jedburgh Grammar School	Jedburgh	Central	Redevelopment	N/A	0.8	Redevelopment

Conclusions

The site should be allocated as a specific redevelopment opportunity that incorporates the retention and reuse of the C listed school building and school house, the loss of which would have a detrimental impact on Jedburgh. Wider development in the site would need to fit with the Conservation Area status which covers the site. The site is very well located in terms of accessibility, sustainability and local impact and integration. There are no planning or infrastructure issues which preclude development. There is a potential issue with development viability which arises from the need to retain the listed buildings within a location where the market has been subdued in recent years.

**Report 4: Extract of Site Assessment Database -
Sites to be Removed from LDP**

Berwickshire HMA

Eyemouth

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Existing Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
BEY1	Barefoots	Eyemouth	Eastern	Housing	20	1.3	Remove LDP Site

Conclusions

The site is currently allocated for housing within the Local Development Plan (BEY1), with an indicative site capacity of 20 units. The site was allocated within the 1994 Berwickshire Local Plan. The site was granted planning consent for 20 units (06/00611/OUT) and a renewal application was submitted in 2010 (10/00516/PPP). However, the renewal application was subsequently withdrawn. Further to this, planning application (14/01282/FUL) was submitted for the change of use of land to form an extension to the existing holiday park. The application was refused planning consent for the following reason: 'The proposal would be contrary to Policy H3 of the Consolidated Local Plan in that the proposed change of use of land would result in the loss of allocated housing land which is required to meet the housing land requirement for the Berwickshire Housing Market Area' and 'The proposal would be contrary to Policy Inf3 of the Consolidated Local Plan in that the proposed development would give rise to road safety concerns with additional traffic to the park requiring to access residential streets rather than utilising the existing park entrance and access route'. The application was subject to a Local Review Body appeal and was refused planning consent. A further planning application (16/01058/FUL) was submitted for a change of use of land to form an extension to the existing holiday park. The Local Authority declined to determine the application.

All the existing allocations within the LDP were subject to review, as part of the MIR process and a letter was sent to the landowner of the site. The landowner wrote back to the Council advising they have no objections to the site being removed from the LDP as a housing allocation. They support the removal of the allocated site as they consider that it could be more realistically developed in conjunction with their holiday park. The owner indicated they have tried for several years to develop the site for housing, actively marketed the site for 8 years, including a fresh market exercise when the original consent was renewed, and no interest has been received from the developers to take the site forward.

Taking the above into consideration, it is the Council's intention to remove the housing allocation (BEY1) from this site.

Preston

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Existing Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
zRO16	Preston Farm	Preston	Eastern	Redevelopment	45	2.0	Remove LDP Site

Conclusions

The site is currently allocated for re-development within the Local Development Plan (zRO16), with an indicative site capacity for 45 units. All the existing allocations within the LDP were subject to review, as part of the MIR process and a letter was sent to the landowner of this site. The site was allocated for re-development within the Local Plan, however has not been subject to any planning applications for residential use since the allocation. It should be noted that there have been a number of planning applications consented in recent years for works associated with an operations working farm. These include; the erection of agricultural buildings in 2012 and the installation of ground mounted solar array in 2012. It is evident that the site remains an operating working farm and is not redundant.

The landowner, Mr Forrest, has subsequently responded and confirmed in writing, that he owns the re-development site (zRO16). He believes that the site should be retained for re-development within LDP2. The majority of the re-development site is the current base for Mr Forrest's farming operations, however there are elements of the site which could be developed/re-developed and the land owner advised he is now considering these options. It is possible that the farming operations could cease operating on the re-development allocation and re-allocate elsewhere. However, currently they will remain within the existing allocation. The land owner has submitted 2 alternative sites within Preston for consideration, to compensate the loss of the current re-development site. However, these will be assessed on their own merits as part of the site assessment process.

In conclusion, given that there is strong evidence to show that this site is still a working farm and is not redundant, a re-development allocation is not considered to be appropriate. It is evident that the site is not effective and given the working operations of the farm there are no immediate plans for the re-development of this site. Furthermore, at the time of writing this conclusion, an application has been submitted for additional agricultural buildings within the site. Therefore, taking the above into consideration, it is proposed that the allocation (zRO16) is removed and not included within the LDP2. It is acknowledged that the agent indicates there may be a change of circumstances in the future surrounding the operation of the farm, however this is no different to any working farm. The site would remain included within the settlement boundary for Preston, as 'white land'. As a result, any smaller proposals within the site could be tested through the development management process subject to a planning application.

Central HMA

Chesters

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Existing Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
RC2B	Roundabout Farm	Chesters	Rest of Borders	Housing	5	0.1	Remove LDP Site

Conclusions

The site is currently allocated for housing within the LDP, with an indicative capacity of 5 units. All the existing allocations were subject to review, as part of the MIR process. The site was allocated for housing within the Roxburgh Village Plan (1996) up to the Local Development Plan 2016. Over this period, the size of the site has reduced due to piecemeal development. Given the length of time the site has been allocated, a letter was sent to the landowner requesting whether there is a realistic likelihood of the site being developed.

The landowner responded by telephone, advising that she was happy for the site to be removed. The landowner said that there is also a prominent tree within the site and it is doubtful whether the site could accommodate 5 new units. The site is also occupied by existing properties. It was agreed that the site would be removed and not included within the new Local Development Plan 2.

Earlston

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Existing Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
EEA12B	Earlston Glebe	Earlston	Central	Housing	25	2.5	Remove LDP Site

Conclusions

This site is to be removed as an allocation and instead incorporated within the Earlston settlement boundary. The landowner (Church of Scotland) has responded to SBC mailout and has stated that they aim to develop the site but no developer for the site or specific plan for its development has been identified.

The site has been allocated since 1995, soon after this two houses were developed. Since then, development has not taken place and the site's effectiveness was questioned as long ago as 2007 by SG reporters as part of previous Local Plan process.

The site will become 'white land'. This means it could be developed for housing in future as infill development, and it may contribute a windfall development.

It should be noted that a significant part of the site is affected by flood risk and will not be developable for housing, however this had already been accounted for and has been reflected in its lower than usual site capacity in the LDP 2016.

**Report 5: Extract of Site Assessment Database -
Sites to be Retained within LDP**

Berwickshire HMA

Ayton

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Existing Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AAYTO004	Land north of High Street	Ayton	Eastern	Housing	6	0.7	Retain LDP Site

Conclusions

The site is already allocated for the proposed use and indicative site capacity within the Adopted Supplementary Guidance on Housing (November 2017). It is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2.

Coldstream

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Existing Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
BCS3A	Guards Road	Coldstream	Rest of Borders	Housing	7	0.3	Retain LDP Site

Conclusions

The site is currently allocated for housing within the LDP, with an indicative site capacity for 7 units. All the existing allocations were subject to review, as part of the MIR process. The site was allocated as part of the 1994 Berwickshire Local Plan and there has been no planning history on the site to date. The site is currently used as an area of open space. Given the length of time the site has been allocated, a letter was sent to the land owner requesting whether there is a realistic likelihood of the site being developed.

The landowner and developer responded to the letter, advising that they are currently marketing the site and have had discussions with Eildon Housing Association, who are a RSL, however no deal was possible to date. Therefore, they requested that the site remains allocated within LDP2.

The developer, J S Crawford Properties are a well known local developer, who have developed a vast number of housing sites within the Scottish Borders. Given the weak market and slow development rates at the current time, it is acknowledged that this site is owned by a developer and is being actively marketed. There are no constraints to the site being delivered, therefore, it is considered that the site should remain allocated for housing within the LDP2. Furthermore, the units are programmed as being effective within the most recent HLA (2017).

Therefore, taking the above into consideration, it is considered that the allocation (BCS3A) will be retained.

Greenlaw

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Existing Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AGREE006	Marchmont Road II	Greenlaw	Rest of Borders	Housing	60	0.1	Retain LDP Site

Conclusions

The site is currently allocated within the Local Development Plan (AGREE006) for housing, with an indicative site capacity for 60 units. All the existing allocations were subject to review, as part of the MIR process. The eastern part of the site was allocated as part of the 2009 Local Plan Amendment, while the western part of the site allocated in the 1994 Berwickshire Local Plan.

It is acknowledged that the eastern part of the allocation (AGREE006) is a recent housing allocation and not long after the allocation the economy experienced a downturn. This affected the number of completions recorded throughout the whole of the Borders and it is still recovering. It is therefore recommended that the existing housing allocation (AGREE006) is retained for inclusion within the LDP2, with an indicative site capacity for 60 units.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Existing Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
BG200	Marchmont Road	Greenlaw	Rest of Borders	Housing	25	0.1	Retain LDP Site

Conclusions

The site is currently allocated within the Local Development Plan (BG200) for housing, with an indicative site capacity for 25 units. All the existing allocations were subject to review, as part of the MIR process. The site was allocated as part of the 2008 Local Plan and there has been no planning history on the site to date. This site has only been allocated for 10 years.

During the review process the agent, acting on behalf of the landowner, wrote to advise that there remains a reasonable prospect of delivering residential development on the existing allocation (BG200) during the current Local Plan period, or failing that, during the next Local Plan period. They have drawn up draft layout plans, services are nearby and the affordable element has been traded to the housing site (AGREE004) in preparation for development. Therefore, they support the retention of the existing housing allocation (BG200).

It is acknowledged that (BG200) is a recent housing allocation and not long after the allocation the economy experienced a downturn. This affected the number of completions recorded throughout the whole of the Borders and it is still recovering. It is therefore recommended that the existing housing allocation (BG200) is retained for inclusion within the LDP2, with an indicative site capacity for 25 units.

Swinton

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Existing Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
BSW2B	Well Field	Swinton	Rest of Borders	Housing	25	0.1	Retain LDP Site

Conclusions

The site is currently allocated for housing within the Local Development Plan (BSW2B), with an indicative site capacity for 25 units. The site was allocated for housing within the 1994 Berwickshire Local Plan. There have been a number of planning applications submitted for housing on the site, however no approvals to date. Planning applications (04/00004/OUT) and (04/00541/OUT) were both submitted and withdrawn for the erection of 25 units on the site.

The site is located within Swinton itself, on the Main Street and the principle of housing development is acceptable, subject to satisfying the criteria contained within the settlement profile for the allocation in the LDP. There is an allocated mixed use site (MSWIN002) located to the south of this housing allocation. The mixed use development site relies on 2 access points, one from Coldstream Road and one through the housing allocation (BSW2B).

It is acknowledged that there has been no recent interest in the housing allocation, however there has been recent interest in the adjacent mixed use site to the south. Furthermore, there is no other current housing allocation within Swinton. However, it should be acknowledged that the housing market has been slow since the recession and even more so in rural Berwickshire, in comparison to other areas. The development of this site for housing would ensure connectivity for the mixed use site to the south from Main Street, through the housing allocation, linking into (MSWIN002).

It is therefore considered in this instance that the housing site (BSW2B) should be retained for housing in LDP2. Especially when it provides a linkage and future connectivity to any development to the south. It is envisaged that when the market starts to pick up, this would be a natural infill housing development, rather than breaking into currently un-developed fields on the edge of Swinton and expanding the existing settlement boundary.

Central HMA

Eildon

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Existing Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AEILD002	West Eildon	Eildon	Central	Housing	5	0.1	Retain LDP Site

Conclusions

The site is currently allocated for housing within the LDP, with an indicative site capacity of 5 units. All existing allocations were subject to review, as part of the MIR process. The site was allocated as part of the Scottish Borders Consolidated Local Plan 2011 and there has been no planning history on the site to date. The site is currently an enclosed grassed area. A Mini Planning Brief was produced for the site in 2011. Given previous indications that it may not be the landowner's intention to develop the site, a letter was sent out to the landowner requesting whether there is a realistic likelihood of the site being developed.

The joint landowners responded to the letter, confirming that several enquiries regarding a possible sale of the land had been received but that these are currently at a preliminary stage and the owners advised that a development could happen within the next two or three years.

Given this information, it is considered that the site should remain allocated for housing within the LDP2. Furthermore, the units are programmed as being effective within the most recent HLA (2017).

Galashiels

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Existing Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
EGL17B	Buckholm Corner	Galashiels	Central	Housing	60	0.1	Retain LDP Site

Conclusions

The site is currently allocated for housing within the LDP, with an indicative site capacity of 60 units. All existing allocations were subject to review, as part of the MIR process. The site was allocated for housing within the Ettrick and Lauderdale Local Plan 1995 up to the Local Development Plan 2016. Given the length of time the site has been allocated and the fact there is no history of planning applications on the site, a letter was sent to the landowner requesting whether there is a realistic likelihood of the site being developed.

A response was received from DM Hall on behalf of Thomson Cooper who are the administrators appointed to act on behalf of Murray & Burrell Ltd who are now in administration. DM Hall are currently marketing the site for housing and note that this is a good housing site located within a sustainable location and therefore strongly believe that they can deliver housing in the not too distant future and therefore seek the Council's support in continuing the allocation of the site for housing development in the next LDP.

It is acknowledged that there has been no recent interest in the housing allocation, however, the housing market has been particularly slow since the recession.

Given this information, it is considered that the site should remain allocated for housing within the LDP2.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Existing Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
EGL200	North Ryehaugh	Galashiels	Central	Housing	20	0.1	Retain LDP Site

Conclusions

The site is currently allocated for housing within the LDP, with an indicative site capacity of 20 units. All existing allocations were subject to review, as part of the MIR process. The site was allocated for housing within the Scottish Borders Local Plan 2008 up to the Local Development Plan 2016. Given the length of time the site has been allocated and the fact there is no history of planning applications on the site, a letter was sent to the landowner requesting whether there is a realistic likelihood of the site being developed.

A response was received from DM Hall on behalf of Thomson Cooper who are the administrators appointed to act on behalf of Murray & Burrell Ltd who are now in administration. DM Hall are currently marketing the site for housing and note that this is a good housing site located within a sustainable location and therefore strongly believe that they can deliver housing in the not too distant future and therefore seek the Council's support in continuing the allocation of the site for housing development in the next LDP.

It is acknowledged that there has been no recent interest in the housing allocation, however, the housing market has been particularly slow since the recession.

Given this information, it is considered that the site should remain allocated for housing within the LDP2.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Existing Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
EGL32B	Ryehaugh	Galashiels	Central	Housing	10	0.1	Retain LDP Site

Conclusions

The site is currently allocated for housing within the LDP, with an indicative capacity of 10 units. All existing allocations were subject to review, as part of the MIR process. The site has been allocated for housing since at least the Etrick and Lauderdale Local Plan 1996 and there has been no planning history on the site to date.

Torwoodlee and Buckholm Estates Company Ltd own the site and have indicated that the site is currently being marketed and it is anticipated that the recent return of railway will generate more interest in the site. This is a medium term anticipation.

It is acknowledged that there has been no recent interest in the housing allocation, however, the housing market has been particularly slow since the recession.

Given this information from the landowner, it is considered that the site should remain allocated for housing within the LDP2.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Existing Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
EGL41	Buckholm North	Galashiels	Central	Housing	180	0.1	Retain LDP Site

Conclusions

The site is currently allocated for housing within the LDP, with an indicative capacity of 180 units. All existing allocations were subject to review, as part of the MIR process. The site has been allocated for housing since the Scottish Borders Local Plan 2008 and there has been no planning history on the site to date. Given the length of time the site has been allocated, a letter was sent ut to the landowner requesting whether there is a realistic likelihood of the site being developed.

Torwoodlee and Buckholm Estates Company Ltd own the site and have indicated that the site is currently being marketed and it is anticipated that the recent return of railway will generate more interest in the site. This is a medium term anticipation.

It is acknowledged that there has been no recent interest in the housing allocation, however, the housing market has been particularly slow since the recession.

Given this information from the landowner, it is considered that the site should remain allocated for housing within the LDP2.

Gattonside

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Existing Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
EGT10B	Orchard	Gattonside	Central	Housing	5	0.1	Retain LDP Site

Conclusions

The site is currently allocated for housing within the LDP, with an indicative capacity of 5 units. All existing allocations were subject to review, as part of the MIR process. The site has been allocated for housing since at least the Etrick and Lauderdale Local Plan 1995. An outline planning application for residential development was submitted in 2003 (03/01969/OUT) for this site and the adjoining land to the north. This application was ultimately withdrawn. The site is currently an undeveloped field.

The landowner is an active local developer and has confirmed verbally they would wish for this allocation to be retained.

Given this information, it is considered that the site should remain allocated for housing within the LDP2. Furthermore, the units are programmed as being effective within the most recent HLA (2017).

Hawick

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Existing Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
RHA12B	Summerfield 1	Hawick	Central	Housing	40	0.1	Retain LDP Site

Conclusions

The site is currently allocated for housing within the LDP, with an indicative site capacity of 40 units. All existing allocations were subject to review, as part of the MIR process. The site has been allocated since at least the Roxburgh Local Plan 1995 and there has been no planning history on the site to date. A planning brief was produced for the site in 2007. Given the length of time the site has been allocated, a letter was sent out to the landowner requesting whether there is a realistic likelihood of the site being developed.

The Executor of the land in question has responded confirming that he would wish to retain the existing allocations for housing, with a view to future development. The Executor would not wish the Council to consider the removal of the sites from the LDP.

It is acknowledged that there has been no recent interest in the housing allocation, however, the housing market has been particularly slow since the recession, particularly in Hawick in comparison with other areas.

Given this information, it is considered that the site should remain allocated for housing within the LDP2.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Existing Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
RHA13B	Summerfield 2	Hawick	Central	Housing	60	0.1	Retain LDP Site

Conclusions

The site is currently allocated for housing within the LDP, with an indicative site capacity of 60 units. All existing allocations were subject to review, as part of the MIR process. The site has been allocated since at least the Roxburgh Local Plan 1995 and there has been no planning history on the site to date. A planning brief was produced for the site in 2007. Given the length of time the site has been allocated, a letter was sent out to the landowner requesting whether there is a realistic likelihood of the site being developed.

The Executor of the land in question has responded confirming that he would wish to retain the existing allocations for housing, with a view to future development. The Executor would not wish the Council to consider the removal of the sites from the LDP.

It is acknowledged that there has been no recent interest in the housing allocation, however, the housing market has been particularly slow since the recession, particularly in Hawick in comparison with other areas.

Given this information, it is considered that the site should remain allocated for housing within the LDP2.

Heiton

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Existing Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
RHE2B	Heiton Mains	Heiton	Central	Housing	15	0.9	Retain LDP Site

Conclusions

The site is already allocated for the proposed use within the current Local Development Plan and it is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Existing Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
RHE3B	Ladyrig	Heiton	Central	Housing	20	1.1	Retain LDP Site

Conclusions

The site is already allocated for the proposed use within the current Local Development Plan and it is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2.

Jedburgh

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Existing Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
RJ27D	Wildcat Cleuch	Jedburgh	Central	Housing	6	1.7	Retain LDP Site

Conclusions

The site is already allocated for the proposed use within the current Local Development Plan and it is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Existing Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
RJ2B	Lochend	Jedburgh	Central	Housing	43	3.1	Retain LDP Site

Conclusions

The site is already allocated for the proposed use within the current Local Development Plan and it is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Existing Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
RJ7B	Annefield	Jedburgh	Central	Housing	40	0.1	Retain LDP Site

Conclusions

The site is already allocated (part of ANEWT005) for the proposed use within the current Local Development Plan and it is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Existing Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
RJEDB007	The Anna II	Jedburgh	Central	Redevelopment	N/A	0.1	Retain LDP Site

Conclusions

This site forms part of RJEDB001. This site came through as part of the schools review in Jedburgh along with other potential redevelopment sites. However, given that the site is already allocated for redevelopment within the current Local Development Plan, it is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2.

Kelso

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Existing Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AKELS029	Nethershot (Phases 1 & 2)	Kelso	Central	Housing	240	10.3	Retain LDP Site

Conclusions

The site is already allocated for the proposed use within the adopted Local Development Plan (Phase 1) (AKELS021) and the Adopted Supplementary Guidance on Housing (Phase 2) (AKELS026). It is the intention of the Council to retain these allocations within the Local Development Plan 2. It should be noted that the site capacities included within the LDP are only indicative, any increased capacity would be tested through the development management process at that time.

The submission shows a proposed increase in the indicative capacity by four units. This is an indicative capacity only and would be pursued through the planning application stage.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Existing Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
RKE12B	Rosebank 2	Kelso	Central	Housing	20	1.4	Retain LDP Site

Conclusions

The site is already allocated for the proposed use within the current Local Development Plan and it is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2.

Lilliesleaf

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Existing Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
ELI6B	Muselie Drive	Lilliesleaf	Central	Housing	7	0.7	Retain LDP Site

Conclusions

The site is already allocated for the proposed use within the Local Development Plan 2016. It is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2. The proposal seeks to increase the indicative capacity of the site from 7 units to 20 units. This is not acceptable however, due to concerns raised by the Roads Planning Officer who has concerns that the size of the site would not allow for the required road infrastructure and parking. This would require to be tested through the process of a planning application.

Newstead

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Existing Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
ANEWS005	The Orchard	Newstead	Central	Housing	6	0.1	Retain LDP Site

Conclusions

The site is already allocated for the proposed use within the Adopted Supplementary Guidance on Housing (November 2017). It is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2. The indicative capacity of the site is 6 units, this is considered appropriate given the location of the site within the Newstead Conservation Area. An indicative site capacity of 18 for this site is considered to be exceptionally high. However, the capacity of the site would be established through the planning application process.

Newtown St Boswells

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Existing Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
ANEWT010	Newtown Expansion III	Newtown St Boswells	Central	Housing	400	0.1	Retain LDP Site

Conclusions

The site is already allocated (part of ANEWT005) for the proposed use within the current Local Development Plan and it is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2.

Selkirk

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Existing Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
ASELK033	Angles Field	Selkirk	Central	Housing	30	0.1	Retain LDP Site

Conclusions

The site is already allocated for the proposed use within the Adopted Supplementary Guidance on Housing (November 2017). It is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2. However, the Scottish Environment Protection Agency has raised objections to the allocation of Angles Field (ASELK033) on the grounds that this is undeveloped land and that flood risk from the Long Philip Burn cannot be fully prevented. This matter has been discussed with the Council's Flood and Coastal Management Team and the Senior Project Manager of the Selkirk Flood Protection Scheme. As part of the Selkirk Flood Protection Scheme, a final 'as built' model run will be undertaken of the scheme to determine actual risk. This will confirm the actual standard of protection. It is expected that this will be undertaken by the end of August 2018 and thereafter analysed. This information will then be conveyed to the Scottish Environment Protection Agency for their information and further comments. Angles Field remains an existing allocation within the Local Development Plan 2016 (as amended by the Housing Supplementary Guidance 2017) and it is noted that this allocation is subject to further scrutiny by SEPA and is therefore now subject to review.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Existing Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
ASELK042	Philiphaugh Steading II	Selkirk	Central	Housing	24	1.2	Retain LDP Site

Conclusions

The principle of residential development at this location has long since been established given the site is already allocated within the LDP 2016. The reduced size and capacity, which takes account of the recent Flood Protection Scheme, is regarded as acceptable.

However, SEPA object to the allocation of the site on flooding grounds on the grounds that the site is in a sparsely developed developed area and an increase in sensitivity from commercial to residential. SEPA do not consider that the site meets the requirements of SPP and they advise that their position is unlikely to change. SEPA require that the site is removed from the LDP. These matters have been discussed with the Council's Flood and Coastal Management Team and the Senior Project Manager of the Selkirk Flood Protection Scheme. As part of the Selkirk Flood Protection Scheme, a final 'as built' model run will be undertaken of the scheme to determine actual risk. This will confirm the actual standard of protection. It is expected that this will be undertaken by the end of August 2018 and thereafter analysed. This information will then be conveyed to SEPA for their information and further comments. This site is therefore suggested as an 'alternative' site at this point in time, due to the outstanding objection raised by SEPA. This is, however, subject to ongoing discussion and will be reported further in the Proposed Plan.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Existing Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
MSELK002	Heather Mill	Selkirk	Central	Mixed Use	75	0.1	Retain LDP Site

Conclusions

The site is already allocated for the proposed use within the Adopted Supplementary Guidance on Housing (November 2017). It is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2.

Sprouston

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Existing Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
RSP2B	Church Field	Sprouston	Central	Housing	15	1.5	Retain LDP Site

Conclusions

The site is already allocated for the proposed use within the current Local Development Plan and it is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2. It should be noted that the site capacity included within the LDP are only indicative, ultimately any proposal would be assessed throughout the development management process.

Yetholm

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Existing Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
RY1B	Deanfield Court	Yetholm	Rest of Borders	Housing	7	0.1	Retain LDP Site

Conclusions

This site is owned by Scottish Borders Council. Forward Planning spoke to Neil Hastie directly, who advised that they are doing works to the walls along this road at the moment and in discussions with developers, therefore likely prospect that this site will be developed. It is therefore considered that the site should remain an allocation within the LDP.

Northern HMA

Innerleithen

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Existing Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
AINNE004	Kirklands/Willowbank II	Innerleithen	Rest of Borders	Housing	150	0.1	Retain LDP Site

Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the Call for Sites process. However, the site is already allocated for the proposed use within the LDP. It is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Existing Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
TI200	Kirklands	Innerleithen	Western	Housing	55	0.1	Retain LDP Site

Conclusions

The site was submitted as part of the Call for Sites process. However, the site is already allocated for the proposed use within the LDP. It is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2.

Lauder

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Existing Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
RLAUD002	Burnmill	Lauder	Rest of Borders	Redevelopment	5	0.1	Retain LDP Site

Conclusions

Retain the allocation for re-development within the LDP2. Consider removal of the indicative site capacity at the Proposed Plan stage.

Peebles

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Existing Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
APEEB044	Rosetta Road	Peebles	Western	Housing	100	0.1	Retain LDP Site

Conclusions

The site is already allocated for the proposed use within the current Local Development Plan and it is the intention of the Council to retain this allocation within the Local Development Plan 2 for housing, with an indicative site capacity for 100 units.

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Existing Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
MPEEB006	Rosetta Road Mixed Use	Peebles	Western	Mixed Use	30	0.1	Retain LDP Site

Conclusions

The site is currently allocated within the LDP as a mixed use development, with an indicative site capacity for 30 units. The site was submitted as part of the Call for Sites process by the landowner. They wish the site to be retained for mixed use development, however for an increased site capacity of 100 units. They state that this would tie in with the masterplan, submitted as part of planning application (13/00444/PPP), which shows housing within this site. The landowner also states that as part of the planning application, the Council accepted an overall maximum site capacity of 130 houses. They state that given the change, the LDP designation (APEEB044) would find it difficult to deliver 100 units, as identified. Therefore, they request that (MPEEB006) is increased to 100 units from 30 units.

Both the housing allocation (APEEB044) and the mixed use allocation (MPEEB006) were recently included within the LDP by the Reporter, as part of the LDP Examination. The Reporter at that stage only included an indicative site capacity on the housing allocation (100 units). As part of the Housing SG, 30 indicative units were added to the mixed use allocation. It is also noted that the planning application (13/00044/PPP) remains pending, subject to a Section 75 Legal Agreement, therefore there is no extant planning consent for housing on either of the site. The combined indicative site capacity between the 2 allocations is 130 units.

As part of the LDP Examination, the Reporter stated that 'Allocation of this site would allow for the relocation and enhancement of the existing holiday accommodation and related facilities. I note in this regard that the proposed plan recognises tourism as one of the main employment sectors in the plan area'. Therefore, given the lack of progress with the planning application or any other proposals being put forward since the LDP Examination, it is not considered appropriate to alter the Reporters decision. Therefore, the site will be retained for mixed use development, with an indicative site capacity for 30 units.

Report 6: Extract of Site Assessment Database - Proposed Settlement Boundary

Central HMA

Oxnam

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR Status
SBOXN001	Oxnam Development Boundary	Oxnam	Central	Development Boundary	N/A	0.1	Not Applicable

Conclusions

The Council has been approached by Oxnam Community Council with a view to having a development boundary incorporated around the hamlet. This would effectively mean Oxnam would become a recognised settlement within the LDP. It is considered Oxnam is of a size which could justify inclusion within LDP2 and could ensure control of future development proposals within the current building group. A proposed boundary, suggested by the Community Council, is proposed within the MIR.
