

SCOTTISH BORDERS COUNCIL

PLANNING AND BUILDING STANDARDS COMMITTEE

4 FEBRUARY 2019

APPLICATION FOR PLANNING PERMISSION

ITEM:	REFERENCE NUMBER: 18/01417/FUL
OFFICER:	Mr C Miller
WARD:	Galashiels and District
PROPOSAL:	Residential development comprising of 69 dwelling units with associated works
SITE:	Coopersknowe Phase 4 and 5, Coopersknowe Crescent, Galashiels
APPLICANT:	Eildon Housing Association
AGENT:	Collective Architecture

SITE DESCRIPTION

The site is an undulating area of land sited alongside Coopersknowe Crescent, located at the easterly end of Galashiels. Coopersknowe Crescent is a residential development of 30 houses, comprising the first three phases of an incomplete development, of which this site has been intended to form part. The existing houses are served by a road network which has a junction with the C77 to the north, sweeps through Coopersknowe Crescent, incorporating a number of cul-de-sacs, and extends through the centre of the application site, before leading back to the C77 to the east. The road is incomplete in its construction as it passes through the application site. The site bounds the existing houses at Coopersknowe Crescent to the west and north, the gardens of a grouping of houses to the north-east, a commercial/industrial estate to the south-west and south, and the C77 public road to the east, the other side of which is an emerging housing development which will eventually comprise over 500 residential units. There is also a farm steading area across the C77 to the north-east which has previously received planning permission in principle.

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

This application seeks consent for 69 residential units, of which 15 would be flatted dwellings and 24 in the form of "Colony Houses" with flats on the ground floor and maisonettes on the floors above. All units would meet with the Council definition of "affordable". The layout comprises semi-detached and terraced units, three "Colony" blocks and three blocks of flats. They include single and 1 ½ storey houses, with the "Colony" and flatted blocks being 2½ storey. The dwellings would be served by a new access road linking Coopersknowe Crescent to the C77, via a small square towards the eastern end. A range of in-curtilage and communal parking spaces are proposed, and the layout includes a play area to the north of the "Colony Houses" and south of existing cottages fronting the C77, swale to the southern boundary for surface water drainage and proposals for boundary treatments and planting.

The application also involves the removal of existing drainage and roadways within the central part of the site and treatment with a 600mm capping layer to deal with the contaminated land area at this location. This part of the site will be largely filled together

with adjoining parts of the site to the west and south. There will also be areas of cut to the north, west and south.

The application is classed as a 'Major' development under the Hierarchy of Developments (Scotland) Regulations 2009. The applicants publicised and held a public event prior to the application being submitted, as well as consultation with Galashiels Community Council and the Coopersknowe (and Easter Langlee) Residents Association. The outcome of the public consultation exercise has been reported in a Pre-Application Consultation Report submitted with the application. The requirements of the Development Management Procedure (Scotland) Regulations 2013 have been satisfied.

In addition to the submitted plans and drawings, there are also statements and reports in support of the application, as follows:

- Design and Access Statement
- Stage 1 Geoenvironmental Investigation Report with associated correspondence
- Drainage Survey Report
- Appendices and Correspondence relating to Pre Application Consultation
- 3D presentation

PLANNING HISTORY

Planning consents for residential development of this area date back to 1990. The houses currently forming Coopersknowe Crescent were built under detailed planning permissions granted (mainly) between 2001 and 2004. Thirty houses have been built, though the overall development was never completed as the construction company went into liquidation. This application incorporates the six unbuilt plots originally forming part of the third phase of the development.

In January 2008, full planning consent (06/01838/FUL) was granted for the erection of 50 houses on the site.

In June 2014, full planning consent (12/00709/FUL) was granted for the erection of 42 houses on the site. This consent expired in June 2017.

In December 2016, full planning consent (16/00869/FUL) was granted for the erection of 58 affordable residential units on the site, the initial proposal for 60 being reduced by a Condition imposed by the Committee, as follows;

No permission is granted for the proposed houses on plots 59 and 60 identified on the approved site layout plan. Details of the landscaping of this land (plots 59 & 60) shall be submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development. Thereafter, the approved scheme shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and within an agreed timescale.

Reason: The Planning & Building Standards Committee considered that there needed to be visual break between the development at Coopersknowe Crescent and the proposed development and that the provision of a landscape area at this point would assist the transition between the two distinctly different phases of development.

This consent was granted to the current applicant but has not been proceeded with and remains valid until December this year. The new application is to seek an alternative development of the same site.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Scottish Borders Council Consultees

Roads Planning: Recognises the site's allocation and consent history and considers that the C77 has the capacity to accommodate this development, given the short section affected. It will also reduce traffic using Coopersknowe Crescent and is accessible to public transport, albeit improved pedestrian crossing points to the bus stop would be sought. Provides a series of comments generally accepting the layout and parking provision but requests further consideration of swept path analyses, driveway sizes, Scottish Water adoption, clarification of levels, visibility splays, drainage details, consistency between drawings etc. Suggests a meeting to resolve matters.

Education Officer: The development is within the catchment areas of Peebles High School and Kingsland Primary School, requiring contributions of £1051 and £7463 respectively, based upon management of capacity issues. Would allow the phasing of contributions but also states that contributions can change per year based upon the BCIS index.

Landscape Architect: A more detailed landscaping scheme is required which includes protection of the mature tree on the C77, replacement of high fences with hedges/shrubs, improved scheme for the open spaces, hedging along the C77, a new path to Block 8, restriction of fences to the rear gardens of blocks such as 63-66 etc.

Housing Strategy: Supports the 100% affordable scheme and it is included in the 2019 SHIP. Also supported by the Scottish Government who are willing to provide grant funding to assist the project.

Environmental Health: A Noise Impact Assessment is needed to demonstrate that noise impacts from the adjoining Industrial Estate do not already affect new residents. If the outcome suggests adverse impact, then mitigation measures need to be explored and detailed. A Construction Method Statement is also required by condition.

The site contains a former sheep wash area of potential contamination. Previous site investigations and risk assessment have suggested remedial measures but no finalised report has been received. Recommended that further site investigation and risk assessment is carried out and a suspensive condition imposed to control this.

Flood Protection: No objections. The site is not at risk from river flooding but surface water flooding may be a risk due to the steep topography. Further information should be sought including swale discharge and surface water flow calculations to ensure the greenfield run-off rate is maintained and a 1 in 30 flood event can be accommodated.

Neighbourhood Services: Generally no objections to the play area provision but not supportive of the retaining wall which should be avoided. No policy to adopt a play area in this location and would have preferred contribution for off-site provision. Recognises the connectivity difficulty with the nearest Council play facility in Langlee and the plans at that facility making spend of contribution unlikely in short term. If provision on site, details of provision would need to be agreed to BS:EN standards, proposed and designed by the applicant.

Statutory Consultees

Scottish Water: Response awaited.

SEPA: No objections. Impacts of a small watercourse through the site need to be checked with the Council Flood Protection Team. There is also a Scottish Water asset needs investigation with no development on top or adjacent to the culvert. Surface water flow needs to be managed through the site and finished floor levels set accordingly. Provides advice on the SUDS system which is reliant on a storm cell and small swales and also on licensing and CAR requirements.

Galashiels and District Community Council: Response awaited.

REPRESENTATION SUMMARY

Letters of objection have been received to the application from the occupants of 13 properties. These can be viewed in full on the Public Access website and the main grounds of objection include the following:

- Increased road safety risks from extra traffic including junction with C77, lack of roundabout, inadequate footpath provision, no safe bus stop crossing, disabled housing too far from bus stops etc.
- Parking overspill and driveway conflicts in areas of Plots 1-4 and Block 3.
- Inaccurate site levels and inadequate detail of treatment of levels.
- Concerns over site contamination and play area, site previously housing a sheep dip with asbestos and septic tanks present in the play area vicinity.
- Concerns over contamination generally and the impacts of raising soil levels as mitigation.
- Play area location unsuitable as are levels and retaining wall. Play area not well overlooked and unlikely to be used due to provision at Melrose Gait.
- Overdevelopment of the site increasing from 58 previously approved, contrary to Policy PMD2, over the LDP allocation of 50 and using up previous play area for development. Particular overdevelopment in area of Blocks 5-7 with lack of space and impacts on residents.
- Two houses previously been removed from site at request of Committee, site should be left as open space and also has drainage issues.
- Overdevelopment will increase noise, litter and traffic problems.
- No attempt to integrate with existing layouts and densities.
- Viability is not a valid reason to increase density.
- Overlooking of existing houses.
- The Colony and flatted blocks are too high impacting on the amenity of the area and have been moved higher up the site, affecting existing houses.
- Concerns over the site levels and whether the 600mm capping is incorporated.
- Unimaginative designs with inappropriate materials and colours.
- Inappropriate design and massing of blocks facing the C77.
- Inappropriate use of external staircases.
- Increased flooding from site onto surrounding land and footpath.
- Inadequate existing services.
- Lack of details regarding treatment of existing pond.
- Scheme inconsistent with the Deed of Conditions.
- Road name will need to be changed.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES:

Scottish Borders Local Development Plan 2016

PMD2 Quality Standards
PMD3 Land Use Allocations
IS2 Developer Contributions
IS3 Developer Contributions Related to the Borders Railway
IS4 Transport Development and Infrastructure
IS6 Road Adoption Standards
IS7 Parking Provision and Standards
IS8 Flooding
IS9 Waste Water Treatment Standards and Sustainable Urban Drainage
IS13 Contaminated Land
EP1 International Nature Conservation Sites and Protected Species
EP13 Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows
EP16 Air Quality
HD1 Affordable and Special Needs Housing
HD3 Protection of Residential Amenity

OTHER PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

SESplan Strategic Development Plan 2013
Scottish Planning Policy 2014
PAN 44 Fitting New Housing into the Landscape 2005
PAN 61 Planning and Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems 2001
PAN 65 Planning and Open Space 2008
PAN 67 Housing Quality 2003
Designing Streets 2010

SPG Affordable Housing 2015
SPG Developer Contributions 2016
SPG Trees and Development 2008
SPG Landscape and Development 2008
SPG Green Space 2009
SPG Placemaking and Design 2010
SPG Guidance on Householder Development 2006
SPG Waste Management 2015

KEY PLANNING ISSUES

The main determining issues with this application are compliance with Local Development Plan Policies and Supplementary Planning Guidance on development outwith settlement boundaries, impacts on landscape, residential amenity, road safety, archaeology and the water environment.

ASSESSMENT OF APPLICATION

Planning Policy

The site is allocated in the Local Development Plan 2016 for housing, with an indicative capacity of fifty units. The density of the site, and detailed LDP criteria are assessed further in this report but it is a material consideration that the site currently has Planning Permission for 58 affordable houses and flats on the basis of a similar layout and from the same applicant and agent. That consent remains extant and establishes not only

the principle of development but also much of the design approach, density and layout aspects.

The adjoining land uses were discussed in the previous scheme consideration, noting that there were residential developments of varying proximity and density to the north, west and east and industrial uses to the south. Consideration of the previous scheme included assessment of how the development would relate to these uses, layouts and densities and this development, whilst similar, does raise further issues in relation to the increased unit numbers and additional higher blocks within the site.

Whilst the relationship with houses will be discussed in the following sections, the issue with regard to the industrial uses to the south was considered with the previous development and there is little change with the proposed scheme except some slightly greater proximity in the blocks 13-16. Maintaining the tree belt within the estate that acts as a buffer between it and this development is desirable, as is planting alongside it to infill any gaps. Though the trees were not specifically safeguarded under earlier permissions, the previous and current applications include a higher number of residential units than previously approved.

In the previous application, the root protection area of those trees was identified together with gap planting to secure sufficient privacy and amenity for the new houses. This was considered sufficient protection, controlled by condition. Whilst the current development places some units slightly closer to the trees and protection zone, which are still highlighted on the plans, the units themselves have been reduced from two storey to 1½ storey which compensates in terms of shadowing and rear garden impact. There is no objection from the Landscape Architect to the relationship of the proposed houses to the existing trees. As stated on the previous application, it is in the applicant's own interests to safeguard the amenity of their tenants by securing a retained and augmented planted boundary with the industrial estate. A condition will be attached to control this and seek further details.

Although there is concern expressed by Environmental Health over noise impacts on the proposed houses from the industrial estate, it is not considered that a Noise Impact Assessment is justified given that such a report was not sought on the approved scheme and that the site is allocated for housing in the Local development Plan. The agent has responded on this matter by listing the adjoining current industrial uses which tend not to suggest a prospect of major conflict, albeit uses can change. They identify their intention to retain and augment the trees but also would carry out an Impact Assessment if required. For the reasons mentioned, it is considered that the tree retention and augmentation is sufficient in this instance.

Density and layout

The general layout of this scheme is similar to the previously approved scheme, utilising a curving link road between Coopersknowe Crescent and the C77, interrupted by a square, various communal parking areas and spur roads serving the "Colony Houses" and flatted blocks. The previous scheme represented an increase in unit numbers over the earlier consent but that was accepted as being largely as a result of the incorporation of the three flatted blocks of 2½ storey design in that scheme.

One of the main issues with the design and layout was to ensure that the development provided an acceptable transition between the large, low density housing in Coopersknowe Crescent and the more varied, denser development across the C77 at Easter Langlee. It was considered that the currently approved layout, with the exception of the plot next to 28 Coopersknowe Crescent, did that - with single storey

houses immediately adjoining the existing houses, leading to 1½ and two storey blocks and the higher 2 ½ storey blocks towards the lower southern part of the site and adjoining the C77. It was felt that there were also 2 ½ storey blocks at Easter Langlee which gave context for an element of 2 ½ storey blocks at the eastern end of the site.

Given the acceptance of these relationships and transitions in layout and general design, the issue with the current application is whether the increase in unit numbers from 58 to 69 together with adjustments to the ratio and position of the higher blocks, has detrimentally affected the transition and made the balance inappropriate, after assessment against relevant LDP policies including PMD2, PMD3 and HD3. These Policies generally seek compatibility and respect between new developments and their immediate surroundings.

Whilst there is criticism from the objectors that the new application does not achieve this, given that the current scheme for 58 houses and flats was approved with a very similar layout, it is appropriate to concentrate on those areas where the increased density may be more noticeable i.e. the two additional 2½ storey blocks which replace a mixture of 1, 1½ and 2 storey housing. However, in considering the impacts of this increase in massing on slightly higher parts of the site, there should also be consideration of the changes made to the scheme between Coopersknowe Crescent and the higher blocks, where additional single and 1 ½ storey blocks have replaced 1.5 and 2 storey blocks. This larger area of lower height housing has helped offset the impacts of the additional 2 ½ storey blocks and, given the general drop in levels and elevated position of the houses to the north and north-west together with their distance away, it is not considered that the increase in density through two additional higher blocks has created any impression of overdevelopment or lack of transition or sympathy to the extent that the scheme should now be opposed.

The submitted Design and Access Statement states how important it was to achieve a low height transition, illustrated by massing 3D plans and site sections. The latter show the drop in the ground and the relationship of roof heights between the higher blocks and the existing houses. Whilst levels are referred to later in this report, it is not considered that the additional two blocks of 2½ storey houses and flats represent any townscape or overdevelopment reason to oppose the new application. The sections generally demonstrate a fall in roofs as the ground falls from north to south and from west to east. The transitions and relationships with surrounding buildings and ground levels are generally still acceptable and it must also be noted that the currently approved scheme was still subject to final approval of site and floor levels which could have resulted in local variations in roof height relationships.

Nevertheless, to reflect the objections and also to recognise that the “Colony Houses” are intended to occupy higher raised land compared to the previous scheme, the agent was requested to review the heights of these particular blocks to see if some lowering was possible. It was also considered that the building roofs had a rather dominant impression and that the design would benefit from a ridge height reduction. The agent has now revised these units and achieved a 500mm ridge height reduction which narrows the difference between the height and massing of the previous scheme compared to the current one. The reduction also improves the roof proportions and reduces the massing of these blocks.

One of the new higher “Colony Houses” is intended to be located on the C77, north of two other 2 ½ storey flatted blocks which are in a similar position to the previously approved scheme. There has been criticism of this block, concentrating on the rural nature of the road and the modest proportions of the cottages adjoining to the north. The agent was asked to look at substituting this block with a block of 1/1½ storey height

to reflect the approved scheme. It was also suggested that a higher block could have been proposed elsewhere to the south of the site to compensate. The agent has responded by retaining the proposed block, considering that the 50m plus gap between buildings combined with the drop in levels and consistency with other blocks to the south facing the C77 are reasons to retain the design. The agent also points out that the ridgeline is dropped by 500mm and that the northern gable facing up the C77 has been reduced in bulk by removal of the corner dormer window. Whilst more significant amendment in this location was requested, it is accepted that there is an 8m floor level difference with the nearest affected property to the north and that this drop in levels is demonstrated on the site sections. With the 500mm drop in ridge height, the new ridgeline should still be at or below the eaves of the nearest house to the north. Ultimately, the relationship and transition in this location between the proposed development and the existing houses has to be considered acceptable, given the drop in levels, the distance and the context of both approved and existing 2½ storey blocks in the vicinity.

In terms of the remainder of the layout and general design approach, it is considered that as with the last approved layout, the current design complies with Placemaking and Design and Designing Streets guidance. The development continues to adopt the improvements and changes secured during processing of the last application, the design principles outlined in the Design and Access statement. The scheme generally continues to allow visual connectivity with the houses in Coopersknowe Crescent through the choice of lower height buildings, the townscape and ridge heights then flowing through to the higher blocks in the centre, east and south of the site, utilising the generally dropping levels.

As with the previous scheme, attention has been paid to focal points throughout the development, landscaped and architectural treatment of end gables, minimisation of parking courts where possible and narrowing certain entry and lane junction points to improve enclosure and sense of place. The mixture of houses and flats in distinct blocks, set within areas of communal landscaping, continue the theme that was accepted in the previous application.

Much of the local objections and concern relate to the increased unit numbers, rather than the actual design principles. The agent has clarified that the increased footprint from the previously intended 60 to 69 units is approximately 200 square metres. Given that the Committee removed two of the units from the previous approval, it is fair to assume that the actual increase in footprint is around 300 square metres. They also point out that each individual unit has actually reduced in comparative footprint, effectively from approximately 60 to 53 square metres. As previously mentioned, much of the unit increase has been as a result of additional storey heights to two of the "Colony Houses" blocks, rather than an intensification of layout and smaller spacing between units throughout the development. Whilst 69 units is 19 above the indicative capacity figure in the Local Development Plan, this has already been exceeded by 8 in the current approval and it is not considered that an additional 11 units, comprising of approximately an additional 300 square metres, causes issues of overdevelopment or compaction of layout to any extent considered unacceptable or unsympathetic. Indeed, when comparing ratio of density to recent schemes (affordable and private) elsewhere in diverse parts of the Borders, the density is not excessive e.g. 31.3 units per hectare compared to 38 in Chirnside or 34.5 in Lauder.

Objectors do not consider that the increased density of development should be justified on the basis of increased site costs as a result of contamination remediation, as claimed by the applicants in the Design and Access Statement. Members need to be aware of the reasons, however, leading to the resubmission and increased density,

albeit decisions on the application should properly be based upon the provisions of the Development Plan and compliance with its Policies and any other material considerations. Whilst viability and deliverability of any scheme could be considered to be a material consideration, the development must be primarily assessed and determined on compliance with the Development Plan. For the reasons mentioned above, it is not considered that the increased unit numbers or footprints result in conflict with the relevant policies in the Local Development Plan or the advice within Supplementary Planning Guidance.

One of the significant issues with the currently approved layout was the link of the development with the layout and houses in Coopersknowe Crescent. Though the building line was not considered critical (given the existing variation within the estate) any development alongside it needs to comfortably relate to it, to achieve a reasonable flow between new and existing, particularly since Coopersknowe Crescent was abruptly curtailed part-way through a cul-de-sac. The most recently approved scheme achieved it by using house types on the adjacent plots that broadly reflected the existing (albeit they were semi-detached) and planting to create visual breaks.

Whilst this development continues the connection with single storey houses and alignment matching the arrangements adjoining, the application again proposes development of the ground between 28 Coopersknowe Crescent and the footpath to the industrial estate. Previously, a semi-detached bungalow was proposed on this ground replacing an earlier intention to site the children's' play area in that location. Although the Case Officer felt that different approaches to use of the ground might have been considered, he ultimately did accept that a single storey semi-detached house on this plot would not cause significant visual harm, subject to appropriate colours, materials and planting.

The Committee felt differently about this plot and imposed a planning condition prohibiting any development on it and seeking it to be landscaped open space instead. They considered that there needed to be visual break between the development at Coopersknowe Crescent and the proposed development and that the provision of a landscape area at this point would assist the transition between the two distinctly different phases of development. Clearly, the current application is seeking to again develop this plot with the same type of single storey, semi-detached unit. The Design and Access Statement argues that it is in the best interests of the efficient use of land and that development would complete the streetscape and form a better transition.

The agent has looked again at this plot and whilst two houses are still proposed, the building line has been set back so that it no longer projects ahead of the house to the west. Although it is slightly closer to that house boundary, it relates better to the front and rear building lines, albeit there is less space now available for intervening planting which will take the form of a triangle in front of the building lines. A deeper planted boundary remains proposed alongside the footpath leading to the industrial estate. Overall, the relationship is improved and, although development of this plot was prohibited by a condition imposed by Committee, the applicant is entitled to seek reconsideration of this matter. Ultimately, the proposed development is little different to that supported by the Case Officer under the previous application and it is not considered that there is justification to take a different view in this instance. Members will need to consider whether to adhere to the prohibition or accept the development, in order to achieve acceptable transition between schemes.

In summary, it is considered that the new scheme continues to provide an acceptable layout and transition between different areas of housing development, the increased

density being able to be accommodated without the scheme presenting problems of overdevelopment or character which is out of context with adjoining development.

Design and materials

The approved development is significantly different from Coopersknowe Crescent, with a more simplistic, crisper design approach, albeit one largely based on traditional forms. Improvements were made during the previous application to window proportions, and deep gabled house types were removed. Better townscape flow was achieved by changes to the placing of buildings, though there was still a variety of storey heights and some narrow gables. Nevertheless, the scheme was felt to be large enough to absorb the variations, and would still provide a reasonable visual connection between Coopersknowe Crescent and the development to the east.

It was felt that the flatted blocks were largely devoid of visual interest with poorly proportioned dormers. Dormers were also an issue with the H5 house type, being generally square in overall form, rather than vertically proportioned. Conditions were imposed on the current consent to seek improvements in these matters.

The new application follows a very similar design approach with the single and 1 ½ storey houses and these designs remain acceptable. Windows remain vertically proportioned and timber panels merge with doors on the front elevations to add interest. The dormers on the 1 ½ storey units are considered acceptable subject to some minor repositioning and trimming. On the 2 ½ storey blocks, the dormers are generally better proportioned by being deeper and the wider dormers provided with Juliet balconies and three vertically proportioned windows.

The biggest design change has generally been with the “Colony Houses” on Blocks 5-7. These units have already been reduced in height by 500mm which improves the bulk and dominance of the roofs. Whilst there have been concerns expressed over the external staircases, these are generally presented to rear gardens and parking courts, providing some interest and punctuation to rear facades. The front elevations facing the C77 and the southern part of the development are similar in appearance to the other 2½ storey blocks with modest square dormers and ground floor timber panelling. The dormers have been amended and repositioned slightly to line up more successfully with windows below.

Given the prominent location of the gables of the “Colony Houses”, active and interesting gables remain important. The other 2 ½ storey blocks have varied gables due to being T or L shaped but the “Colony Houses”, being linear blocks, need interest on the gables to improve the public realm and focal points. The agent was asked to review the gables with reference to one of the gables perhaps being enhanced and mirrored on the opposite gable. Their changes are somewhat limited, however, although they are still prepared to mirror the better gable. This matter can be reserved by condition and probably only requires a setback dormer projection and enhanced timber panelling to be acceptable.

The Design and Access Statement refers to the rural farm steading influences in its selection of off-white dry dash render, timber panelling, dark grey windows and fibre cement slate. The use of off white colouring throughout has been criticised by objectors and this uniformity was also recognised as an issue in the currently approved scheme. As with that consent, the combination of materials is generally appropriate for the setting in principle. However, it is considered that a variety to render and timber cladding colours is necessary. A single colour would depart significantly from the variety that exists within the surrounding area. A condition is recommended to require

details of all finishes, including an appropriate colour/finish palette for all. The fibre cement slate will also be selected from samples submitted.

In summary and subject to conditions, the design of the units and the materials will allow connection and integration with the surrounding urban fabric whilst providing a sense of place and variety of townscape and design, in keeping with Local Development Plan Policies and Supplementary Planning Guidance.

Landscape

The Design and Access Statement bases the designed layout and landscaping on “Designing Streets”, reducing the dominance of traffic and on-street parking by providing in curtilage parking and parking courts, rather than parking to front elevations. The landscaped structure involves tree planting which will be maintained by the applicants and varied surface treatments throughout. This general landscaping approach was accepted under the current approved scheme as presenting greater public open space and communal landscaped areas than would perhaps have been expected in a development of wholly private housing, especially around the flatted blocks.

The Landscape Architect raised no objections to the current landscaping proposals but sought a more detailed landscaping scheme which includes protection of the mature tree on the C77, replacement of high fences with hedges/shrubs, an improved scheme for the open spaces, hedging along the C77, a new path to Block 8 and restriction of fences to the rear gardens of blocks such as 63-66.

The agent has now submitted revisions to the landscaping scheme in order to address the points made by the Landscape Architect and her response will be reported to Members at the meeting. There would need to be an assurance that the hedge and path works along the C77 are compliant with British Standards 5837:12 and a condition regarding protection will be attached in that respect. It would, as per the existing consent, still be advisable to ensure detailed landscaping and boundary treatments are reserved by condition as there are still likely to be further details needing to be adjusted and requirements for timing and maintenance that can only be controlled by condition.

Residential Amenity

Environmental Health recommend a construction method statement. Given the site is subject to previous consents, one of which is extant, there will be construction activity on this site in any case. The site is accessible from the C77 without requiring access via Coopersknowe Crescent. Nuisance arising from construction works is a matter that the EHS can control under separate legislation and construction works should be carried out in compliance with British Standards to minimise effects on the amenity of neighbouring property. An informative note is recommended. There are also standard recommendations contained within planning consent notices that guide applicants on minimisation of construction noise.

There should be no impacts on neighbouring properties by way of daylight, sunlight or outlook loss that would be unacceptable when assessed against Policy HD3. Much attention has been paid to the low-height designs of the proposed houses nearest the existing houses in Coopersknowe Crescent. Similarly, sufficient distance and dropping levels also determines that the relationship between Block 6 and the cottages to the north is acceptable in terms of the “Privacy and Sunlight” SPG. Privacy should also be safeguarded, albeit some side and rear garden screen fencing is required. The current

plan for boundary treatments awaits comment from the Landscape Architect but a general landscaping and screening condition is recommended in any case to require a final detailed scheme.

Access

Policies PMD2 and IS6 require safe access to and within developments, capable of being developed to the Council's adoptable standards and in accordance with the guidance in "Designing Streets".

Despite the increase in residential unit numbers, Roads Planning continue to have no concerns with the number of units or proximity of the access on the C77 to the access serving the housing development to the east. They consider that the C77 and the B6374 have the capacity to cope with the additional units. They also consider that the development will reduce the number of vehicles using Coopersknowe Crescent to the north. They are also satisfied with the on-site parking provision for the development and note that the development layout does not prejudice development of the allocated mixed use site to the south. They would, however, prefer to see improved pedestrian crossing points at the C77 for bus users.

The layout has been designed to suit a swept path for refuse and standard vehicles, although this still requires demonstration to satisfy Roads Planning. In this regard, there has been particular attention to the design of the central square. Visibility onto the C77 should be achievable, albeit a condition is imposed to ensure this is the case.

The layout is similar to that within the approved scheme. The layout plan includes an arrangement of shared surfacing (using coloured asphalt) within the main road, with standard surfacing/design linking to Coopersknowe Crescent and the C77 at either end. Block paving will be used for rear 'lanes', with grey permeable paving for parking areas. The arrangement effectively reduces the road specification down from the standard approach in Coopersknowe Crescent, to a more pedestrian friendly arrangement.

The layout continues to incorporate a pedestrian connection from Coopersknowe Crescent via a footpath to the centre of the site, which leads between Blocks 5 and 7. This is not such a circuitous route as a path following the road would be, and takes pedestrians away from the main road through the site. Other footpaths include one in the south-eastern corner to the C77, and retention of the footpath to the industrial estate. In terms of traffic speed, there is no need for speed humps. The layout has been designed to slow cars down, incorporating tighter corners and a square (like the previously approved scheme). Plot 5 (adjacent Coopersknowe Crescent) also has a build out. Ultimately, the street layout and pedestrian arrangements are designed to reduce the influence of the car.

Parking provision meets Roads Planning requirements, and comprises a range of in-curtilage and communal spaces. The layout incorporates parking courts within 'lanes' to the north and south of the square, to reduce the visual impact of the spaces on the main route through the scheme. Lanes and parking areas are overlooked, especially as building gables also contain windows. Flats have cycle storage incorporated within the layout, and a condition will require details to ensure these are visually agreeable, and incorporate one space per flat.

There were a series of other matters raised by Roads Planning in their response primarily related to driveway dimensions, levels, surface water drainage and other issues related to the drainage drawings. These have been raised with the agent and

any further comments from Roads Planning will be reported to Members at the Committee meeting.

Drainage

Local Development Plan Policies IS8 and IS9 are the most relevant in consideration of the impacts of development of this site on the water environment. Mains water and drainage is proposed. A planning condition will be required to ensure that connections to these services will be achieved. Scottish Water have made no representation on this application, though it is understood that foul drainage capacity exists. Ultimately, it will be up to the applicants to demonstrate that Scottish Water have granted consents to connect and service the proposed number of residential units.

There are significant local concerns about surface water drainage problems being potentially exacerbated by this development. Surface water drainage is proposed by underground storage, permeable paving (parking spaces) and a swale along the southern boundary. SEPA do not object to this arrangement although they direct the applicants to SUDS guidance for preventing run-off from the site and, ultimately, comment that it would be for Scottish Water and Roads Planning to agree such a drainage scheme.

Details of the swale, in any case, will be needed, to ensure that it will be an attractive feature that can incorporate acceptable planting. Confirmation on porous paving within the site will be needed. The full details of the drainage scheme are not wholly a matter for the planning consent, but assurance is needed that the layout can support a final detailed scheme based on the approach now proposed, and which maintains greenfield run-off levels. There are also Roads Planning queries to be accommodated as well as responses from the Council's Flood Prevention Team. A condition is, therefore, recommended to address these matters.

Floor levels are advised to be set above ground levels where required but SEPA's advice is based upon knowledge of the floor levels proposed and they have not objected. The views of SBC Flood Prevention are not opposed to the levels proposed but they do seek final verification of surface water flow paths which can influence ground levels. Future maintenance will also need confirmed by condition. Interference with existing field drainage is a matter for the applicants to address.

Contamination and levels

It is known that the site's previous agricultural use may have potentially led to some contamination. The previous and current applications have been supported by assessments which have sought to address any potential contamination of the site. These include consideration of potential contamination from the nearby landfill site, former mill pond and sheep wash. The latest report identifies contaminants, including asbestos, proposing a number of remedial measures including 600mm ground capping. The potential contamination and methods of treatment are of great concern to the objectors and local residents. The applicants are claiming that this constraint has contributed to the need for the increased density of development.

Environmental Health do not appear to have significant concerns as they feel that there has been extensive investigation into the ground conditions and potential contamination. Nevertheless, they comment that a finalised report is still required which involves further site investigation and risk assessment, including remediation measures. All of this would be required to be carried out and agreed prior to any development commencing and a standard suspensive condition would be imposed to

cover this matter. However, Environmental Health are not advising that providing a 600mm capping layer is an inappropriate form of treatment nor are they advising that there are issues with regard to properly treated contaminated ground and public health, whether for existing/proposed residents or for users of play space.

Much comment has been made about the finished levels on site but the agent has clarified that, as stated, they include the 600mm capping level within the potentially contaminated part of the site. A new simplified floor level plan has also been submitted to attempt to demonstrate that, despite the areas of fill, final ridge heights and floor levels are still reasonable throughout the site and especially at the site edges where they more closely relate to existing houses. The area of capping is generally limited to the area for the three "Colony Houses" blocks and, in reality, overall townscape impacts are reduced both by their general distance from existing houses, the general falling levels and the fact that a ridge height reduction of 500mm has already been achieved following design amendments.

The overall levels have not generally changed within the simplified new floor plan. Whilst they appear to be generally reasonable in relation to the ground and allow for the capping layer and areas of cut and fill, they still need to be finally verified and accepted by Roads Planning and Flood Protection Officers at the time of writing this report. As with the current consent on the site, it would, therefore, be advisable to reserve a final scheme of levels for approval by condition to ensure that all technical matters in relation to gradients and drainage are taken into account, together with assessment of the townscape relationship of floor and ridge levels.

Play Area

Previous consents have applied a requirement for play area provision here, and the last two consents for this site included an area to be developed for this purpose, firstly within the ground now occupied by Plots 68/69 and previously at the road bend between Plots 63/64. The original three phases have never been provided with the play area required under previous consents. Applying current policy Green Space guidance, and accounting for the history of this site as well as the lack of other facilities, and the potential risk of children crossing the C77 to access the facilities to be provided in the Easter Langlee housing development, suggests that a play area on site is justified.

The location now proposed is to the north-east of the location chosen in the previous consent. It occupies land that has greater level differences on it but is still considered to be close to the centre of the main road through the site with two access points to different parts of the development. The proposed site is appropriate as regards size and proximity to neighbouring properties (subject to detailed design), and will be overlooked, albeit the rise in levels will be challenging and will need alternative treatment rather than the initially intended retaining wall. A condition will be necessary to secure details, implementation (as part of a phasing scheme) and future maintenance. It is expected that the applicant will maintain the play area as per the previous condition requirement. If the Council is to adopt it, this would require a financial contribution to the Council, notwithstanding that the play area would serve affordable housing. The Neighbourhood Services Officer also confirms that if an off-site contribution was sought, there may be some delay in spending it in association with proposals for the current play facility at Langlee.

Other open space includes land around the flatted blocks, alongside parking areas and planting strips. Though additional planting will be required in some areas, the open space will otherwise provide meaningful complement to the built townscape, the

amount of open space in the public realm being greater than if the development had been housing and all enclosed private gardens. A detailed planting scheme and future maintenance will be required. The open space will be maintained by the applicants.

Other issues

Compliance with Building Standards will cover the principal energy efficiency requirements of the LDP. That said, the Design and Access Statement refers to minimising water usage, using responsibly sourced timber, low emission boilers and other such measures. Photovoltaics and heat recovery systems are also being considered. Implementation of such measures can be addressed via the Building Warrant. Any visual changes that result may require separate application, as noted above.

In terms of the layout, solar gain has been accounted for as far as is practicable, having accounted for other considerations. There may be some overshadowing by trees in the south-western part of the site adjoining the industrial estate but, compared to the approved scheme in this location, any slight increase in proximity to the trees would not create any demonstrably increased shading. Overall, however, accounting for various other constraints, including townscape and parking, the layout has reasonably accounted for solar gain.

The site layout includes bin storage, albeit the details of these are for the Building Standards. Details of the screening of flatted block bins should, however, be agreed by condition.

It is known there is a major gas pipeline nearby, though Scotland Gas Networks had previously advised that this will not be affected by the development. The pipeline is too distant to fall within Health and Safety Executive consultation requirements. Other pipes and infrastructure within the site that may be affected are a matter for the applicants to address.

The site is not designated and there are no nearby designations likely to be affected. There are no buildings to be removed, albeit there will be removal of some vegetation/trees (particularly as the site has become overgrown of late) and disturbance of the ground. However, bearing in mind the previous planning permission remains extant and has no requirement to mitigate any potential ecological impacts by condition, an 'informative' continues to be considered sufficient to advise the applicants of their obligations under protected species licensing.

A phasing condition will be necessary to ensure delivery of all supporting works e.g. paths, roads, open space, water and drainage.

Developer Contributions

Local Development Plan Policy IS2 requires all housing developments to contribute to infrastructure and service provision where such contributions are considered necessary and justified, advised by the Development Contributions SPG. This application is stated as being fully affordable housing and, as with the current consent, a condition would be imposed to ensure all units are occupied as such. Given this, there is no further requirement for development contributions for affordable units. The one exception to this would have been in relation to play space provision had there been a justification to seek contributions towards off-site facilities. Given an on-site facility is required for the reasons previously mentioned, there will be no requirement

for any commuted sum. The play facility will be provided and managed by the applicants, secured by condition.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion and subject to compliance with the proposed schedule of conditions, the development is considered acceptable when assessed against the Local Development Plan and having accounted for the extant planning consent for the site. The increase in numbers has generally been handled without significant detrimental impact on the relationship of the scheme with surrounding housing schemes, particularly when compared with the current approved plans for the site. Ultimately, the impact of the development, when viewed within the wider context and provided suitable mitigation can be achieved by way of planting, materials, colours, and boundary treatments, is considered to be acceptable and in compliance with Council Policies and Guidance.

RECOMMENDATION BY CHIEF PLANNING OFFICER:

I recommend the application is approved subject to the following conditions and informatives:

1. All approved residential units shall meet the definition of “affordable housing” as set out in the adopted Local Development Plan 2016 and Supplementary Planning Guidance “Affordable Housing” 2015 and shall only be occupied in accordance with arrangements (to include details of terms of occupation and period of availability) which shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority prior to development commencing.
Reason: The permission has been granted for affordable housing, and development of the site for unrestricted market housing would not comply with development plan policies and guidance with respect to contributions to infrastructure and services, including local schools and the reinstatement of the Waverley Railway.
2. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the plans and drawings approved under this consent, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Planning Authority, or requiring to be amended by this or other conditions in this schedule.
Reason: To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and drawings unless amendments are specified by or agreed by the Planning Authority
3. No development shall commence on the Colony Houses on Blocks 5-7 or the houses on Blocks 13-16, notwithstanding plans and drawings approved under this consent, until revised elevation drawings and supporting floor plans have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved plans and drawings.
Reason: To achieve design improvements to these aspects of the development
4. Unless otherwise agreed in writing and in advance by the Planning Authority, prior to any development commencing on site, a scheme will be submitted by the Developer (at their expense) to identify and assess potential contamination on site. No construction work shall commence until the scheme has been submitted to, and approved, by the Council, and is thereafter implemented in accordance with the scheme so approved.

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

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

and thereafter

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

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

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

5. No development shall commence until a phasing programme for the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. This shall include all buildings, roads, paths, parking areas, cycle storage, water, foul and surface water drainage services. Development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved phasing programme. All flatted blocks shall be provided with cycle storage (one per unit) in the locations identified on the approved site plan (GA01 Revision W) and in accordance with details of the visual appearance of the cycle storage units which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority prior to their installation.

Reason: To ensure the development is carried out in a manner which ensures that occupied residential units are provided with necessary infrastructure and services.

6. No development shall commence until a) written evidence on behalf of Scottish Water that the development will be serviced by mains foul drainage and water supply and b) until a final surface water drainage scheme, based on the approved site layout (GA01 Revision W) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. The surface water drainage scheme shall specify permeable paving/surfacing for all parking spaces, underground storage and swale; shall provide information on swale discharge points: shall demonstrate that this shall maintain greenfield run-off levels and accommodate a 1 in 30 flood event; shall demonstrate pre and post-construction flow paths: shall include full details of the swale (sufficient to establish its visual appearance); and, shall specify future maintenance of the scheme. The approved services shall be installed in accordance with the approved phasing scheme (Condition 5)

Reason: To ensure the development can be adequately serviced and minimise risk of off-site surface water run-off

7. No development shall commence until a scheme of details for the children's play area has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. Details shall include the layout, levels, boundary treatment, specification, implementation date(s) and future maintenance of the play area. The play area shall be installed and maintained in accordance with the approved scheme of details.

Reason: To ensure the development is provided with adequate children's play space.

8. No development shall commence, (notwithstanding the details provided in the approved drawings), until a revised and augmented scheme of landscaping and boundary planting (incorporating layout, location, species, schedule, implementation date(s) and future maintenance of all new planting and communal open space within the site) has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. The development shall only be carried out in accordance with implementation and maintenance of the approved scheme.

Reason: Further information is required to achieve an acceptable landscape scheme for the site.

9. No development shall commence, (notwithstanding the details provided in the approved drawings), until a revised and augmented scheme of boundary treatments (walls and fencing and bin store enclosures) has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. The scheme shall include the layout/route of all existing and proposed walls and fencing, and their detailed design, height and materials. All boundary treatments within the application site shall accord with the approved scheme.

Reason: Further information is required to achieve an acceptable boundary treatment scheme for the site.

10. No development shall commence until a scheme of external materials (including specifications and samples of materials and colours) for all buildings within the development, and of all roads, paths and parking areas, has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. The road surfacing layout shall accord with Plans 15.602-810 and 811 Revision B. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To ensure external materials are visually appropriate to the development and sympathetic to the surrounding area, and that the road layout accords with the approved layout, in the interests of road and pedestrian safety

11. No development shall commence until further details of proposed levels within the site have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. These details shall include existing and proposed ground, road and other hardstanding levels; proposed house and flat floor levels and any retaining wall height and specifications. The levels shall relate to a fixed, off-site datum. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details

Reason: To ensure levels and retaining walls within the site achieve a sympathetic visual appearance

12. No development to be commenced until a plan is submitted to, and approved in writing by the Planning Authority, demonstrating a driver visibility splay for the proposed junction onto the C77. Once approved, the splay shall be provided free of obstruction prior to occupancy of the first dwellinghouse/flatted dwelling within the development and maintained free from obstruction thereafter (with the exception of the tree to be retained).

Reason: In the interests of road and pedestrian safety.

13. The existing tree within the site adjacent the proposed C77 junction, and trees adjacent the boundary of the site with the industrial estate alongside Blocks 12-17 shall be safeguarded during the construction of the development in accordance with a Tree Protection Plan that shall first be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority prior to development commencing. The Tree Protection Plan shall apply BS5837:12. The development shall only be implemented in accordance with the approved plan. The existing tree adjacent the C77 shall be retained following completion of the development and shall not be lopped, felled or otherwise disturbed without the prior written approval of the Planning Authority

Reason: To safeguard a tree of value within the site and minimise risk to trees on land adjacent the site, in the interests of the visual amenity of the surrounding area and the amenity of future residents

14. A site notice or sign shall be displayed in a prominent place at or in the vicinity of the site until the completion of the development, which shall be readily visible to the public, and printed on durable material. The Notice shall take the following form:

- i. Development at (Note 1)
- ii. Notice is hereby given that planning permission has been granted, subject to conditions (Note 2) to (Note 3) on (Note 4) by Scottish Borders Council.
- iii. The development comprises (Note 5)
- iv. Further information regarding the planning permission, including the conditions, if any, on which it has been granted can be obtained, at all reasonable hours at Scottish Borders Council Headquarters, Newtown St. Boswells, Melrose. Telephone 0300 100 1800, or by visiting <http://eplanning.scotborders.gov.uk/publicaccess>, using the application reference (Note 6).

Reason: To ensure compliance with Section 27C of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997, as amended by the Planning etc. (Scotland) Act 2006.

15. No development to be commenced until revised Proposed Road Layout Drawings (15.602-810 and 811) are submitted to, and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. Once approved, the development then to proceed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that amendments made to the Site Plan and other plans are consistent with the more detailed road layout drawings.

Informatives

1. If future maintenance of the play area and communal open space planting/landscaping is to be adopted by the Council, this shall require a legal agreement to cover financial contributions for this arrangement.
2. Colours and finishes for external materials shall be expected to be sympathetic to the varied palette evident within adjacent and nearby housing areas, in particular Coopersknowe Crescent
3. Roads Construction Consent will be required. The applicant should discuss this separately with the Council's Roads Planning Service to establish the scope and requirements of Council adoption.
4. Field drains (understood to be potentially affected by Plot 68), pipelines and other infrastructure are matters the applicants must account directly for prior to commencing work on site. It is also understood from previous application correspondence for this site that that a tail drain for a septic tank (Rowallan) is believed to fall within the site. The applicants/developers should address these matters directly with the owners and utility companies
5. Where alterations to the buildings are required to incorporate zero/low carbon technologies, such works may require separate Planning Permission, unless these do not materially alter the approved development. Amenity implications for neighbouring properties and other residents within the development (in particular, air quality and noise) should, in any event, be accounted for when designing and locating such works.
6. Development should be carried out in a manner consistent with British Standard guidance on construction works, to maintain neighbouring amenity, in particular BS5228.
7. Any unauthorised disturbance to protective species habitats is an offence under European and UK habitat legislation. The applicants/developers should ensure precautions are taken before commencing work on site (including vegetation clearance) and the advice of an ecologist is recommended.
8. The Notes required of Condition 14 should be completed as follows:
 - Note 1: Insert address or describe the location of the development
 - Note 2: Delete "subject to conditions" if the planning permission is not subject to any conditions
 - Note 3: Insert the name and address of the developer

- Note 4: Insert the date on which planning permission was granted (normally the date of this Notice)
- Note 5: Insert the description of the development.
- Note 6: Insert the application reference number.

DRAWING NUMBERS

Location Plan (EX) 01
 Site Survey 01 B
 Existing Plan (EX) 02
 Site Plan GA (01) Rev W
 Footprint Comparison GA (04)
 Existing and Proposed Site Levels GA (05)
 Site Layout Drainage 15.602-700 Rev C
 Proposed Road layout 15.602-810 Rev B
 Proposed Road layout 15.602-811 Rev B
 Site Sections 1-4 15.602-851 Rev A
 Site Sections 5-8 15.602-852 Rev A
 Site Section 9 15.602-853 Rev A
 Site Section A-A SE (101)
 Site Section B-B SE (102)
 Site Section C-C SE (103)
 Site Section D-D SE (104)
 Site Section E-E SE (105)
 Cut and Fill Layouts 15.602-855 Rev A
 Elevations 1-4 EL (51)
 Elevations 5-8 EL (52)
 Elevations Block 8 EL (57) rev A
 Elevations 9-32 EL (53) rev B
 Elevations 9-32 EL (54) rev B
 Elevations 9-32 EL (55) rev B
 Elevations 33-38 EL (56) rev A
 Elevations 39-47 EL (58)
 Elevations 39-47 EL (59)
 Elevations Blocks 10 & 11 EL (61) rev A
 Elevations Block 11 EL (62)
 Elevations 60-67 EL (63) rev B
 Elevations 68-69 EL (64)
 Floor Plans Blocks 1 & 2 (GA 31)
 Floor Plans Blocks 3 & 4 (GA 32)
 Floor Plans Blocks 5 & 7 (GA 33)
 Floor Plans Blocks 5 & 7 (GA 34)
 Floor Plans Blocks 5 & 7 (GA 35)
 Floor Plans Block 8 (GA 36)
 Floor Plans Block 8 (GA 37)
 Floor Plans Block 9 (GA 38)
 Floor Plans Block 9 (GA 39)
 Floor Plans Block 9 (GA 40)
 Floor Plans Blocks 10-12 (GA 41)
 Floor Plans Block 11 (GA 42)
 Floor Plans Blocks 13-16 (GA 43)
 Floor Plans Block 17 (GA 45)
 Floor Plans Flat B3 (GA 200)
 Floor Plans Flat B4 (GA 201)

Floor Plans Flat C1 (GA 202)
 Floor Plans Flat C2 (GA 203)
 Floor Plans Flat C3 (GA 204)
 Floor Plans Flat C4 (GA 205)
 Floor Plans Flat W4-1 (GA 206)
 Floor Plans Flat W4-2 (GA 207)
 Floor Plans Flat F1 (GA 208)
 Floor Plans Flat F3 (GA 210)
 Floor Plans Flat F4 (GA 211)
 Floor Plans Flat F5 (GA 212)
 Floor Plans Flat F6 (GA 213)
 Floor Plans Flat F7 (GA 214)
 Floor Plans Flat F8 (GA 215)
 Floor Plans Flat F9 (GA 216)
 Floor Plans Flat H4 (GA 217)
 Floor Plans Flat H5 (GA 218)
 Floor Plans Flat F10 (GA 221)

Approved by

Name	Designation	Signature
Ian Aikman	Chief Planning Officer	

The original version of this report has been signed by the Chief Planning Officer and the signed copy has been retained by the Council.

Author(s)

Name	Designation
Craig Miller	Principal Planning Officer



18/01417/FUL

Coopersknowe Phase 4 And 5
Coopersknowe Crescent
Galashiels

