

**From:** Calvert, Euan  
**Sent:** 23 Sep 2020 10:53:34 +0100  
**To:** Planning & Regulatory Services  
**Subject:** FW: Application 20-00956-PPP Land NE of Balacladach

Please upload community council comments and acknowledge 20/00956/PPP.

Many thanks

*Euan Calvert*

Assistant Planning Officer (Development Management)

Regulatory Services,

Scottish Borders Council, Council Headquarters, Newtown St Boswells, MELROSE, TD6 0SA

Tel: 01835 826513 | [ecalvert@scotborders.gov.uk](mailto:ecalvert@scotborders.gov.uk)

**From:** malcolm.rmcgregor [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 22 September 2020 12:09  
**To:** Calvert, Euan <[ECalvert@scotborders.gov.uk](mailto:ECalvert@scotborders.gov.uk)>; Crailing Eckford Nisbet Community Updates  
[REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Application 20-00956-PPP Land NE of Balacladach

**CAUTION:** External Email

Good Morning Euan.

With reference to the above application, which has been circulated to CCmembers and residents in Ulston, we would comment as follows:

1. We believe that Mr and Mrs Pulford, (Fairfields, Easter Ulston), make some very considered points in their comments to the application. I am sure that because of other recent applications in

this area, during the last few years, you will be very familiar with this locality and the pressure on the narrow road network, as well as other utilities.

Their first three points are salient. The image provided appears to indicate that the proposed site is presently high quality agricultural farmland. When CEN CC considered the SBC Local Development Plan 2 (2018) and the Main Issues Report, we studied carefully the Housing Land Supply Sites section, with particular reference to 'Preferred and Alternative Options' on our patch, i.e. Cheviot. We noted the alternative options proposed for Crailing and Cheviot and responded accordingly in our consultation submission. In the MIR document, there was no reference to further housing development in Ulston. If there had been, we would have consulted with residents, as we did in Eckford and Crailing at the time.

Also, it is worth noting the comment at the start of this section in the MIR, with reference to the low housing requirement in the SESPlan: "It is anticipated that LDP2 is unlikely to require a significant number of new housing allocations".

2. Having examined the location plan on the SBC Idox, the size of the site, relative to neighbouring properties seems unusually large. The comments in Mr & Mrs Bell's (The Three Gables), objection seem to CEN CC understandable and valid, especially their concern of further development on this sizeable site.

3. Carol and Geoffrey Spalton, who also live in Ulston have written to the CC concerning this application. Whilst they think the application appears reasonable, they raise an important point, which relates to our LDP2 comment above: "how much piecemeal development should continue before more major effort is required to address the challenges posed by an increased number of residents, ...." i.e. the limits of the narrow access road from Jedburgh, poor telecommunications, limited roadside parking leading to damaged verges as the locality is popular with recreational walkers. Such concerns are echoed by Jane Crispin, (Arden House), especially the housing development changes which have occurred in this small hamlet during the past 20 years.

A further issue, they suggest, is that to permit the development, the application seeks to modify the Section 75 agreement made when Wester Ulston Farm was relocated. Mr and Mrs Spalton believe that any wider scale modification of this agreement, or the equivalent for Easter Ulston Farm governing land to the SE of the road, should also adequately address the important infrastructure issues.

4. Several residents have pointed out important inaccuracies in the planning design statement, ie Mr Sturrock, (Balacladach), including completely out of date photographic images, which CEN CC considers unacceptable. His comprehensive objection comment raises a range of important and valid points.

In summary, CEN CC has serious concerns regarding this further proposed housing development, in a locality which, in recent years, seems to have received an unusual amount of them, in comparison to other areas of our ward, when it was not designated for such in the Local Development Plan.

Best,

Malcolm McGregor

Chair,

CEN CC

Sent from Samsung tablet.

**CONSULTATION RESPONSE TO  
PLANNING OR RELATED APPLICATION**

<b>Comments provided by</b>	Roads Planning Service	<b>Contact e-mail/number:</b>		
<b>Officer Name and Post:</b>	Keith Patterson Roads Planning Officer	<a href="mailto:kpatterson@scotborders.gov.uk">kpatterson@scotborders.gov.uk</a> <b>01835 826637</b>		
<b>Date of reply</b>	23 <sup>rd</sup> October 2020	<b>Consultee reference:</b>		
<b>Planning Application Reference</b>	20/00956/PPP	<b>Case Officer:</b> Euan Calvert		
<b>Applicant</b>	Mr D J Irvine			
<b>Agent</b>	RM Architecture Ltd			
<b>Proposed Development</b>	Erection of dwellinghouse with integral garage			
<b>Site Location</b>	Land North East Of Balcladach Easter Ulston Jedburgh Scottish Borders			
<i>The following observations represent the comments of the consultee on the submitted application as they relate to the area of expertise of that consultee. A decision on the application can only be made after consideration of all relevant information, consultations and material considerations.</i>				
<b>Background and Site description</b>				
<b>Key Issues (Bullet points)</b>				
<b>Assessment</b>	There has been a considerable amount of development at Ulston over the last few years, with the new properties contributing to road improvements. Ulston is becoming a fairly sizeable community with no infrastructure other than a 30mph speed limit to support this (currently reduced to 20mph for a trial period). This results in all movements being by private car which increases the strain on the minor road. The larger the community also results in a larger number of pedestrians on the road, without appropriate infrastructure being in place. I am able to support this proposed dwelling on the basis of an additional passing place being provided on the minor road between the site and Jedburgh, however it is unlikely that I will be in a position to support further residential development served by this minor road.			
<b>Recommendation</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Object	<input type="checkbox"/> Do not object	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Do not object, subject to conditions</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Further information required
<b>Recommended Conditions</b>	<p>The access to the site to be formed to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority prior to occupation. Reason: To ensure the development is served by a properly formed access and to provide for adequate servicing.</p> <p>Prior to occupation of the dwelling a passing place to be formed to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority at an agreed location on the minor road between the site and Jedburgh. Reason: To mitigate the impact of the increase in traffic on the minor road network.</p> <p>Prior to occupation of the dwelling two parking spaces and turning to be provided within the curtilage of the site and retained thereafter in perpetuity.</p>			

	Reason: To ensure the development is served by adequate parking provision at all times.
<b>Recommended Informatives</b>	<p>The access to the site to be formed as a service layby as per standard drawing DC-3.</p> <p>The passing place to be formed generally as per standard drawing DC-1 or DC-1a.</p> <p>It should be borne in mind that only contractors first approved by the Council may work within the public road boundary.</p>

**AJS**