

## Draft SPG - Tweedbank Expansion

### Public Consultation Responses - Summary

| Contributor No. | Summary of Main Issues Raised  | Proposed Response to Main Issues Raised   | Recommendation      |
|-----------------|--|---|---------------------|
| 1 (Individual)  | Issues relating to increased traffic and need for improved public transport. Impacts on public services and carbon neutrality.   | Comments noted. It is considered that these matters are suitably considered and addressed within the Draft SPG. These are also matters which will be required to be addressed through the process of future planning applications for the site.   | No action required. |
| 2 (Individual)  | No demand for new properties in this location, should be focused in Galashiels.  | This site was allocated with an indicative capacity of 300 units through the process of the Council's Supplementary Guidance on Housing. This was approved by the Scottish Ministers. The allocation of this site for mixed use development has therefore been accepted and cannot now be questioned. The site is within a highly attractive landscape setting in a central location within a well-established housing market area. | No action required. |
| 3 (Individual)  | In favour of the plan, asks that affordable housing is provided, need for environmentally friendly properties, sufficient parking, should be considerate of surrounding stonework, provision of shops/play area/school (if necessary), suitable access roads, consideration of flood risk and appropriate landscaping. | Comments noted. It is considered that these matters are suitably considered and addressed within the Draft SPG. These are also matters which will be required to be addressed through the process of future planning applications for the site.   | No action required. |
| 4 (Individual)  | Train stop in Heriot?  | This is not a matter for consideration through the process of this Supplementary Planning Guidance for the expansion of Tweedbank.  | No action required. |

|                                   |   |   |  |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|
| 5 (Individual)                    | Railway should be extended to Hawick/Carlisle.  | The Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance for this site does not impinge upon any potential extension of the railway on to Hawick/Carlisle. The Scottish Borders Local Development Plan confirms the Council's long term aspirations to see the reopening of the Borders Railway southwards to Carlisle | No action required.  |
| 6 (Individual)                    | Development should be focused in Galashiels.  | This Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance provides guidance for a site which is already allocated within the Scottish Borders Local Development Plan 2016. Consequently the principle of development at this location cannot be challenged.  | No action required.  |
| 7 (Individual)                    | More dedicated parking required for railway.  | This is a matter for Network Rail to address. Network Rail have responded to this consultation and are aware of the issues around parking at the railway terminus.  | No action required.  |
| 8 (Individual)                    | Must factor in need for additional railway parking.   | This is a matter for Network Rail to address. Network Rail have responded to this consultation and are aware of the issues around parking at the railway terminus.  | No action required.  |
| 9 (Historic Environment Scotland) | Welcome the Draft SPG. Advise it would be worthwhile explicitly mentioning the historic environment within the strategic objection (page 26) and suggest that the Historic Environment Policy for Scotland (HEPS) is included within the policy context summary table (page 9). HEPS should be used for the whole historic environment, not just designated assets. | Comments noted and agreed.  | Amend the second bullet point of the key objectives set out on Page 25 to read <i>'Ensure new development strengthens and safeguards the core landscape, environmental (<u>including historic</u>) assets and ensures future generations continue to benefit from its richness'</i> . Furthermore, add the Historic Environment Policy |

|  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|---|
|  |  |  | <p>for Scotland (HEPS) to the policy context summary table on Page 9 noting the following: <i>‘HEPS is designed to support and enable good decision making about changes to the historic environment. Good decision-making takes into account all aspects of the historic environment and the different ways people value it. Good decision-making is transparent and open to challenge, and recognises that a wide range of factors can affect the historic environment in different ways. Changes might support its long-term survival, impact on its current management or even give us new information to improve our understanding of it. HEPS sets out a series of principles and policies for the recognition, care and sustainable management of the historic environment. It promotes a way of understanding the value of the historic environment</i></p> |
|--|--|--|---|

|                    |   |   |  |
|--------------------|---|---|--|
|                    |   |   | <i>which is inclusive and recognises different views. It encourages consistent, integrated management and decision-making to support positive outcomes for the people of Scotland. It also supports everyone's participation in decisions that affect the historic environment. By doing these things, HEPS helps to deliver the vision and aims of Our Place in Time. It takes into account principles that the UK and Scottish governments have agreed to in international charters and conventions on cultural heritage and landscape.'</i> |
| 10<br>(Individual) | Concerned that opportunities for sustainable transport are being missed. Suggests centralised underground vehicle parking. This would be attractive to home owners and would add security and character and allow for more garden ground (ecology). | It is considered that the need for sustainable transport is clear within the Draft SPG. Policy PMD1 – Sustainability of the Scottish Borders Local Development Plan 2016 encourages walking, cycling and public transport in preference to the private car. This is replicated within the Council's Placemaking and Design SPG which encourages the use of sustainable transport modes, and promote healthier, more active lifestyles through improved access to public transport and walking and cycling routes. The site is well placed for access to these modes. The Draft SPG notes that the site lies | No action required.  |

|                    |   |  |   |
|--------------------|---|--|---|
|                    |   | close to existing transport infrastructure with Tweedbank Railway Station located immediately adjacent to the southern boundaries of the site. The Borders Abbeys Way and a Core Path runs through the site, adjacent to the river, and the Southern Upland Way passes to the south of the site. The site, being located adjacent to Tweedbank has potential to be well served by local bus stops located along Tweedbank Drive. Underground vehicle parking may be considered at the design/planning application stage.   |   |
| 11<br>(Individual) | Too many houses planned. Each household must have sufficient parking. Tweedbank would become a town with a lack of infrastructure to support it. Post Office, pharmacy, public house, improved community centre would be required. Raises issues relating to density. Supportive of Dementia Care Centre and the retention of woodland. | This site was allocated with an indicative capacity of 300 units through the process of the Council's Supplementary Guidance on Housing. This was approved by the Scottish Ministers. The allocation of this site for mixed use development has therefore been accepted and cannot now be reviewed. Parking provision requirements would be addressed at the planning applications stage and the SPG identifies the opportunity for mixed use/amenity facilities in the vicinity of Lowood House. The SPG confirms adequate infrastructure would require to be provided in order to deliver the site. The site is within a highly attractive landscape setting in a central location within a well-established housing market area. Support noted in relation to Dementia Care Centre and the retention of woodland. | No action required.                                   |
| 12<br>(NatureScot) | Generally agree with content. Phase 1 Ecological Survey (Appendices, Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report,   | Comments noted. In respect of sensitivity to otters, it is considered that the following   | It is recommended that the Finalised SPG includes the |

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  | <p>Para 3.9) re sensitivity to otters, recommend that the SPG should demonstrate that the north bank of the River Tweed has either been included in the survey or that it will be prior to planning applications being made. Content with handling of Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA) within the Draft. When carried out, the HRA Screening of this proposal should consider NatureScot's comments and the finalised SPG should make a clearer analysis of the effect of the existing mitigation/standoff from the River Tweed and explain the effect of that on the need for further appraisal within the HRA.</p> <p>NatureScot's advice on HRA is hopefully clear but it takes a somewhat different approach to that SBC might have experienced before. NatureScot have based their advice on recent case law (the People Over Wind decision in the ECJ) in combination with the proposed standoff from the River Tweed that is already set out in the draft Supplementary Guidance. There are two things to be aware of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The case law has changed the application of mitigation in HRA and one thing it does is clarify that provided that mitigation is already an intrinsic part of a proposal, it can be applied as a means of avoiding Likely Significant Effect (LSE).</li> <li>• The draft Supplementary Guidance includes standoff areas from floodplain and river terraces, effectively introducing areas that are not developable.</li> </ul> | <p>requirement should be added to the Pre-application Checklist on Page 45 of the SPG: Protected Species: Any development within 200m of the north bank of the River Tweed will require a survey of otter habitat to be undertaken and submitted prior to the submission of any planning application.</p> <p>The SPG sets out a Pre-application Checklist on Page 45 which requires, prior to the development of designs and prior to any planning application submission, the requirement for an HRA and its timescales must be established. NatureScot's comments are noted and it is agreed that the Finalised SPG should note the need for the HRA Screening to take account of NatureScot's comments.</p> | <p>following requirement within the 'Biodiversity' section of the Pre-application Checklist on Page 45: <i>'Any development within 200m of the north bank of the River Tweed will require a survey of otter habitat to be undertaken and submitted prior to the submission of any planning application'</i>. Furthermore, it is recommended that the Finalised SPG should note the need for the HRA Screening to take account of NatureScot's comments. These should be attached to the SPG as an Appendix.</p> <p>The north bank of the River Tweed is shown to be included in the survey area of the Extended Phase 1 study (LUC, September 2019) although it is not clear in the text of that report that this area has been surveyed.</p> <p>NatureScot's requirement should be added into a section in the Pre-</p> |
|--|--|--|--|

|                   |  |   |   |
|-------------------|--|---|---|
|                   | <p>The latter means that NatureScot consider that intrinsic mitigation is in place which, due to its nature, then means that LSE can be avoided.</p> <p>NatureScot are happy that this can be done in this case but SBC would need to take care with any future plan or strategy that SBC weren't seeking to introduce 'intrinsic' mitigation for the purpose of avoiding LSE as that would expressly be outwith the acceptable applications set out in the People Over Wind decision. Similarly, NatureScot would encourage SBC to treat any applications with caution if they appear to be including mitigation for the express purpose of avoiding having to undertake further HRA. It's hopefully fairly straightforward to avoid either of these situations by considering whether mitigation has been identified for a reason clearly unrelated to HRA and which is nevertheless required and justifiable. In these situations NatureScot can then advise on whether it would also avoid LSE or not.</p> |   | <p>application checklist of the SPG as follows:</p> <p>Protected species surveys for otter, bats, badger, red squirrel and breeding birds will be required, including any development within 200m of the north bank of the River Tweed will require a survey of otter habitat to be undertaken. Further guidance on surveys for bats and otter can be found <a href="#">here</a></p> <p>Pre-application checklist should also include requirements for an appropriate, sensitive lighting scheme and biodiversity enhancements.</p> |
| 13 (Network Rail) | <p>Network Rail requests that due consideration is given to the impacts that this new development may have on the existing rail network. A large residential development of between 300 and 400 homes may impact on the strategic function/capacity of the network and the station infrastructure. Where growth areas or significant housing allocations of this type are identified, it is essential that the potential impacts on the existing rail infrastructure are assessed. The station car park is running at or close to capacity and a significant increase in patronage may create the need</p>   | <p>This site was allocated with an indicative capacity of 300 units through the process of the Council's Supplementary Guidance on Housing. This was approved by the Scottish Ministers. The allocation of this site for mixed use development has therefore been accepted and cannot now be reviewed.</p> <p>The 'Borders Railway Maximising the Impact: A Blueprint for the Future' is a strategy to maximise the potential of the railway line. It</p> | <p>SBC will continue to consult Network Rail throughout this project.</p>   |

|                                   |  |  |                            |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|----------------------------|
|                                   | <p>for an extension as well as other infrastructure such as ticket machines, cycle lockers and EV and electric bike charging points. If the development of sites is not linked to a commensurate increase in rail services, capacity and infrastructure then impacts on the operation of the railway may occur and the result is not sustainable.</p> <p>Further discussions will be required with the Network Rail Property Team in relation to access rights across the railway. Furthermore, discussions with the Network Rail Asset Protection Team will be required to inform the design and safe construction of the structure.</p> <p>Network Rail agrees that it is important to maintain an opportunity to extend the railway should this become feasible in the future.</p> <p>Network Rail requires further details in relation to the proposed use of the station access road as 'Access 2' for the Lowood site as this access road is within Network Rail ownership. Notwithstanding this, Network Rail would resist any change to the prioritisation of the road layout at this location which currently favours station users and would require any traffic assessment to demonstrate that the additional traffic arising from the development does not impact upon the safe and efficient operation of the junctions with Tweedbank Drive and the station car park entrance.</p> | <p>was launched by the First Minister in November 2014 and aims to capitalise on the transformational impact of the new line in creating new places to 'live, work, visit, learn, play and grow'. From a planning perspective, the site in question was allocated within the aforesaid Supplementary Guidance on Housing due to its location immediately adjacent to the railway terminus, directing development towards the railway in line with the Blueprint.</p> <p>The Council will continue to engage in dialogue with Network Rail in respect of the issues raised as the project develops. Network Rail's comments have been copied to the Council's Projects Manager.</p> |                            |
| 14<br>(Campaign for Borders Rail) | <p>CBR are generally supportive of the document and of development in the area under consideration, provided development is undertaken sensitively and based on principles of sustainability. CBR's ambition is that the guidance will facilitate increased usage of the railway by</p>  | <p>This response relates to all bullet points raised collectively. The Central Borders Business Park Supplementary Guidance/Simplified Planning Zone (2017) states that development must protect the potential future extension of the</p>   | <p>No action required.</p> |



|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  | <p>addressing the needs not only of those who use Tweedbank Station as a departure point or destination, but also in the future of those who may travel through by rail and those whose freight may also pass through. CBR's comments relate to ensuring that the route safeguarding provisions in the Tweedbank masterplan for extension of the Borders Railway are developed in sufficient detail to be adequate in practice. The key issues that CBR think need to be addressed are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmation is required of the land-take and spatial envelope required for the extended rail formation with space for double track (even if only constructed as single track initially) and for electrification.</li> <li>• Identification is required of land for railway stabling sidings potentially needed both during the construction phase of an extension and afterwards. These would accommodate passenger rolling stock overnight such that infrastructure trains can run to and from the extension and to permit other trains to run outside passenger service hours.</li> <li>• A clearer concept is required for access into the Lowood site, the existing Tweedbank station car park and the adjacent development land (sites MTWEE001 and zEL59) post-extension, given that extension of the railway would sever the existing car park access road.</li> <li>• The spatial requirements for a considerable distance of the onward extension of the railway will need to be fully understood in order to establish the design parameters for the subject site. Identification of land is required with potential for use as temporary compounds and work sites during the construction phase.</li> </ul> | <p>railway line. This requires the exclusion of development along the potential line as well as the reconfiguration of the entrance into the existing railway station car park. A Rail Route Protection Study (2015) undertaken by Mott MacDonald on behalf of Scottish Enterprise found that the extended railway line could extend under the existing road network at Tweedbank Drive/Tweedside Park which would suitably maintain access at this location. A Transport Statement, undertaken by Mott MacDonald in August 2016, recommends that a holistic approach be applied to development of the area, including consideration and implementation of transport measures to facilitate sustainable access, which in turn will support the framework vision of the SG and Simplified Planning Zone Scheme. No development is therefore permitted by the SG/SPZ which might prejudice the future provision of the extension of the Borders Railway from Tweedbank through to Hawick and onwards to Carlisle. This is in line with Policy IS4: Transport Development and Infrastructure of the Scottish Borders Local Development Plan 2016.</p> |  |
|--|--|--|--|

|                                     |  |  |   |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| <p>15 (David Bell Planning Ltd)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In terms of good practice masterplanning, a key principle is that masterplanning is an iterative process which involves an understanding of development costs and wide ranging deliverability issues together with an understanding of financial returns that could flow from completed development – all aimed at ensuring development viability in commercial terms. One of the key points set out in my client’s letter of 28 June 2019 was that until such time as the Council decide what scale of housing and mixed use development on the site is commercially viable, it cannot begin to properly plan the net developable areas. As part of this a detailed assessment would be needed to be carried out to establish the associated costs of the delivery of the required level of supporting infrastructure including access roads, vehicular over-bridges, education provision, healthcare, waste, water and drainage etc. It will be critical therefore for the housing market information and the associated infrastructure costings to inform the draft SPG and the various points listed above in terms of housing density, broad specification, phasing etc. The importance of this approach is set out in Government guidance.</li> </ul> | <p>The contributor’s letter raises a number of non-planning related matters which have been responded to separately by the Council’s Legal/Project Management teams. Each bullet point is responded to individually as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The draft consultation relates to draft Supplementary Planning Guidance. A Masterplan was undertaken by Proctor Matthews Architects on behalf of the Council which was agreed by Council in January 2018. This was the starting point against which the Council could begin to fulfil its commitment within the Borders Railway Blueprint and City Deal to maximise the full economic potential of the Borders Railway and comprised a mixed-use development, primarily focused on the delivery of residential and Class 4, 5 and 6 business space. There remained significant work to be undertaken that would include commencing the formal planning process to adopt the masterplan as Supplemental Planning Guidance, developing a communications and branding strategy which would attract private sector investment through an agreed delivery mechanism, development of business cases for individual projects as they come forward, analysis of risk and detailed costed proposals for the comprehensive development of the area. The Tweedbank masterplan was seen as a significant</li> </ul> | <p>No action required.</p> <p>No action required.</p> |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|

|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A further critical point is the need for a full Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) to be undertaken at this stage to establish the proper extent of the functional floodplain (1:200 year output) and what the effect of an exceedance event output is. Both are critical. The first because no development is allowed on a functional floodplain. The second because mitigation measures will need to be put in place to deal with the exceedance event flooding (e.g. raised development platforms or raised floor levels) which will have an impact on viability. This FRA cannot be left to the detailed stage. Until the FRA is carried out, development viability cannot be properly estimated. The potential impact of flooding and the cost to the local authority, residents and businesses needs to be fully considered by the Council and councillors.</li> </ul> | <p>expansion to the existing Tweedbank settlement as well as repositioning the current Tweedbank Industrial Estate as a new Borders Innovative Park. The masterplan was intended as a 'vision' document that demonstrated one architect's proposals and architectural language for how the area could be developed. As more formative proposals and detailed planning applications are brought forward, these would be subject to change and likely to reflect private developer's aspirations for the site, particularly in relation to the proposed residential development sites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Draft SPG sets out a requirement for Flood Risk Assessments to be undertaken at the planning application stage, where considered necessary. This is in agreement with the Scottish Environment Protection Agency and the Council's Flood and Coastal Management team. It should be noted that development is not proposed within the functional flood plain.</li> </ul> | <p>No action required at this stage.</p> |
|--|--|---|--|

|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Furthermore, the Council needs to carry out a proper Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) as part of this exercise involved in the promotion of this guidance. This is because of the impact of the Sweetman decision which expects the measures that are intended to be applied to mitigate the impact of a development on a European site, such as the River Tweed SAC have to be properly identified. It is no longer good enough for to just rely on the position in principle that policies in place which are designed to ensure that no adverse impact would occur. The Council needs to identify now as part of this exercise what mitigation measures would apply. These measures will need to be costed too as part of the viability appraisal.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site was considered through the process of the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) undertaken as part of the Housing Supplementary Guidance. The HRA concluded the following:<br/> <i>'Any housing development taking place on this site would still require to be acceptable under LDP Policy EP15, which confirms that development that would adversely affect the water environment would be refused. Furthermore, the development requirements for this site include a flood risk assessment, mitigation required to ensure that there will be no significant adverse effects on integrity of the River Tweed SAC, possibly an environmental impact assessment, a drainage impact assessment, contact with Scottish Water in respect of water treatment works, and the assessment of ecology impacts and the provision of mitigation. The above is considered sufficient mitigation for any potential minor effects on the SAC.'</i> The Draft SPG sets out the need to establish the requirements and timescales for an HRA. This approach has the agreement of NatureScot who confirm they are content with handling of Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA) within the Draft. When carried out, the HRA Screening of this proposal should consider NatureScot's comments and the finalised SPG should make a clearer analysis of the effect of the</li> </ul> | <p>No action required at this stage.</p> |
|--|--|---|--|

|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
|  |  | <p>existing mitigation/standoff from the River Tweed and explain the effect of that on the need for further appraisal within the HRA. NatureScot have based their advice on recent case law (the People Over Wind decision in the ECJ) in combination with the proposed standoff from the River Tweed that is already set out within the Draft SG. There are two matters to be aware of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The case law has changed the application of mitigation in HRA and one thing it does is clarify that provided that mitigation is already an intrinsic part of a proposal, it can be applied as a means of avoiding Likely Significant Effect (LSE).</li> <li>• The Draft SG includes standoff areas from floodplain and river terraces, effectively introducing areas that are not developable.</li> </ul> <p>The latter means that NatureScot consider that intrinsic mitigation is in place which, due to its nature, then means that LSE can be avoided.</p> <p>NatureScot's comments will be included as an Appendix to the SPG.</p> <p>Carrying out an HRA at this stage as part of the SPG as suggested by the respondent would be of little value and not standard practice. By the time a planning application is submitted the circumstances of a</p> |  |
|--|--|---|--|

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  | <p>My client's view still stands, as set out in the letter to the Council of 28 June that the process of developing the SPG cannot be properly started until this viability issue has been satisfactorily addressed.</p> <p>Despite the requirements set out in the Brief set by SBC and approved by Committee on 30 January 2020, namely that the development proposals be realistic and deliverable and that detail be provided on phasing and in particular that phasing for development should take into account infrastructure issues and indeed that clear guidance should be provided <i>"on delivery mechanisms for the development of the site"</i>, it would seem that these aspects have been entirely ignored. The draft SPG is silent on them and the consultants have made no reference whatsoever to these matters having been taken into account in drawing up the new layout guidance in the draft SPG.</p> <p>The draft SPG has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failed to address even a preliminary flood risk assessment applying SEPA's guidance on the need to build in mitigation measures to deal with climate change not just the 1:200 year event shown on the site constraints map with a view to establishing the impact on the potential developable areas and the potential need for additional flood defence infrastructure.</li> </ul> | <p>habitat(s) may have changed considerably in the interim period and new issues may need to be addressed. Consequently any planning application must be accompanied by an HRA identifying up to date and relevant matters to be addressed.</p> <p>Issues relating to viability are not a matter for the SPG to address. As noted above, the contributor has been contacted separately by the Council's Legal/Project Management teams on this matter. The Design Guide sets out an anticipated phasing plan for the development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please refer to flooding issues noted above.</li> </ul> | <p>No further action required.</p> <p>No further action at this stage.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|

|  |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failure to instruct even a preliminary surface water drainage assessment to consider the need for a district wide Sustainable Urban Drainage (SUDS) scheme and the location and size of any required SUDS pond and the impact on the potential developable areas, particularly important if land raising is required to achieve gravity run off. The LDP SPG specifically requires an assessment of how the risk from surface water would be mitigated for this site.</li> <li>• Failed to address or reference the impact of the “indicative” 295 / 300 units housing development on the local school estate and whether a new primary school might be needed again with a potential huge impact on the potential developable areas and costs or if it is not needed on site the potential need for phasing linked to increased capacity being provided in the existing school estate and estimation of the potential developer contribution (s.75 planning obligation) costs.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Draft SPG notes the requirement that during the development of designs and prior to any application submission, advice should be sought from Development Management, the Council’s Flood and Coastal Management Team and Transport Manager to identify their key requirements for SUDS.</li> <li>• The Draft SPG sets out the need for future developers to contact and seek advice from SBC’s Education Officer in order to establish availability of primary and secondary school capacity and the need for any developer contributions. The site was allocated through the Housing SG, at which time it was considered that an extension to the existing primary school may be required. The forecasting in respect of if and when such extensions are required cannot be confirmed with any certainty at this point in time. As Lowood develops through time SBC Education will be taking account of other residential developments being implemented in the catchment area and impacts they may be having on school capacities. Any Developer Contributions towards any identified school extensions will be confirmed through this process at the appropriate time.</li> </ul> | <p>No further action at this stage.</p> <p>No further action at this stage.</p> |
|--|---|---|---|

|  |   |  |   |
|--|---|--|---|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failure to establish when the identified capacity constraints in the local Waste Water Treatment Works (WWTW) will be addressed and how that would impact potentially on development phasing</li> <li>• Failure to identify a requirement for Affordable Housing and the impact of a 25% requirement on financial viability of the development overall.</li> <li>• Failure to address phasing: particularly important if a district wide SUDS scheme needs to be created as the pond would need to be sited and built at the start.</li> <li>• Failure to address any aspect of phasing also raises questions about the effectiveness of the site as a housing allocation. The site was specifically allocated to address a shortfall in the 5 year effective housing land supply identified by the Scottish Ministers. Having been allocated through the promotion of SPG the expectation was that the site would start to deliver housing by 2022 and the latest HLA reflects that expectation. Against that background it is incumbent upon the SPG to set out a phasing arrangement that demonstrates how the first batch of housing units will be delivered on site by 2022.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Draft SPG sets out the need for future developers to contact and seek advice from Scottish Water and SEPA on this matter. SW/SEPA are content with this.</li> <li>• The SPG sets out the need to seek advice from SBC to establish the requirement/extent of affordable housing provision. The Council's Affordable Housing Supplementary Guidance sets this at 25%.</li> <li>• The SPG sets out the need for any future developer to establish phasing. The Design Guide sets out an anticipated phasing plan for the development and further guidance relating to SUDS.</li> <li>• It is not considered necessary for the SPG to detail deliverability. It has already been established that the site is deliverable hence its allocation for development with an indicative capacity of 300 units through the process of the Council's Supplementary Guidance on Housing. This was approved by the Scottish Ministers. The allocation of this site for mixed use development has therefore been accepted and cannot now be questioned. It is not suggested that the indicative number of units will all be built within a 5-year period. This was not a requirement of the SG on Housing. Typically, a site of this size in the</li> </ul> | <p>No further action at this stage.</p> <p>No further action required.</p> <p>No further action at this stage.</p> <p>No further action required.</p> |
|--|---|--|---|



|                        |   |  |   |
|------------------------|---|--|---|
|                        | <p>If these matters are not addressed, then the legal advice MPL has obtained is that the process of preparing detailed planning guidance that the Council has embarked upon is fundamentally flawed, thereby rendering any future decision on the part of the Council to adopt the SPG based on this current approach being open to challenge in the courts.</p> <p>I would be grateful if you could please confirm how the Council proposes to address the matters set out above in the final SPG.</p>  | <p>Borders may take some time to be completed notwithstanding the fact the Council remains clear the site will be a highly popular option for potential housebuilders and house purchasers.</p> <p>The Council would refute this statement.</p> <p>Please refer to responses above.</p>  | <p>No further action required.</p> <p>See above actions.</p>                    |
| 16 (Scottish Forestry) | <p>Comments relating to specific trees which require to be considered (and potentially TPO'd?).</p> <p>It is strongly recommended that the entire C1/B2/C2 woodland complex be retained. Additional compensatory planting in the field edge along the railway line running west from the woodland C1 along the site boundary and around to connect with the area marked as compensatory area 1 would provide a much stronger biodiversity corridor and screen to any development at the very visible west end of the site. Located within area C1, there is a heronry of significant size, approximately 15 nests in close proximity within the central area of C1 within the younger area of Sitka Spruce plantation. It is recommended that advice is</p> | <p>As part of the preparation of the SPG an initial tree survey was undertaken by LUC. This confirmed the removal of the woodland areas referred to. As part of the consultation process the Council's Landscape Architects and Development Management Officers concluded that the retention of these trees could not be justified. It was agreed compensatory planting would be carried out elsewhere on the site, as indicated. All proposed new planting will be carried out, taking cognisance of wider screening issues promotion of biodiversity</p> | <p>The Council will further consult where necessary with Scottish Forestry.</p> |

|  |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|
|  | <p>sought from an appropriately qualified ecologist to identify the significance of the heronry and what mitigation will need to be put in place prior to any tree felling works.</p>   | <p>opportunities. In terms the heronry within area C1, the trees have an estimated shelf life of approximately 15 years and would require to be felled in any event.</p> <p>The numbers of herons has varied at this location with between 1-16 nest recorded between 2011-20, although surveys were not carried out in all years. The count in 2020 was 8 nests. The proposed development phasing means that this area, residential zone 1, may not be developed for some time and during this period the trees may have reached age of felling and be treated under the tree management programme. Any felling would be required to occur outside of the breeding season, and it is likely that the herons using this site will re-locate to a suitable location within the local area.</p> |   |
|  | <p>Area U1 has rightly been identified as unstable, with several windblown trees evident (most of the windblow appears to have occurred following removal of the original woodland edge for realignment of the tarmac road and wall associated with railway development about 5 years ago). However, no note has been made as to how a wind firm edge will be located to stop area A2 becoming unstable once area U1 has been removed. Further thought is required here with additional details provided.</p> | <p>This will be reviewed in due course and will be addressed by the Council via its forthcoming estate management plan.</p>   |   |
|  | <p>Scottish Forestry is in general supportive of the areas identified for use as compensatory planting, however</p>   | <p>The Council will prepare details of specific species to be planted within the compensatory</p>   | <p>The Council will further consult where necessary with Scottish Forestry.</p> |

|                  |  |  |   |
|------------------|--|--|---|
|                  | <p>further information on species selection is requested to fully inform choice of areas to ensure that appropriate species are used. There is mention of wet woodland planting (which may be appropriate in places) but most of the compensatory planting area appears to be free draining and fertile, suitable for a wide range of species including the likes of oak.</p>  | <p>planting area in due course. The Council will be happy to forward these proposals to Forestry Scotland for their observations.</p>  | <p>The Council will further consult where necessary with Scottish Forestry.</p>   |
| 17 (NHS Borders) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no mention or detail within the plan of health care facilities. The planned 300-400 homes would have a significant primary and community health care requirement particularly as some of these homes are earmarked for individuals with dementia. It is unclear how and where primary and community health care will be provided. The health care facility most closely located to this site is Eildon Practice in Melrose which currently has significant space and capacity challenges. NHS Borders requires clarification on how healthcare will be provided for the development within Lowood estate and would expect a resolution to this to be part of the conditions of any planning decisions.</li> <li>Part of the site is earmarked for a dementia care village. What would the impact be of this</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Scottish Borders Local Development Plan Examination report proposed modifications to require an additional 916 housing units, to be identified through Supplementary Guidance (SG) on Housing. Lowood (MTWEE002) was identified within the Draft SG for public consultation (5 Dec 2016 – 30 January 2017) and the NHS were formally consulted. No response was received from the NHS during this period. NHS comments were sought again via email in May 2017 however no comments were forthcoming. On 9 November 2017, Scottish Ministers confirmed that SBC could proceed to adopt the SG, it is now an adopted document and forms part of the Scottish Borders Local Development Plan 2016. The Council will continue to discuss and communicate on forthcoming Local Development Plan it is the NHS's responsibility to provide sufficient healthcare to the community.</li> <li>Scottish Borders Council are working with partners, architects, care organisations and</li> </ul> | <p>No action required although the Council will continue to discuss and communicate with the NHS regarding Local Development Plan proposals.</p> <p>The Council will continue to liaise with interested parties</p> |

|                             |   |   |  |
|-----------------------------|---|---|--|
|                             | development on NHS secondary care mental health and elderly services and what plans are in place to make sure health and social care work in an integrated way. NHS Borders requests further information on this.   | the NHS to establish new build care services that will ensure choice, participation, dignity and respect for older people in care spaces that support and protect all aspects of their life.  | as details of the care village develop.  |
| 18 (Ben Tindall Architects) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General - The site at Lowood is so exceptional that it demands a special and inspiring response. The opportunities afforded by the site being owned by SBC gives the rare chance of the committed long term owner participation that is the key to all successful new settlements.</li> <li>Vision? - This document is no 'vision', it is more a gathering together of standard policy documents with some added landscape analysis. A 'vision' needs to be inspiring and drive forward a reality on the ground. A 'vision' is something that applies to the future, which will now so obviously be different from today. The pre-existing policies will produce the same results as can be seen today.</li> <li>Process - 'Life' has to be the first consideration, then followed by appropriate infrastructure and spaces, with buildings coming last, built in a coherent but flexible manner to agreed guidelines. This is an</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed.</li> <li>Page 26 of the Draft SPG sets out a clear development vision for the site along with strategic objectives for the development of the site. The development vision states 'The Lowood site provides a unique opportunity to support the sustainable expansion of Tweedbank with a range of historical, cultural and environmental assets to create a distinct sense of place. These important assets will be safeguarded and enhanced, encouraging their recreational use and enjoyment by the local community and visitors. The integrated and expanded settlement of Tweedbank will be a social, well-connected community which people will aspire to live in and visit.</li> <li>Comments noted. There is not a set methodology nor template which all SPGs should follow and there will be a range of opinions from a range of bodies as to how</li> </ul> | <p>No action required.</p> <p>No action required.</p> <p>No action required.</p> |

|  |  |   |   |
|--|--|---|---|
|  | <p>approach that has been developed by the Scandinavians that is now generally accepted as good practice and exemplified by Gehl People. David Sim, of Gehl People, <a href="https://gehlpeople.com">https://gehlpeople.com</a> has just published a book, Soft City, which is a template for the kind of human based development needed here.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Needs - The Vision does not articulate the community's needs and aspirations at all. Successful long term development depends entirely on the community's buy-in and active participation. This is what gives a place economic and social sustainability.</li> <li>Zoning - The vision lays out zones. Zones were brought into the planning system by CIAM (Corbusier etc) in the 1930s when the world was a very different place and has been the main cause of planning failures worldwide ever since. At Lowood there is the opportunity to do correct this and revert to a natural and human way of mixed use developing, plot by plot, based on an infrastructure plan, where employment is integrated into the whole.</li> </ul> | <p>this should be done. The Council are content with the format and aspirations of the SPG.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council held two well-attended public events in relation to this SPG, one an 'information gathering' event prior to the preparation of the Draft SPG and another during the public consultation period of the SPG. The feedback received was positive for the most part. The Council has also received a detailed response from Tweedbank Community Council which is included within this table. The Council is of the view that the local community has and will continue to have active participation as the process develops.</li> <li>The employment element of the development is tied up through the City Deal, this dictates that the business element of the development sits adjacent to the existing business part at Tweedside Road, in close proximity to the Railway terminus. The Council is satisfied with the development approach laid out in the SPG.</li> </ul> | <p>No further action required at this stage.</p> <p>No further action required.</p> |
|--|--|---|---|

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrastructure - Whilst of course Lowood's wonderful picturesque landscape is important, and I believe it's more important than stated in the report, the most important thing is the railway station. This is the obvious 'market square'/centre of the settlement. From there should emerge streets that fit in with the landscape and gives a circulation that prioritises walking and social interaction.</li> <li>• Design - The design of the buildings and the public realm is critical for the success of the development and is not something to be left to developers. The vision needs to encompass design too. I believe that this is best achieved by a code. This gives owners confidence in their investments and allows owners and builders flexibility to meet changing markets.</li> <li>• So? - I suggest that SBC invites David Sim david@gehlpeople.com to give presentations to the local community and the Council. Having led the design for Christchurch New Zealand and many projects such as this I have no doubt will provide the kind of inspiring vision that is needed.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The area of land in question is outwith the allocated site and land availability around the railway station is at a premium. This is therefore an issue relating to deliverability and available space.</li> <li>• Further to a detailed Workshop with Architecture and Design Scotland (ADS) as well as many internal working groups specifically based on this matter, a Design Guide has been prepared and is attached to the SPG.</li> <li>• Suggestion noted. However, the Council is content with the vision, format and aspirations contained within the Draft SPG and from the input received from a wide range of both internal and external parties.</li> </ul> | <p>No further action required.</p> <p>No further action required.</p> <p>No further action required.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| <p>19<br/>(Dementia Village Associates (DVA))</p> | <p><u>DVA approach, 'The Dutch Model'</u><br/>A Senior living development and Dementia Village concepts requires a cultural shift in thoughts about care of older persons. A shift from the medical system to a social relational system that focusses Quality of Life, on experiencing health and enjoying a normal and social life, despite the dementia syndrome and other health problems that occur: a holistic view on people and organisations. This cultural shift demands creativity and person-centred focus from the developing team and all professionals within the organization. It is a shift from the institute to normal surroundings and a normal daily life with professional help and support. The familiarity of e.g. the Dementia Village is designed to reduce residents' confusion and create an environment which promotes active participation in the community and facilitates opportunities to remain engaged with activities you enjoyed throughout your life. The underlying integral concept contributes to a socially active environment that clearly couldn't be more different than a traditional care model. All in a holistic way to realize social inclusion and to integrate and combine different living solutions, recreation, education, mixed generations, various steps of care, meeting places and common facilities, sustainable and with new energy solutions.</p> <p><u>Paradigm shift</u><br/>Paradigms under the senior living and support and (dementia) care for the elderly have to change dramatically. Therefore, new initiatives have to follow the change of paradigms as described hereafter if they want to deliver a state-of-art elderly care. These</p> | <p>Dementia Village Associates, who are based in the Netherlands, have provided a particularly articulate response, the contents of which are useful. Scottish Borders Council has looked to international innovation to ensure that we have the best principles of care and building for care established in the Scottish Borders. The Covid-19 pandemic has suggested that we need to do better for older people in our care and traditional care builds are no longer fit for purpose. We are working with partners, architects, care organisations and the NHS to establish new build care services that will ensure choice, participation, dignity and respect for older people in care spaces that support and protect all aspects of their life.</p> | <p>No action required from a planning perspective at this stage.</p> |
|---|--|---|--|

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  | <p>paradigms are also the vision of the European providers of housing support and care for vulnerable seniors. The paradigm changes are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality of life will be the focus of the core business as an outcome of the delivery of support and care services. Often the quality of care seems dominant in the quality thinking. While the support and care must serve a purpose: a by the customer perceived good quality of life.</li> <li>• From 'care' to 'prevention and inclusion'. This means that although customers are in need of care, we must all do to prevent a (higher) need of care and isolation and loneliness of people in need of (high) care. Actually, 'caring for' is more important than 'taking care of'.</li> <li>• The current facilities are often based on an institutional model that was back in the 70's the standard but needs to shift to a home model where people feel more at ease.</li> <li>• When a person is in need of care, family is often not involved anymore when a person is receiving residential care. We believe that involvement (co-creation) of the family will increase the customer orientation and therefore the quality of care. Co-creation means also that professional and family bear shared responsibilities.</li> <li>• The institutional design of residential aged care of the 70's was designed based on a dominant medical point of view. Without denying the importance of the medical services in residential aged care we think that a social approach better addresses the needs of the customers in maintaining the life they want to live and choices they want to make.</li> </ul> |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|



|  |  |   |   |
|--|--|---|---|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Focus on quality of life means also that we have to personalise the service and care for the customers where we now deliver a more 'one size fits all' package. We need to involve the lifestyle of the person, so the support and care are more individualised.</li> <li>•The consequence of that approach is that we have to maximise the choices that a person can make based on what they are used or want to do (customer focus). This instead that the life of our customer is regulated by the way we have organised our delivery (system dominance).</li> <li>•With the help of smart technology, we believe that we can maintain the quality of support and care primarily because we believe that technology can support the professional staff instead of taking it over from them. That will relieve the pressure and therefore will increase staff satisfaction.</li> </ul> |   |   |
| 20 (Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)) | <p><u>Flood Risk</u><br/>As is noted within the Draft SPG, SEPA will require that a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) is undertaken to assess the flood risk to the site from the River Tweed. Consideration will need to be given to bridge structures located upstream and downstream of the site. The presence of Lowood Pond within the application site should also be considered within the FRA. The appropriate climate change uplifts for the River Tweed catchment should be applied.</p> <p><u>River Basin Management Plan</u><br/>Would welcome reference to the River Basin Management Plan (RBMP) for the River Tweed, the following should be incorporated within the SPG:</p>   | <p>Comments noted. These matters would be fully assessed through the process of planning applications within the vicinity of the areas mentioned. It is considered that these comments should be added to the relevant sections of the Pre-application Checklist of the SPG.</p> <p>Comments noted. It is considered these points should be attached to the SPG in an Appendix for the information of developers.</p> | <p>It is recommended that the Finalised SPG includes the following requirements within the 'Flood Risk Assessment' section of the Pre-application Checklist on Page 45:</p> <p>It is recommended that these points are attached to the SPG as an Appendix for</p> |

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are no RBMP pressures on the river at this site – this long stretch is currently at good condition and should be protected from deterioration.</li> <li>• Biosecurity measures should be employed on the development site.</li> <li>• No morphology pressures are logged in our system– but this has not been surveyed/groundtruthed – so there may be opportunities to improve but these would need proper assessment.</li> <li>• Riparian planting should always be sensitive: an appropriate scheme to fit with what is currently there; planning of tree stands ages etc.; using native species mix and implemented with regard to banks etc. Biodegradable tree shields are also now available.</li> </ul> <p><u>Air Quality</u><br/>Recommend that as part of pre-development checklist, that the SPG also ensures that good air quality outcomes for the proposed site are integrated into the document by identifying the principles of good practice, as outlined in the Delivering Cleaner Air for Scotland – Development Planning and Development Management guidance. The pre-development checklist should require that these are followed and incorporated in to the considerations for design and operation of the site as far as practically possible. This could include the identification of the location of buildings where particularly sensitive members of the population are likely to be present such as school buildings or care home, which should be sited 100m or more away from busy roads. Also, that new housing in central areas of the development should be designed to ensure</p> | <p>This matter would be addressed by Environmental Health during the development of the site in the normal manner.</p> | <p>the information of developers.</p> <p>No action required at this stage.</p> |
|--|---|--|--|

|                                  |   |  |  |
|----------------------------------|---|--|--|
|                                  | <p>residents are not exposed to poorer air quality as a result of being located nearby busier roads and congested junctions.</p> <p><u>Energy</u><br/>Recommend that any layout or design of the development is informed and provides space for low carbon energy (including heat) within the site, as an integrated part of the design.</p> <p><u>Water Environment / Surface Water / Waste Water / Engineering activities in the water environment / Ecology / Waste / Contaminated Land / Co-location</u><br/>General advice provided.</p> | <p>Comments noted. It is considered that these matters are suitably incorporated within the SPG/Design Guide.</p> <p>It is considered that SEPA's advice in respect of these subject matters should be attached to the SPG as an Appendix for the information of future developers.</p> <p>SEPA's full response should be attached to the SPG as an Appendix.</p>  | <p>No action required.</p> <p>SEPA's full response should be attached to the SPG as an Appendix.</p> |
| 21 (Scottish Water (SW))         | <p>No further comments to make on this consultation. Scottish Water are content that previous comments have been included and are satisfied that the document reflects these.</p>   | <p>Comments noted.</p>   | <p>No action required.</p>   |
| 22 (Tweedbank Community Council) | <p><b>Consultation</b><br/>The Community Council is concerned that the consultation took place during lockdown, with its significant restrictions. SBC may feel that the consultation has concluded successfully, the Community Council would ask that consideration is given as to how best to carry out some further consultation, as it is not</p>   | <p>The detailed comments of the Community Council are greatly appreciated and useful.</p> <p>The Council is content that the public consultation period was fruitful given the number of responses received. Fortunately, the public exhibition was held before the outbreak of the pandemic. Issues regarding the pandemic in terms of continuing to operate public services and consultations of this nature are appreciated and challenging for everyone.</p> | <p>See comments below:</p> <p>No further action required.</p>  |

|  |   |   |  |
|--|---|---|--|
|  | <p>convinced that the consultation responses received will not have been significantly impacted upon by Covid-19.</p> <p>Turning to the Tweedbank Master Plan consultation, the Community Council supports the extension of Tweedbank. Tweedbank was formed as the result of the purchase of most of the Lowood estate, the village began life in 1974 and the original plan was to create a community of mixed housing types with outstanding landscape quality, good community facilities and the provision of high quality business space.</p> <p><b>Tweedbank's Contribution to the Scottish Borders</b><br/>The original vision has been enormously successful. Tweedbank has grown in phases into a vibrant community with a mix of housing designs and styles, and with accommodation for those who need social housing, affordable housing and private home ownership.</p> <p>The Tweedbank industrial area, which contains the Innovation Park and Industrial Estate, houses a number of significant companies and supports a great many jobs in the Scottish Borders. The village has a range of important community facilities that are well regarded. With the arrival of the railway, Tweedbank has become</p> | <p>The only party who contacted the Council requesting an extension of time to submit comments due to the pandemic was the Community Council. It was considered this was a very reasonable request in the circumstances and the Council was happy to agree this. Planning officers did offer to discuss the SPG with the Community Council via a Teams meeting.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Comments noted and agreed.</p> <p>Comments noted</p> | <p>No action required.</p> <p>No action required.</p> <p>No action required.</p> |
|--|---|---|--|

|  |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|
|  | <p>a significant community in the Scottish Borders and a destination where a great many people wish to live, work and enjoy their leisure time.</p> <p><b>Lessons Learned</b><br/>The Community Council is pleased to see that the proposed Tweedbank Master Plan has learned the lessons from history and intends to largely follow the well thought out principles that helped Tweedbank become the community it is today.</p> <p><b>Phased Basis to Development</b><br/>Development on a phased basis over a number of decades is a sound approach. The provision of further social and private sector housing is very welcome and proposals to develop supported housing for the elderly, and a possible care home, are something the Community Council is fully supportive of.</p> <p>The Community Council is pleased that additional business land will be made available to support inward investment, to encourage existing companies to grow and new start-ups to flourish.</p> <p><b>Landscape development</b><br/>The Master Plan makes much reference to the need for high standards of landscaping and good quality green open space. The Community Council supports this aspiration and it is critical that high quality green open spaces are provided as part of the proposed new housing.</p> | <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Support noted</p> <p>Comments noted and agreed.</p> | <p>No action required.</p> <p>No action required.</p> <p>No action required.</p> <p>No action required.</p> |
|--|---|---|---|

|  |  |   |   |
|--|--|---|---|
|  | <p>The Community Council welcomes the sensitive approach being taken to design and, in particular, the proposals around tree retention within Lowood and the additional space being provided for new tree planting to replace any which need to be felled to support new development.</p> <p><b>Wildlife Habitats</b></p> <p>The current Lowood estate is a haven for wildlife with badgers, deer, bats and a significant number of species. It will be critical to consider the impact of the development on wildlife and to ensure that appropriate consideration is given to protect wildlife interests. Local Tweedbank resident, Andrew Bramhall, who is on the Community Council, has extensive knowledge of the wildlife presence in the Lowood estate and Scottish Borders Council may wish to discuss these matters with him as he has built up a considerable understanding of this issue over decades.</p> <p><b>Community Facilities</b></p> <p>Enhanced community facilities are critical and the Community Council would like to see an area of land identified for a large new play park to be developed to support the proposed housing. It will be essential to ensure that an appropriate developer contribution is made for every house built so that the play park can be provided and be of a size and scale to support the proposed housing.</p> | <p>Comments noted</p> <p>Comments noted. Mr Bramhall has been present at our exhibitions and has provided useful information. The SPG has been prepared in discussion with relevant national wildlife bodies and relevant internal Council Officers. The Council will welcome any comments Mr Bramhall may wish to make via his role within the Community Council when future planning applications for the development of the site are submitted</p> <p>It is agreed that there will be a requirement for a large play area / amenity open space to be incorporated within the site. It is envisaged it will be located in a central location, probably in proximity to Lowood House. Its exact location and timescale for implementation will be determined at the planning application stage as phasing is confirmed. Each house will be required to make a financial contribution towards the facility.</p> | <p>No action required.</p> <p>No action required at this stage.</p> <p>A play area / amenity open space to be provided on the site and delivered via developer contributions.</p> |
|--|--|---|---|

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  | <p>There has long been a desire for a church in Tweedbank and land for a church, and the development of one, was part of the original Tweedbank concept although it has never materialised. The Community Council would hope that an area of land could be identified that may support the development of a new church in the future.</p> <p>Tweedbank currently enjoys a fantastic Community Centre but it is already too small for the community's needs, with poor parking provision. The proposed additional housing will mean that the Community Centre is totally inadequate for the village's future needs. We would urge Scottish Borders Council to either identify land within Tweedbank in the new extension, or the existing village, for the development of a Community Centre or at least commit to a separate feasibility study on this particular issue.</p> <p>The Community Council is encouraged that the Master Plan consultation highlights the need to provide land for additional community amenities in and around the existing Lowood House. An ongoing discussion around the development of community facilities would be very much welcomed by the Community Council.</p> | <p>Comments noted. The SPG identifies the opportunity of a mix of uses in the vicinity of Lowood House and the church could be facilitated in this location. It is assumed the church would set up necessary funding to ensure its implementation – this would not be a financial requirement for the Council nor any developer.</p> <p>Comments noted. The Draft SPG sets out the need for key areas of research that should be undertaken during the development of designs and prior to any planning application submission. Land in the vicinity of Lowood House is identified for a range of uses which could incorporate a new Community Centre. The recently approved Proposed Local Development Plan does not identify a site for a new Community Centre in Tweedbank. In any event it would not be normal practice to identify such land via the LDP process. However, that does not prevent planning applications being submitted on potential infill sites within the village. Council officers would be happy to work with the Community Council to help identify a suitable site.</p> <p>Comments noted. Council Officers would be happy to engage with the Community Council to help discuss potential uses around Lowood House. However, any such inclusions must be considered to have a reasonable certainty that these could be delivered.</p> | <p>Land in the vicinity of Lowood House is identified for a range of uses. A new church could be accommodated within this land.</p> <p>Council Officers to work with the Community Council to help identify a suitable site within the village for a new Community Centre.</p> <p>Council Officers to discuss potential community facilities around Lowood House with the Community Council in due course.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|

|  |   |  |   |
|--|---|--|---|
|  | <p><b>Tweedbank Primary School</b></p> <p>It is the Community Council's understanding that the current primary school has sufficient capacity for the community's needs and that going forward the roll is projected to fall. This means that as the new housing development takes place on a phased basis, it is likely that the school will be able to cope as the school's spare capacity will be taken up as the housing develops, without the need for additional development at the school. However, Tweedbank Primary school is an important community asset which is very well respected and it has seen significant redevelopment in 2012, which enhanced the school greatly. The Community Council would want to ensure that SBC carefully considers any future impact that the Tweedbank extension might have on the school and that should there be a need for additional accommodation, the Council will move swiftly to address these needs.</p> <p><b>Links across Tweedbank communities</b></p> <p>The Community Council is pleased to see the proposed vehicular and pedestrian bridge linking the new part of Tweedbank to the existing village around Essenside Drive. This is one of the most critical elements of the new development and it must be agreed at the outset that this important piece of infrastructure will be provided. The bridge is not only necessary for vehicular transport and pedestrian connectivity, it is also essential for linking the proposed Tweedbank extension to the existing community and will play an important part in community cohesion.</p> | <p>Comments noted. SBC Lifelong Learning (Education) will continue to monitor and advise on this matter as the development phasing is implemented.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> | <p>SBC Lifelong Learning (Education) to continue to monitor the development phasing and any implications this may have on the Tweedbank School capacity.</p> <p>No action required.</p> |
|--|---|--|---|



|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  | <p><b>Lowood Bridge enhancement</b><br/>The Community Council would also want to encourage Scottish Borders Council, as part of the Master Plan exercise, to identify how best to utilise the purchase of Lowood estate to develop a site for a replacement Lowood bridge and to develop designs for this bridge in the years to come.</p> <p><b>Road and Pedestrian safety</b><br/>The current housing within Tweedbank and the layout of the streets has been designed to give higher priority to the pedestrian than the car and to ensure that there is a good, safe footpath network. The Community Council would want to encourage the highest standards of road safety design in the Tweedbank extension and would hope that the needs of pedestrians will be at the forefront of the road and street designs.</p> <p><b>Tweedbank Extension</b><br/>Finally, but most importantly, the Community Council were pleased to see that the consultation focusses on the Tweedbank Master Plan and extending the existing village of Tweedbank. The Community Council is aware that a small number of people hold the misguided view that, in fact, 'Lowood' should be retained and that the proposals out to consultation should actually be altered so that 'Lowood' is seen as a new settlement, separate from Tweedbank. The Community Council are completely opposed to this proposition and fully supports Tweedbank being extended and that the purchase of the remaining element of Lowood is for a Tweedbank extension, and all new developments will</p> | <p>The existing Lowood Bridge is outwith the boundaries of the site and is therefore outwith the scope of the Draft SPG. The Council is, however, aware of the issues associated with the existing bridge and expects that the investigation of a new / replacement bridge will be considered further in the future.</p> <p>Comments noted and agreed. Any future planning applications for the development of the site will be considered against the Scottish Government's policy statement entitled 'Designing Streets' which encourages innovative street design, giving consideration to pedestrian safety with well-connected layouts where the car is less dominant.</p> <p>Comments noted and agreed. Lowood was the name given to the site as part of the Supplementary Guidance on Housing when the site was first taken forward as a potential development site. Consequently the name Lowood is only relevant to the LDP process. However, in view of comments since received, it is the view of the Council that the development of the site represents an extension of the existing, well-established settlement of Tweedbank. The Development Vision of the Draft SPG is clear that <i>'The integrated and expanded settlement of</i></p> | <p>New/replacement Lowood Bridge to be investigated further in the future.</p> <p>Pedestrian safety to be considered and incorporated into the internal network.</p> <p>Agree that the site should be recognised as Tweedbank expansion.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
|  | <p>be part of the village of Tweedbank. The suggestion that a new settlement should be created is a preposterous nonsense and it is hoped that Scottish Borders Council will firmly reject any misguided notion of a new settlement and recognise that the Tweedbank Master Plan will lead to the extension of the successful village of Tweedbank. Tweedbank has been enormously successful, the village and its residents are making an enormous contribution to housing supply, business and industrial provision in the Scottish Borders. Unlike some communities, Tweedbank has accepted significant development and construction. The village will do so again, as these plans unfold in the decades to come.</p> <p>The Community Council look forward to further updates and engaging with the Council in more detail as plans for the Tweedbank extension develop.</p> | <p><i>Tweedbank will be a social, well-connected community which people will aspire to live in and visit.</i>’ Consequently the site should be referred to as Tweedbank expansion as opposed to being considered as a separate entity.</p> <p>The Community Council will continue to be updated as the SPG progresses and will be formally consulted of any planning applications.</p> | <p>No action required at this stage.</p> |
|--|---|--|--|