John Hayward Planning & Development Standards Manager

Donna Dee Lamb
DDL Care Services Ltd
1 Silverbirch Studio
Cavalry Park
Peebles
EH45 9BU

Please ask for: Ranald Dods 01835 825239

Our Ref: 20/00558/PREAPP

Your Ref:

E-Mail: ranald.dods@scotborders.gov.uk

Date: 16th October 2020

Dear Sir/Madam

PROPOSAL: Partial change of use to form day centre from office

LOCATION: 3 Rowan Court Suite 3 Cavalry Park Peebles Scottish

Borders EH45 9BU

The evaluation on the following pages provides a written response to the above pre-application enquiry by the allocated planning officer. It does not comprise any decision made by Scottish Borders Council and its Committees and the advice is not legally binding on the determination of a forthcoming planning application.

The evaluation is the opinion of the planning officer. Should a formal application subsequently be submitted, it shall be subject to statutory consultation and full assessment by the Council. This evaluation shall not prejudice the Council's full consideration of the formal application including any consultation comments and public representations which may be received.

The information provided in this response may be subjected to a Freedom of Information Request under the Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002. It will be for Scottish Borders Council to determine what, if any, information will be or not be exempt from such a request, in accordance with this legislation.

Yours faithfully

John Hayward

Planning & Development Standards Manager



SCOTTISH BORDERS COUNCIL RESPONSE TO PLANNING PRE-APPLICATION ENQUIRY

Comments provided by	Officer Name and Post:	Contact e-mail / number:
Diministra provided by	Ranald Dods	ranald.dods@scotborder.gov.uk
	Planning Officer	☎ 01835 825 239
	(Development Management)	2 01000 020 200
SBC Enquiry Reference	20/00558/PREAPP	
Date	16 Oct 20	
Proposed Development	Part change of use from office to day centre for the elderly	
Site Location	3 Rowan Court, Cavalry Park, Peebles	
Background / Site	The building was one of a number granted under 05/02146/FUL.	
History		
Planning Policies and	Relevant planning policies and supplementary guidance may include: Scottish Borders Local Development Plan (2016) PMD3 – Land use allocations	
Guidance		
	PMD3 = Land use allocations	
	ED1 – Protection of business and industrial land	
	IS7 – Parking provision and standards	
	The <u>Scottish Borders Local Development Plan 2016</u> can be accessed online.	
	The following evaluation represents the informal opinion of the planning officer on the submitted pre-application enquiry. It does not comprise a decision made by Scottish Borders Council.	
Assessment	PRINCIPLE	
7.00000mone	The proposal is for a change of use from office to a day centre within an existing strategic high amenity site in Peebles (Cavalry Park, zEL2). The key policies against which the proposal would be assessed are PMD3 and ED1 of the LDP.	
	strategic high amenity site in Peebles	(Cavalry Park, zEL2). The key policies
	strategic high amenity site in Peebles against which the proposal would be	(Cavalry Park, zEL2). The key policies
	strategic high amenity site in Peebles against which the proposal would be The policies contained in SESplan are assessed.	(Cavalry Park, zEL2). The key policies assessed are PMD3 and ED1 of the LDP.
	strategic high amenity site in Peebles against which the proposal would be a The policies contained in SESplan are assessed. HIERARCHY OF DEVELOPMENT	(Cavalry Park, zEL2). The key policies assessed are PMD3 and ED1 of the LDP.
	strategic high amenity site in Peebles against which the proposal would be a The policies contained in SESplan are assessed. HIERARCHY OF DEVELOPMENT The proposal would be considered a development.	(Cavalry Park, zEL2). The key policies assessed are PMD3 and ED1 of the LDP. e not relevant and have not, therefore, been
	strategic high amenity site in Peebles against which the proposal would be a The policies contained in SESplan are assessed. HIERARCHY OF DEVELOPMENT The proposal would be considered a development. LAND USE ALLOCATION	(Cavalry Park, zEL2). The key policies assessed are PMD3 and ED1 of the LDP. e not relevant and have not, therefore, been "Local" development under the hierarchy of
	strategic high amenity site in Peebles against which the proposal would be a The policies contained in SESplan are assessed. HIERARCHY OF DEVELOPMENT The proposal would be considered a development. LAND USE ALLOCATION The site is designated as a strategic high section of the proposal would be considered as a strategic high site is designated as a strategic high section of the proposal would be considered as a strategic high site is designated as a strategic high section of the proposal would be considered as a strategic high section of the proposal would be a section	(Cavalry Park, zEL2). The key policies assessed are PMD3 and ED1 of the LDP. e not relevant and have not, therefore, been
	strategic high amenity site in Peebles against which the proposal would be a The policies contained in SESplan are assessed. HIERARCHY OF DEVELOPMENT The proposal would be considered a development. LAND USE ALLOCATION The site is designated as a strategic head of the proposal would be considered and development. LAND USE ALLOCATION The site is designated as a strategic head of the proposal would be considered as a strategic head of the proposal would be considered as a strategic head of the proposal would be considered as a strategic head of the proposal would be considered as a strategic head of the proposal would be a strategic head of the proposal would be considered as a strategic head of the proposal would be considered as a strategic head of the proposal would be considered as a strategic head of the proposal would be considered as a strategic head of the proposal would be considered as a strategic head of the proposal would be considered as a strategic head of the proposal would be a strategic head of the proposal would be considered as a strategic head of the proposal would be considered as a strategic head of the proposal would be considered as a strategic head of the proposal would be considered as a strategic head of the proposal would be considered as a strategic head of the proposal would be considered as a strategic head of the proposal would be considered as a strategic head of the proposal would be considered as a strategic head of the proposal would be considered as a strategic head of the proposal would be considered as a strategic head of the proposal would be considered as a strategic head of the proposal would be considered as a strategic head of the proposa	(Cavalry Park, zEL2). The key policies assessed are PMD3 and ED1 of the LDP. e not relevant and have not, therefore, been "Local" development under the hierarchy of high amenity site for class 4 use. Policy
	strategic high amenity site in Peebles against which the proposal would be a The policies contained in SESplan are assessed. HIERARCHY OF DEVELOPMENT The proposal would be considered a development. LAND USE ALLOCATION The site is designated as a strategic by PMD3 states, amongst other things: Any other use on allocated sites will be demonstrate that:	(Cavalry Park, zEL2). The key policies assessed are PMD3 and ED1 of the LDP. e not relevant and have not, therefore, been "Local" development under the hierarchy of high amenity site for class 4 use. Policy be refused unless the developer can
	strategic high amenity site in Peebles against which the proposal would be a The policies contained in SESplan are assessed. HIERARCHY OF DEVELOPMENT The proposal would be considered a development. LAND USE ALLOCATION The site is designated as a strategic head of the proposal would be considered and development. Any other use on allocated sites will be demonstrate that: a) it is ancillary to the proposed use as	(Cavalry Park, zEL2). The key policies assessed are PMD3 and ED1 of the LDP. e not relevant and have not, therefore, been "Local" development under the hierarchy of high amenity site for class 4 use. Policy be refused unless the developer can and in the case of proposed housing
	strategic high amenity site in Peebles against which the proposal would be against which the proposal would be a The policies contained in SESplan are assessed. HIERARCHY OF DEVELOPMENT The proposal would be considered a development. LAND USE ALLOCATION The site is designated as a strategic of PMD3 states, amongst other things: Any other use on allocated sites will be demonstrate that: a) it is ancillary to the proposed use a development, it still enables the site to	(Cavalry Park, zEL2). The key policies assessed are PMD3 and ED1 of the LDP. e not relevant and have not, therefore, been "Local" development under the hierarchy of high amenity site for class 4 use. Policy be refused unless the developer can
	strategic high amenity site in Peebles against which the proposal would be against which the proposal would be a The policies contained in SESplan are assessed. HIERARCHY OF DEVELOPMENT The proposal would be considered a development. LAND USE ALLOCATION The site is designated as a strategic of PMD3 states, amongst other things: Any other use on allocated sites will be demonstrate that: a) it is ancillary to the proposed use a development, it still enables the site to	assessed are PMD3 and ED1 of the LDP. e not relevant and have not, therefore, been "Local" development under the hierarchy of high amenity site for class 4 use. Policy be refused unless the developer can and in the case of proposed housing to be developed in accordance with the
	strategic high amenity site in Peebles against which the proposal would be a gainst which the proposal would be a gainst which the proposal would be a assessed. HIERARCHY OF DEVELOPMENT The proposal would be considered a development. LAND USE ALLOCATION The site is designated as a strategic of PMD3 states, amongst other things: Any other use on allocated sites will be demonstrate that: a) it is ancillary to the proposed use a development, it still enables the site to indicative capacity shown in the Land planning briefs;; b) there is a constraint on the site and	assessed are PMD3 and ED1 of the LDP. e not relevant and have not, therefore, been "Local" development under the hierarchy of high amenity site for class 4 use. Policy be refused unless the developer can and in the case of proposed housing to be developed in accordance with the to Use Proposals table and/or associated and no reasonable prospect of its becoming
	strategic high amenity site in Peebles against which the proposal would be against which the proposal would be a the policies contained in SESplan are assessed. HIERARCHY OF DEVELOPMENT The proposal would be considered a development. LAND USE ALLOCATION The site is designated as a strategic head of the proposal would be considered and development. LAND USE ALLOCATION The site is designated as a strategic head of the site is demonstrated that: a) it is ancillary to the proposed use and development, it still enables the site to indicative capacity shown in the Land planning briefs;; b) there is a constraint on the site and available for the development of the proposed was a strategic head.	assessed are PMD3 and ED1 of the LDP. e not relevant and have not, therefore, been "Local" development under the hierarchy of high amenity site for class 4 use. Policy be refused unless the developer can and in the case of proposed housing to be developed in accordance with the to Use Proposals table and/or associated and no reasonable prospect of its becoming proposed use within the Local Plan period;
	strategic high amenity site in Peebles against which the proposal would be against which the proposal would be a the policies contained in SESplan are assessed. HIERARCHY OF DEVELOPMENT The proposal would be considered a development. LAND USE ALLOCATION The site is designated as a strategic head of the proposal would be considered as a strategic head of the site is designated as a strategic head of the proposed use and the	assessed are PMD3 and ED1 of the LDP. e not relevant and have not, therefore, been "Local" development under the hierarchy of high amenity site for class 4 use. Policy be refused unless the developer can and in the case of proposed housing to be developed in accordance with the all Use Proposals table and/or associated d no reasonable prospect of its becoming proposed use within the Local Plan period; at community benefits that are considered to
	strategic high amenity site in Peebles against which the proposal would be against which the proposal would be a the policies contained in SESplan are assessed. HIERARCHY OF DEVELOPMENT The proposal would be considered a development. LAND USE ALLOCATION The site is designated as a strategic head of the proposal would be considered and development. LAND USE ALLOCATION The site is designated as a strategic head of the site is demonstrated that: a) it is ancillary to the proposed use and development, it still enables the site to indicative capacity shown in the Land planning briefs;; b) there is a constraint on the site and available for the development of the proposed was a strategic head.	assessed are PMD3 and ED1 of the LDP. e not relevant and have not, therefore, been "Local" development under the hierarchy of high amenity site for class 4 use. Policy be refused unless the developer can and in the case of proposed housing to be developed in accordance with the all Use Proposals table and/or associated d no reasonable prospect of its becoming proposed use within the Local Plan period; at community benefits that are considered to

The proposed part change of use to a day centre for the elderly would not be ancillary to the wider Cavalry Park site. There are no known constraints on the site which would prevent its continued use as class 4. There may be some community benefits but those are not significant enough to outweigh the need to maintain the existing use. The proposal would be contrary to policy PMD3

PROTECTION OF BUSINESS AND INDUSTRIAL LAND

Cavalry Park is designated as a strategic high amenity site for class 4 use. Policy ED1 states, amongst other things:

The council rigorously protects strategic business and industrial sites for employment uses.

a) Strategic High Amenity Sites

Development on Strategic High Amenity Sites will be predominantly for Class 4 use. Other complementary commercial activity e.g. offices, call centres and high technology uses may be acceptable if it enhances the quality of the business park as an employment location.

The use as a day centre for the elderly is not one which would be complimentary nor would it enhance the wider Cavalry Park site. There are pressures to find new business and industrial land within the Tweeddale area. The development of a Class 10 Use at this location, would ultimately lead to the loss of allocated business and industrial land when there is known pressure for business and industrial land. The proposal would be contrary to policy ED1.

ROADS

I have consulted my colleagues in Roads. They comment that the proposed use is unlikely to generate a significant change in the demand for parking.

OTHER

It is acknowledged that covid-19 is having an impact on the economy and we all have a role to play in helping businesses set-up and expand. That would be material consideration to the determination of an application. If a planning application were to be submitted, that should be backed up by supporting information which could detail, for example, any other potential sites / buildings which have been considered for the proposed use.

Officer's conclusion

The proposal would not accord with the terms of the LDP. Support could not be given to the proposed development.