

## **APPENDIX B: Support & Notes table**

**LDP2 PROPOSED PLAN RESPONSES TO NON-OBJECTIONS (SUPPORTS & NOTES)**

| SETTLEMENT/<br>POLICY         | SITE CODE | CONTRIBUTOR                                  | COMMENT<br>TYPE  | SUMMARY  | PROPOSED RESPONSE         |
|-------------------------------|-----------|--|------------------|--|---------------------------|
| <b>General</b>                |           | 998 Colin Dumma                              | Support          | Contributor expresses support for the Plan in general and unqualified terms.   | Support noted             |
| <b>General</b>                |           | 1036 Scottish Water                          | Support & Advice | Contributor broadly welcomes reference to key infrastructure considerations and advises that they will support each of the proposed development sites contained within the Settlement Profiles. They state that while they have made every effort to plan for future growth throughout the Scottish Borders, it can be inherently challenging to plan for high water and wastewater business needs. They therefore advise any prospective business to contact them early in the planning stages of any site to discuss their plans especially if the intent is to use large volumes of water and or wastewater services.   | Support and advice noted. |
| <b>Miscellaneous</b>          |           | 057 Scottish National Parks Strategy Project | Support & Advice | Contributor provides support for the Plan's position with respect to consideration of a Scottish Borders National Park, and provides advice to the Council in the following terms: (a) Representation is made on behalf of the Scottish Campaign for National Parks (SCNP) and the Association for the Protection of Rural Scotland (APRS); (b) Fully supports the statement at Paragraph 8.15 (Chapter 8) that the Council will further consider the proposal for a Scottish Borders National Park, including investigating what would be involved in establishing a designation and considering site options; (c) Provides general advice with respect to the potential benefits to the local environment, local communities and the local economy from the designation of a National Park, but advises that it has identified specifically, particular potential in the Scottish Borders within a proposed Cheviots National Park; and (d) Outlines the process of identifying and establishing a National Park, should such a proposal be taken forward. | Support and advice noted. |
| <b>Volume 1<br/>Chapter 2</b> |           | 988 Rosalyn Anderson                         | General          | In respect of 2.3 to 2.5. Changing demographics/ageing population is a key consideration for housing, accessibility, and health issues. Housing requirements   | Comments noted            |

|                               |  |                         |                 |   |                          |
|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------|-----------------|---|--------------------------|
|                               |  |                         |                 | <p>need a robust assessment.</p> <p>In respect of 2.9. Acknowledgement of the importance of greenspace and benefits to health and wellbeing for all and linkages to climate change challenges and biodiversity.</p> <p>In respect of 2.13. Access to services and to accessible public transport are crucial for ageing population and disabled.</p> <p>In respect of 2.14 &amp; 2.15. Believes that the reinstatement of the rail line to Carlisle will boost post-COVID unemployment and green tourism. While having housing close to transport hubs is sensible. Mixed housing could help sustain communities and encourage people nearer to support services reducing strain on health and social services.</p> <p>In respect of 2.16. Suggests there are “mobile network blackholes” in the Borders especially within houses and it is suggested that 5G won't fix this.</p> |                          |
| <b>Volume 1<br/>Chapter 2</b> |  | 843 M & J<br>Ballantyne | Support         | <p>The Contributor supports paragraph 2.10. Increasingly across Scotland emerging draft development plans contain requirements for developer contributions for healthcare provision. This is always a point of contention for two reasons. Firstly, the NHS is provided for by general taxation which housebuilders and new residents of the homes they build are contributors. Secondly, GPs tend to operate as private businesses and it would be wholly inappropriate for one private business to pay for another through planning obligations. For this reason, the Contributor welcomes Scottish Borders Council adopting the correct approach to this matter and acknowledging that the NHS is responsible for healthcare provision.</p>  | Support noted.           |
| <b>Volume 1<br/>Chapter 2</b> |  | 589 NHS<br>Borders      | General/Support | <p>Contributor welcomes acknowledgement at Paragraph 2.9: of the impact of housing developments on demand for health services, although only primary care services are noted. They advise that other services impacted are general community health services, potentially children's</p>  | Support and advice noted |

|                               |  |                    |                     |  |  |
|-------------------------------|--|--------------------|---------------------|--|--|
|                               |  |                    |                     | and maternity services, mental health service provisions and potentially impact on acute health services, in particular the ability to access them. These services would include District Nursing, Community Allied Health Services such as Physio-Therapy, Occupation Health, Health Visitors, Dentistry, Pharmacy and others.  |  |
| <b>Volume 1<br/>Chapter 2</b> |  | 589 NHS<br>Borders | Support             | Contributor welcomes recognition at Paragraph 2.10: of the importance of engaging with ourselves [NHS] regarding the health service implications of development. An indication of the formal ways in which this would be carried out would be helpful  | Support noted  |
| <b>Volume 1<br/>Chapter 3</b> |  | 589 NHS<br>Borders | General/<br>Support | <p>The Contributor notes in paragraph 3.8 9 (and makes the same point in relation to para 4.9 as well) the notes the description of Special [Strategic] Development Areas and their locations and extent. They state that they would find it useful to have early engagement regarding the likely development process and timelines for these areas to assist in forward planning for health care facilities and capacity.</p> <p>In respect to paragraph 3.11, the Contributor notes and agrees with the importance of the Community Planning Partnership and the Community Plan as processes for development within the Scottish Borders and look forward to working closely as one of the Community Planning Partners in coordinating planning through these.</p> <p>In relation to paragraph 3.12, the Contributor notes and supports the Locality Action Plans, which are already strongly influencing planning for the health and social care needs of the local populations. They would hope to see these develop to become core planning tools in the future. The IJB's Locality Working Groups were stood down during the pandemic, and a new methodology is expected to be employed through TEAMS in the future. These could be utilised to support the health agenda within the LDP as it develops further.</p> | <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Comments and agreement noted.</p> <p>Comments and support noted.</p> |
| <b>Volume 1<br/>Chapter 4</b> |  | 589 NHS<br>Borders | General             | Contributor advises with respect to Paragraph 4.8 that the promotion of tourism brings a fluctuating transient   | Advice noted   |

|   |  |                                  |         |  |                |
|---|--|----------------------------------|---------|--|----------------|
| <b>Vision, Aims &amp; Spatial Strategy</b>                    |  |                                  |         | <p>population, which can increase pressures on aspects of the local health service, including primary care, emergency care etc. It would be helpful to work together to identify the nature of the likely tourism population (e.g., potential appeal to older people, increase in outdoor activities such as mountain biking which places specific pressures on the health services).</p> <p>Contributor advises that their advice for Para 3.8 already noted above, is also relevant to Para 4.9.</p>   |                |
| <b>Volume 1 Chapter 4 Vision, Aims &amp; Spatial Strategy</b> |  | 806 Aldi Stores Ltd              | Support | Contributor welcomes the ambitions of the LDP to provide opportunities for the economic growth of the region and job creation, and supports the ambitions to reduce travel in order to work towards a low carbon economy. They support the ambitions of the plan, and consider that it is important that the policies contained within it, can help deliver economic growth.   | Support noted. |
| <b>Volume 1 Chapter 4 Vision, Aims &amp; Spatial Strategy</b> |  | 833 Scottish Land & Estates      | Support | Contributor is supportive of Aims and Visions, particularly having regard to Growing the Economy and Rural Environment.  | Support noted. |
| <b>Volume 1 Chapter 4 Vision, Aims &amp; Spatial Strategy</b> |  | 883 South of Scotland Enterprise | Support | The grouping of the plans aims around the themes of communities, growing the economy and sustainability works well and aligns well with SOSE's statutory duties as defined by the SOSE Act (2019). The main aims themselves are broadly supported.   | Support noted. |
| <b>Volume 1 Chapter 5 Growing Our Economy</b>                 |  | 883 South of Scotland Enterprise | Support | <p>The specific aims relating to growing the economy are broadly supported, namely to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide an adequate range of sites and premises for business/industrial uses</li> <li>• Promote economic development opportunities along the railway corridor</li> <li>• Promote the regeneration of town centres to make them vibrant and viable focal points</li> <li>• within our communities</li> <li>• Maximise and promote the Scottish Borders tourism potential and build a strong visitor</li> <li>• economy</li> <li>• Ensure the delivery of adequate infrastructure to satisfactorily serve developments.</li> </ul> | Support noted. |

|   |  |  |                             |   |  |
|---|--|--|-----------------------------|---|--|
| <p><b>Volume 1<br/>Chapter 6<br/>Planning for<br/>Housing</b></p> |  | <p>589 NHS<br/>Borders</p>                                   | <p>General/<br/>Support</p> | <p>The contributor welcomes the approach to concentrating on development in and around existing settlements, which are easier to support with health services, although note that there is potential for 'stand-alone' settlement development. This would require careful consideration of how health care needs are to be met and the implications for their services.</p>   | <p>Comments noted.</p>   |
| <p><b>Volume 1<br/>Chapter 6<br/>Planning for<br/>Housing</b></p> |  | <p>769 Peebles<br/>Civic Society</p>                         | <p>General</p>              | <p>Services and amenities need to be more fully integrated into the planning process. Adequate water, drainage and utility services are currently material considerations for any proposed development. However, the availability of adequate education and healthcare resources in the relevant area should also be material considerations for significant new housing developments.</p> <p>Local communities should be encouraged and supported to take an interest in their own future development.</p> | <p>Comments noted.<br/>All new sites being included within the Proposed LDP were subject to a full site assessment and consultation process. This included with; education, NHS, Roads Planning Service, Scottish Water &amp; SEPA. Their comments were taken on board in the site assessment.</p> <p>Comments noted.<br/>The Council encouraged local communities to engage and comment on the Proposed LDP. There were a variety of consultation events for the Main Issues Report and Proposed LDP which are outlined within Appendix 4: Publicity and Consultation, of the Proposed LDP.</p> |
| <p><b>Volume 1<br/>Chapter 6<br/>Planning for<br/>Housing</b></p> |  | <p>1032 St<br/>Boswells Parish<br/>Community<br/>Council</p> | <p>General</p>              | <p>Paragraph (4.4): Town and village centres should accommodate housing as a priority as well as following the town centre first principles.</p> <p>Paragraph (6.8 and 6.9): The jargon used in these paragraphs is unintelligible to ordinary folk.</p>  | <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Comments noted.<br/>The wording contained</p>  |

|  |  |  |  |   |   |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|
|  |  |  |  | <p>Paragraph (6.10): On the evidence of current housing demand and construction rates, there can be no arguments for new standalone settlements being contemplated in the Scottish Borders. It is wholly inappropriate for the Council to be promoting fishing expeditions by developers and/or landowners towards an end.</p> <p>Paragraph (6.7): A hyperlink to the consultant's study should be provided. Here again it will be useful to understand whether the climate crisis in particular and sustainable development aims in general influenced their findings.</p> | <p>within paragraphs 6.8 &amp; 6.9 explains and sets out the context in respect of the housing land supply and allocations being taken forward within the Proposed LDP.</p> <p>Comments noted. There are no new settlements proposed as part of the Proposed LDP. This paragraph (6.10) sets out that in the future longer term, it may be that ideas come forward for new 'stand-alone' settlements in high demand areas.</p> <p>Comments noted. The document is available to view on the internet at <a href="#">this location</a>.</p> <p>The purpose of the study was to identify and assess options for housing and employment land in the Western Rural Growth Area, centred on Tweeddale. It sought to identify potential development areas for short and long term, taking account of key environmental and recreational assets of the area. The study informed the development allocations included within</p> |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|

|  |  |   |                             |   |  |
|--|--|---|-----------------------------|---|--|
|  |  |   |                             |   | <p>the Proposed LDP for the Tweeddale area.</p> <p>It should be noted that all sites identified were subject to a full site assessment and consultation.</p> |
| <p><b>Volume 1<br/>Chapter 7<br/>Supporting Our<br/>Town Centres</b></p> |  | <p>883 South of<br/>Scotland<br/>Enterprise</p> | <p>Support and<br/>note</p> | <p>The contributor states that the LDP rightly recognises the challenges and uncertainties presented by the Coronavirus (COVID-19) Pandemic, which is welcomed. The commitment at paragraph 2.8 of the LDP which states that “implications COVID-19 may be having on, for example, the economy, performance of town centres, business recovery, house building, health and well-being will be addressed as part of the decision making process for relevant planning applications” is equally welcomed, as are additional references South of Scotland Enterprise throughout the LDP. This reflects that economic recovery efforts and indeed the emergence of new opportunities post the pandemic, will likely require more flexibility than the LDP presently allows for.</p> <p>The specific aims relating to growing the economy are broadly supported, including the promotion the regeneration of town centres to make them vibrant and viable focal points within our communities.</p> | <p>Support and comments noted.</p>   |
| <p><b>Volume 1<br/>Chapter 7<br/>Supporting Our<br/>Town Centres</b></p> |  | <p>988 Rosalyn<br/>Anderson</p>                 | <p>Note</p>                 | <p>The contributor states that the Kelso data looks impressive up to 2019 and presumably relates very much to tourism due to the races, fishing and Springwood Park all of which will sadly have been impacted by COVID and which also do carry a fairly heavy carbon footprint.</p> <p>The drive to develop tourism across the Borders therefore, in normal times, would seem to be one of the keys to increasing footfall on the high streets of our towns, if we can address public transport links. As we move forward the marketing of the Great Tapestry of Scotland in Galashiels will be critical. Too many people who have never seen it have a negative view of an</p>  | <p>Comments noted.</p>   |



|   |  |  |                       |   |                          |
|---|--|--|-----------------------|---|--------------------------|
|   |  |  |                       | incredible work of art created by the Scottish people. We need local people to support endeavours such as this to bring in not just 'standard' tourists but school, college and university students, potentially from across the world to learn from our historical links to the textile industry and our very highly regarded textile degree courses in Galashiels.  |                          |
| <b>Volume 1<br/>Chapter 8<br/>Delivering<br/>Sustainability<br/>and Climate<br/>Change Agenda</b> |  | 589 NHS<br>Borders                                   | Support and<br>advice | With regard to Paragraph 8.3, the Contributor welcomes the emphasis on developing sustainable transport models, including the importance of developing communities to support active modes of transport to maintain health. They also welcome the requirement to ensure effective and easy-to-access public transport links. They advise that these need to fit with design of transport routes to enable easy access to health facilities, including GP practices, community services and the Borders General Hospital. They note with regard to the latter, that these can be challenging to access from some key areas, including the south (Hawick, Selkirk etc), the Berwickshire coast and the north of the region. | Support and advice noted |
| <b>ED1: Protection<br/>of Business and<br/>Industrial Land</b>                                    |  | 1043 Scottish<br>Environment<br>Protection<br>Agency | Support               | The Contributor supports the retention of this policy and notes the modifications included. The Contributor seeks a modification to the Policy which is considered under Issue No. 10.  | Support noted.           |
| <b>ED8: Caravan<br/>and Camping<br/>Sites</b>   |  | 983 NatureScot                                       | Support               | In relation to Policy ED8, the Contributor supports the policy amendment that caravan and camping sites should also be subject to high standards of placemaking and design.   | Support noted.           |
| <b>ED8: Caravan<br/>and Camping<br/>Sites</b>   |  | 1043 Scottish<br>Environment<br>Protection<br>Agency | Support               | The Contributor supports the principle of Policy ED8.   | Support noted.           |
| <b>ED9: Renewable<br/>Energy<br/>Development</b>  |  | 027<br>Northumberland<br>National Park<br>Authority  | No objection          | In the context of commenting on wind farm development and potential for impacts on the Northumberland National Park, the contributor explicitly advises that they have no objection to the Plan in general.   | No objection noted.      |
| <b>ED9: Renewable<br/>Energy<br/>Development</b>  |  | 802 Renewable<br>Energy Systems                      | Support               | Contributor welcomes the clear statement that the Council 'will support' further renewable energy proposals, including commercial scale wind farms, and that these 'will be approved', where these can be   | Support noted.           |

|   |  |   |                  |   |   |
|---|--|---|------------------|---|---|
|   |  |   |                  | accommodated without unacceptable significant adverse effects.  |   |
| <b>ED9: Renewable Energy Development</b>  |  | 817 SSE Renewables                          | Support          | Contributor welcomes the statement in Policy ED9 that: "the Council will support proposals for both large scale and community scale renewable energy development including commercial wind farms", giving due regard to relevant environmental and community considerations.  | Support noted.  |
| <b>ED10: Protection of Prime Quality Agricultural Land and Carbon Rich Soils</b>      |  | 048 Scottish Forestry                       | Advice           | Largely advisory, advising that the contributor is, in association with the Forestry Research Agency, currently revising its own guidance on woodland creation and retention of peat/organic soils. The contributor anticipates that this will "cut across" the LDP, but that there will also likely be synergies in approach and intention. It is noted that Scottish Forestry and Forestry Research Agency are revising their guidance on woodland creation and retention of peat/organic soils.  | Advice noted. No modifications to Policy ED10 or PLDP has been requested by this contributor or is otherwise suggested by the advice of this contributor. No modification or action required.   |
| <b>ED10: Protection of Prime Quality Agricultural Land and Carbon Rich Soils</b>      |  | 802 Renewable Energy Systems                | Support & Advice | Contributor welcomes the clarifying statement in Paragraph 1.1 of the preamble to Policy ED10 and then in Policy ED10 itself, that this policy does not apply to renewable energy developments, which are instead to be assessed against the requirements of Policy ED9. No modification is sought to Policy ED10 or its preamble. Contributor considers that this useful statement could be applied elsewhere in LDP2 to remove any uncertainties about which policies in addition to Policy ED9, would be relevant to the consideration of a renewable energy proposal. The contributor appears to be referring specifically to Policy ED12, and goes on to raise these concerns directly in relation to that policy. | Advice noted. However, the concerns are most appropriately considered in relation to Policy ED12, and not in relation to Policy ED10, of which the contributor appears fully supportive, without applying any qualifications or seeking any amendments. No modification or action required relative to Policy ED10. |
| <b>ED11: Safeguarding of Mineral Deposits &amp; ED12: Mineral and Coal Extraction</b> |  | 405 The Coal Authority                      | Support          | Contributor supports the inclusion of Policy ED11: Safeguarding of Mineral Deposits and Policy ED12: Mineral and Coal Extraction.   | Support noted.  |
| <b>ED11: Safeguarding of Mineral Deposits &amp; ED12: Mineral and Coal</b>            |  | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Support          | Contributor supports retention of Policy ED11 – Safeguarding of Mineral Deposits and the retention of Policy ED12 – Mineral and Coal Extraction, and welcomes the reference to a presumption against peat extraction and other development likely to have an  | Support noted.  |

|   |  |   |         |   |                |
|---|--|---|---------|---|----------------|
| <b>Extraction</b>   |  |   |         | adverse effect on peatland and/or carbon rich soils within class 1 and 2 peatland areas.  |                |
| <b>ED12: Mineral and Coal Extraction</b>                                  |  | 983 NatureScot                              | Support | Contributor welcomes and supports the policy amendment to Policy ED12, for a presumption against peat extraction and other developments likely to have an adverse effect on peatland and carbon rich soils.   |                |
| <b>HD4: Further Housing Land Safeguarding</b>                             |  | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Support | The Contributor supports the retention and minor amendments to this policy.   | Support noted. |
| <b>HD5: Care and Nursing Homes</b>  |  | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Support | The Contributor supports the retention of Policy HD5.   | Support noted. |
| <b>EP1: International Nature Conservation Sites and Protected Species</b> |  | 048 Scottish Forestry                       | Support | The Contributor states that Policy EP1 is well written and they are confident that there is good cross over with other national and Scottish Forestry/ENFOR Directorate policies.   | Support noted. |
| <b>EP2: National Nature Conservation Sites and Protected Species</b>      |  | 048 Scottish Forestry                       | Support | The Contributor states that Policy EP2 is well written and they are confident that there is good cross over with other national and Scottish Forestry/ENFOR Directorate policies.   | Support noted. |
| <b>EP3: Local Biodiversity and Geodiversity</b>                           |  | 048 Scottish Forestry                       | Support | The Contributor states that Policy EP3 is well written and they are confident that there is good cross over with other national and Scottish Forestry/ENFOR Directorate policies.   | Support noted. |
| <b>Local Biodiversity Site No.25 – Ingraston Moss</b>                     |  | 119 Giles Brooksbank                        | Support | The Contributor welcomes SBC's due consideration to the proposed site to be included in the biodiversity programme. The site plan includes a small proportion of their land towards the eastern part of the map. In recent years attempts have been undertaken to convert part of the identified land into an industrial site. One of the reasons for application rejection was based on ED10 of the LDP, which sets out the protection of carbon rich soil and the proposal would add to the protection of this land. They welcome the adoption. | Support noted. |

|  |  |   |         |  |  |
|--|--|---|---------|--|--|
| <b>Local Biodiversity Site No.171 – Romany Marsh</b> |  | 012 James Wauchope                          | Support | The Contributor states that they have no great problem with an environmental designation for the site. Indeed when we fenced it off and planted some trees in the top end it was very much with a view of general enhancement of its value environmentally.  | Support noted.   |
| <b>EP4: National Scenic Areas</b>                    |  | 048 Scottish Forestry                       | Support | The Contributor states that Policy EP4 is well written and they are confident that there is good cross over with other national and Scottish Forestry/ENFOR Directorate policies.  | Support noted.   |
| <b>EP5: Special Landscape Areas</b>                  |  | 048 Scottish Forestry                       | Support | The Contributor states that Policy EP5 is well written and they are confident that there is good cross over with other national and Scottish Forestry/ENFOR Directorate policies.  | Support noted.   |
| <b>EP7: Listed Buildings</b>                         |  | 135 Kelso and District Amenity Society      | Support | The policy as stated looks good.<br>Can we be sure they will be supported by regular inspections to pick up on any problems and enforce the policies.  | Support noted.<br>The policy will apply to any relevant planning or listed building application. Responsibility for maintenance of properties sits with property owners. |
| <b>EP9: Conservation Areas</b>                       |  | 135 Kelso and District Amenity Society      | Support | The policy as stated looks good.<br>Can we be sure they will be supported by regular inspections to pick up on any problems and enforce the policies.  | Support noted.<br>The policy will apply to any relevant planning application. Responsibility for maintenance of properties sits with property owners.                    |
| <b>EP12: Green Networks</b>                          |  | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Support | The Contributor supports the retention of Policy EP12 Green Networks.  | Support noted.   |
| <b>EP13: Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows</b>          |  | 048 Scottish Forestry                       | Support | The contributor is content with this proposal but hope that the forest and woodland strategy will continue to support woodland expansion in line with the SG climate change plan. They would also like to be reassured that SBC takes account of its own works to ensure that there is no net loss of woodland cover through its operations. | Support noted. The Council confirms to take the necessary steps as highlighted.  |
| <b>EP15: Development Affecting the Water</b>         |  | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Support | The Contributor supports the inclusion of this policy.   | Support noted.   |

|   |  |  |         |   |                |
|---|--|--|---------|---|----------------|
| <b>Environment</b>  |  |  |         |   |                |
| <b>EP16: Air Quality</b>                                      |  | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency  | Support | The Contributor supports the inclusion of this policy.  | Support noted. |
| <b>EP17: Food Growing and Community Growing Spaces</b>        |  | 122 – Peebles and District Community Council | Support | Notes that Policy EP17 is a new policy and reiterates some of the policy context.   | Comments noted |
| <b>EP17: Food Growing and Community Growing Spaces</b>        |  | 797 - Tweedgreen                             | General | Every opportunity should be taken by SBC to support allotments and encourage local food production, good for health and good for the local economy.   | Comments noted |
| <b>IS1: Policy Infrastructure and Local Service Provision</b> |  | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency  | Support | The Contributor supports the retention of this policy.  | Support noted. |
| <b>Policy IS2: Developer Contributions</b>                    |  | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency  | Support | The contributor supports the inclusion of this policy.  | Support noted. |
| <b>IS8: Flooding</b>  |  | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency  |         | The Contributor welcomes the framework provided by this policy, and are pleased to note that the policy is strengthened by the inclusion of an overarching statement that promotes the avoidance of flood risk. This precautionary approach is supported by SPP and the Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009. The Contributor has previously requested that Policy IS8 be modified to state clearly that development on the functional flood plain should be avoided and acknowledge that the policy does state that development should be located away from them. The Contributor is also pleased to note that the policy includes a statement about avoidance of flood risk as a first principle. The Contributor seeks a modification to the Policy which is considered under Issue No. 16. | Support noted. |
| <b>IS9: Waste Water Treatment Standards and Sustainable</b>   |  | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency  | Support | The Contributor supports the retention of this policy and minor amendments.   | Support noted  |

|                                     |  |   |         |  |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---------|--|--|
| Urban Drainage                      |  |   |         |  |  |
| <b>IS11: Hazardous Developments</b> |  | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Support | The Contributor supports the retention of this policy.   | Support noted.   |
| <b>IS16: Advertisements</b>         |  | 1332 St Boswells Parish Community Council   | General | In reference to Policy IS16, the Contributor states that at one time there was an area of special advertising control in St Boswells, and it would be useful to know if this is still current or has been superseded by changes in planning legislation. | <p>Advertisements are regulated by the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (Scotland) Regulations 1984.</p> <p>Part 3 of those Regulations allows planning authorities from time to time to consider whether a part of "<i>their district should be defined as an area of special control</i>". Within the Scottish Borders there are currently no Special Areas of Control designated.</p> <p>However, it should be noted that St Boswells benefits from a Conservation Area designation, and within Conservation Areas, the Council seek a higher standard of design. Further policy guidance can be found within the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Shop Fronts and Shop Signs at: <a href="#">Planning guidance - Shop fronts and shop signage  </a></p> |

|                                   |  |   |         |  |   |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|---------|--|---|
|                                   |  |   |         |  | <a href="http://scotborders.gov.uk">Scottish Borders Council (scotborders.gov.uk)</a> . |
| <b>IS18: Cemetery Provision</b>   |  | 983 NatureScot                              | Support | The Contributor welcomes the recognition of the role of cemeteries as greenspaces and as part of wider green networks in paragraph 1.2 of Policy IS18.   | Support and comments noted.   |
| <b>IS18: Cemetery Provision</b>   |  | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Support | The Contributor supports the inclusion of this policy and welcome the reference to SEPA policy and guidance within the policy wording.   | Support and comments noted.   |
| <b>PMD1: Sustainability</b>       |  | 769 Peebles Civic Society                   | Support | The Contributor welcomes the following statement within Policy PMD1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “The Council will apply the following sustainability principles which underpin all the Plan’s policies”</li> </ul>   | Support noted.  |
| <b>PMD1: Sustainability</b>       |  | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Support | The Contributor supports the retention of this policy.   | Support noted.  |
| <b>PMD2: Quality Standards</b>    |  | 769 Peebles Civic Society                   | Support | The Contributor welcomes the following statement within Policy PMD2: <i>“The aim of the policy is to ensure that all new development, not just housing, is of a high quality and respects the environment in which it is contained”</i> . The Contributor also very much welcomes the reinforced policy objectives for higher standards in placemaking and design going forward. | Support noted.  |
| <b>PMD2: Quality Standards</b>    |  | 1014 Homes for Scotland                     | Support | The Contributor welcomes the removal of the 2016 LDP policy wording on District Heat Networks. Provision of these networks through housing development in the Scottish Borders is not likely to be viable and the policy wording here on “the efficient use of energy and resources, particularly non-renewable resources” is more flexible.                                     | Support noted.  |
| <b>PMD2: Quality Standards</b>    |  | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Support | The Contributor supports the retention of this policy and welcomes the reference to active and sustainable travel modes in the Accessibility Section.  | Support noted.  |
| <b>PMD3: Land Use Allocations</b> |  | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Support | The Contributor supports the retention of this policy.   | Support noted.  |

|   |  |   |         |  |                |
|---|--|---|---------|--|----------------|
| <b>PMD4: Development Adjoining Development Boundaries</b> |  | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Support | The Contributor supports the retention of this policy.   | Support noted. |
| <b>PMD4: Development Adjoining Development Boundaries</b> |  | 843 M&J Ballantyne                          | Support | The Contributor states that the policy confirms, in criteria for exceptions in which development outwith but adjacent to the built up area will be acceptable includes instances where a strong justification can be given that <i>“there is a shortfall identified by Scottish Borders Council through the housing land audit with regard to the provision of an effective 5 year housing land supply”</i> . This approach is wholly aligned with SPP and the need to maintain an effective 5 year supply at all times. It is therefore welcomed and supported.   | Support noted. |
| <b>PMD5: Infill Development</b>                           |  | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Support | The Contributor supports the retention of this policy.   | Support noted. |
| <b>HD1: Affordable Housing</b>                            |  | 843: M & J Ballantyne                       | Support | The Contributor supports Policy HD1 and states that the LDP acknowledges in its subtext and in Policy HD1 that affordable housing requirements will normally be no more than 25% as per SPP paragraph 129. It further set out the three methods of contribution methods, those being on-site provision, off-site provision and commuted sums. That these are presented equally and without first preference is welcomed, particularly in an area such as the Scottish Borders where on-site provision as a requirement or even first preference can easily be detrimental to viability and commuted sums represent a more viable solution. | Support noted. |
| <b>HD2: Housing in the Countryside</b>                    |  | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Support | The Contributor supports the retention of this policy.   | Support noted. |
| <b>HD2: Housing in the Countryside</b>                    |  | 983 NatureScot                              | Support | The Contributor supports the policy amendment in the supporting information for Policy HD2 and welcomes the requirement that high quality design that is responsive to landscape context is a requirement for all rural development.   | Support noted. |
| <b>HD3: Protection</b>                                    |  | 1043 Scottish                               | Support | The Contributor supports the expansion of this policy.   | Support noted. |



|                               |                             |                               |         |   |  |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|---------|---|--|
| <b>of Residential Amenity</b> |                             | Environment Protection Agency |         |   |  |
| <b>General</b>                | Trees in Conservation Areas | 468 Mr S and Mrs J Grewar     | Comment | The Contributors state that the Council do not allow any more trees to be removed from within Conservation Areas.   | The Council considered applications for the removal of trees from within a Conservation on a case by case basis. It should be noted that there will be times when tree removal is necessary for example where there is a risk to safety.   |
| <b>VOLUME 2</b>               |                             |                               |         |   |  |
| <b>Settlements – General</b>  |                             | 488 Karen McDonald            | General | Scrutiny of all housing developments within the Scottish Borders should be carried out before they are given the go ahead. Schools and medical centres are struggling with the population of our towns. Including the bridges, roads etc, that cannot stand more and more traffic.  | Comments noted. It should be noted that all sites being included within the Proposed LDP have been subject to a full site assessment, including consultation with NHS, education and the Roads Planning Service. Any proposed development would be subject to a planning application, which would also be subject to consultation. |
| <b>Settlements – General</b>  |                             | 589 NHS Borders               | General | <p>The Contributor states that they would welcome the opportunity to work closely and at an early stage with the Council on the planning and development of housing sites.</p> <p>The Contributor states that based on the information in the Proposed Local Development Plan, there are three areas where they would welcome guidance or early involvement in developments;</p> <p>1. Developments that are likely to attract specific groups who may have particular health care needs. These</p> | Comments noted. The Council would be pleased to work closely with NHS Borders and assist in providing guidance where required.   |

|                |                    |                                      |         |   |                |
|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------|---------|---|----------------|
|                |                    |                                      |         | <p>would include developments likely to attract older people, those of childbearing age or with children and developments with specific health needs (e.g. mental; health, physical disability etc).</p> <p>2. Specific known developments or land allocations that will generate Planning Briefs, where they can assess the potential impact on health services and start any required planning at an early stage to address these.</p> <p>3. Based on the numbers of units identified within Volume 2: Settlements, the locations they would wish to review in terms of likely potential for development and current health service provision, based on the size of potential developments or the proportion of the local population that developments would represent are;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Newtown St Boswells</li> <li>• Reston</li> <li>• Eddleston</li> <li>• Greenlaw</li> <li>• Tweedbank</li> <li>• Swinton</li> <li>• Cockburnspath</li> <li>• Walkerburn</li> <li>• Coldstream</li> </ul> <p>The Contributor would also like to assess the impact of the size of development in the following locations on current health service capacity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Galashiels</li> <li>• Kelso</li> <li>• Hawick</li> <li>• Peebles</li> <li>• Eyemouth</li> <li>• Tweedbank</li> </ul> |                |
| <b>Ashkirk</b> | EA200 – Cransfield | 907 Gordon Hunter                    | Support | The Contributor supports the continued allocation of the site.  | Support noted. |
| <b>Ashkirk</b> | EA200 – Cransfield | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection | Note    | There is a small watercourse on the opposite side of the road. There is no evidence that it flows within the site. Any surface runoff from the development should be  | Comment noted. |

|                          |  |   |         |  |  |
|--------------------------|--|---|---------|--|--|
|                          |  | Agency                                      |         | carefully designed to ensure there is no increase downstream.  |  |
| <b>Ayton</b>             | AAYTO003 – Lawfield                    | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourse flowing through the site. Majority of site is likely to be developable.   | Comment noted. A relevant site requirement is included within the Proposed Plan.   |
| <b>Bonchester Bridge</b> | ABONC003 – Site opposite Memorial Hall | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | The Main Issues Reports states that a FRA will be required to inform site layout, design and potential mitigation. In addition, no development should take place over existing culverts (this should include proposed culverts). The Contributor agrees with this statement. A bridge adjacent to the site may exacerbate flooding at the site. MIR mentions excluding small area of flood risk from residential development. The Contributor would require a FRA to identify the extent of the 1:200 year floodplain. May constrain the number of houses on site. | Comment noted.   |
| <b>Broughton</b>         | TB10B – Springwell Brae                | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | The Contributor states that based on topographic information available, there is sufficient height difference between the allocation and the Broughton Water. Should the boundary change then SEPA would require reconciliation. Surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage.  | Comment noted.   |
| <b>Broughton</b>         | Settlement Boundary (ABROU002)         | 565 Emma Lambe                              | Support | The Contributor supports the continued inclusion of site ABROU002 within the Development Boundary for Broughton.   | Support noted.   |
| <b>Burnmouth</b>         | ABURN003 – Lyall Terrace II            | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | Surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage.   | Comment noted. The Planning Brief for the site states that a SUDS scheme for treatment of surface water run-off would be required. |
| <b>Cardrona</b>          | MCARD006 – North of Horsburgh Bridge   | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | The Contributor states that they are satisfied with the developer requirements. There are bridges along this reach which could potentially exacerbate flooding. Site will likely be heavily constrained due to flood risk.   | Comment noted. A relevant site requirement is included within the Proposed Plan.   |
| <b>Cardrona</b>          | SCARD002 – Land at Nether Horsburgh    | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | The Contributor states that they require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourses which flow through and adjacent to the site as well as the River Tweed. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site which   | Comment noted. A relevant site requirement is included within the Proposed Plan.   |

|                      |                        |   |         |   |  |
|----------------------|------------------------|---|---------|---|--|
|                      |                        |   |         | may exacerbate flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Site may be constrained due to flood risk.   |  |
| <b>Chirnside</b>     | ACHIR003 – Crosshill   | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | Surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage.  | Comment noted. A relevant site requirement is included within the Proposed Plan, in respect of flood risk. |
| <b>Chirnside</b>     | zEL1 – Southfield      | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | Surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage.  | Comment noted.   |
| <b>Chirnside</b>     | zEL25 – Berwick Road   | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | Surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage.  | Comment noted.   |
| <b>Clovenfords</b>   | EC6 – Clovenfords West | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | The Planning Brief mentions requirement for FRA and therefore the Contributor is satisfied with the developer requirements. The Contributor requires an FRA which assesses the risk from the Caddon Water which flows along the perimeter of the site. Site will likely be constrained due to flood risk. There are bridges/culverts along this reach which could potentially exacerbate flooding. Surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage. | Comment noted.   |
| <b>Cockburnspath</b> | BCO10B – Burnwood      | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Cockburnspath Burn which flows adjacent to the site. Majority of site will likely be developable.  | Comment noted. A relevant site requirement is included within the Proposed Plan, in respect of a FRA.      |
| <b>Cockburnspath</b> | BCO4B – Dunglass Park  | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues adjacent or encroaching onto the site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the Flood Prevention Officer.  | Comment noted.   |
| <b>Coldstream</b>    | ACOLD011 – Hillview    | 800 Sir Ilay Campbell                       | Support | The Contributor supports the inclusion of ACOLD011 in the Proposed Plan and make would welcome early sight  | Support noted.   |

|                   |                                     |   |         |  |  |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---------|--|--|
|                   | North 1<br>(Phase 1)                |   |         | of any draft Planning Brief in the form of Supplementary Planning Guidance produced for the combined sites. In relation to vehicular access, planning permission was granted on 6 May 2020 (19/01317/FUL) for the construction of a vehicular access from Hill View to allocation (ACOLD011), and this has been designed to serve both Phase 1 and 2.  |  |
| <b>Coldstream</b> | ACOLD014 – Hillview North (Phase 2) | 800 Sir Ilay Campbell                       | Support | The Contributor supports the inclusion of ACOLD014, in addition to ACOLD011 in the Proposed Plan and make would welcome early sight of any draft Planning Brief in the form of Supplementary Planning Guidance produced for the combined sites. In relation to vehicular access, planning permission was granted on 6 May 2020 (19/01317/FUL) for the construction of a vehicular access from Hill View to allocation (ACOLD011), and this has been designed to serve both Phase 1 and 2.  | Support noted.   |
| <b>Coldstream</b> | ACOLD014 – Hillview North (Phase 2) | 983 NatureScot                              | Support | The Contributor welcomes the addition of site requirements as suggested in our MIR response. We also welcome the proposal to adopt a joint site planning brief for this site alongside ACOLD011. This presents a better opportunity to improve setting, deliver green networks, path connectivity and more cohesive development overall.   | Support noted.   |
| <b>Coldstream</b> | ACOLD014 – Hillview North (Phase 2) | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. In addition, the surface water flood map indicates a potential flow path which can indicate a potential small watercourse. Review of Scottish Water information and historic maps does not indicate the presence of a small watercourse. This should be explored further during site investigations. | Comment noted. A relevant site requirement is included within the Proposed Plan, in respect of potential flood risk. |
| <b>Coldstream</b> | zEL27 – Coldstream Workshops        | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues on the site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the Flood Prevention Officer.   | Comments noted.  |
| <b>Coldstream</b> | zEL28 – Hillview Industrial Estate  | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues on the site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the Flood Prevention Officer.   | Comments noted   |

|                   |                                  |  |         |  |  |
|-------------------|----------------------------------|--|---------|--|--|
| <b>Coldstream</b> | zRO17 – Duns Road                | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency        | Note    | Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues on the site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the Flood Prevention Officer.   | Comments noted.  |
| <b>Crailing</b>   | ACRAI001 – Crailing Toll         | 661 Lothian Estates                                | Note    | <p>The contributor notes the allocation of Crailing Toll (ACRAI001) and the statement regarding preferred areas for future expansion within the Crailing settlement profile.</p> <p>The contributor states they assume that this qualification would be based on the interest shown and the quality of home developed with the Crailing Toll Site.</p> | <p>Comments noted. Regarding potential future housing allocations within Crailing, this will be reviewed as part of the next Local Development Plan.</p> <p>Any sites submitted for consideration as part of the next LDP will be assessed accordingly. The allocation of sites will be based on the housing need and demand within that Housing Market Area not the build quality of adjacent developments.</p> |
| <b>Crailing</b>   | ACRAI001 – Crailing Toll         | 799 Crailing, Eckford and Nisbet Community Council | Note    | The Contributor notes the continuation of the existing housing allocation at Crailing Toll (ACRAI001) for 5 units.   | Comments noted.  |
| <b>Darnick</b>    | ADARN005 – Land South of Darnlee | 985 Paul Cathrow                                   | Support | The Contributor supports the allocation of site.   | Support noted.   |
| <b>Darnick</b>    | ADARN005 – Land South of Darnlee | 054 David Slater                                   | Note    | The Contributor notes that no neighbour notification was received of the proposed allocation. This matter has been investigated and the Council can confirm that the Contributor's property is outwith 20 metres of the site and did not therefore require to be served a neighbour notification.  | Comments noted, no action required.  |
| <b>Darnick</b>    | ADARN005 – Land South of Darnlee | 983 NatureScot                                     | Note    | Welcomes the site requirements which have been included as recommended at the Main Issues Report stage relating to development at ADARN005 (Land south of Darnlee).  | Comments noted.  |
| <b>Darnick</b>    | ADARN005 –                       | 985 Paul   | Support | The Contributor supports the allocation of the site and  | Support/comments noted.  |

|             |                                  |   |      |   |   |
|-------------|----------------------------------|---|------|---|---|
|             | Land South of Darnlee            | Cathrow                                     |      | notes that it will be essential to take this opportunity to widen the eastern end of Broomilees Road. This is already a pinch point and with increased flow of traffic to recent new development at Gilroy Gardens and no footpath it does present a risk to all road users including pedestrians.  |   |
| <b>Duns</b> | General                          | 63 Joanne Middleton                         | Note | The Contributor made comments following correspondence with the department requesting a copy of the Proposed Plan. It would appear that the comments are a Development Management matter and are not related to the Proposed Plan.  | Comment noted.  |
| <b>Duns</b> | ADUNS010 – Todlaw Playing Fields | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note | We are satisfied that the developer requirements are sufficient to address flood risk at the site. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues to the north of the site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the Flood Prevention Officer.  | Comment noted.  |
| <b>Duns</b> | BD12B – Berrywell East           | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note | The Planning Brief states that a FRA is unlikely, which is acceptable. Please note that regular flooding in west end of public park was noted by locals this is suspected to be exacerbated by the depositing of fill material on a field to the north west in recent years.  | Comment noted.  |
| <b>Duns</b> | RDUNS002 – Duns Primary School   | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note | Site is outwith SEPA flood maps. Recommend that contact is made with the Flood Prevention Officer due to flooding in public park to the east.   | Comment noted.  |
| <b>Duns</b> | SDUNS001 – South of Earlsmeadow  | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note | We are satisfied with the developer requirements. Please note the following comments. We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the potentially culverted small watercourse which is identified as being located along the northern boundary. Recent studies have not identified the exact location of the culvert. We do not support development over culverts that are to remain active. We would note that the OS Map identifies this area as boggy which may constrain development. We also understand that land-raising done as part of the high school development may alter flooding and flow-paths. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues at this site or immediately adjacent. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the | Comment noted. Relevant site requirements are attached within the Proposed Plan, in respect of a FRA, flood risk and ground conditions. |

|                  |                                   |  |      |   |  |
|------------------|-----------------------------------|--|------|---|--|
|                  |                                   |  |      | <p>Flood Prevention Officer.</p> <p>We require a FRA which assesses the risk to this site as noted by local residents. Careful design may be required to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere. Area shown as marshy on OS map.</p>   |  |
| <b>Duns</b>      | zEL8 – Peelrig Farm               | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency        | Note | <p>We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourse which flows along the northern boundary of the site. Surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage. Consideration should be given to whether there are any culverted watercourses within/near the site.</p>   | <p>Comment noted. Relevant site requirement is attached within the Proposed Plan, in respect of a FRA.</p> |
| <b>Earlston</b>  | EEA12B – Earlston Glebe           | 937 Earlston Community Council                     | Note | <p>The Contributor notes the removal of the housing allocation at Earlston Glebe (EEA12B).</p>  | <p>Comment noted.</p>  |
| <b>Eckford</b>   | General                           | 799 Crailing, Eckford and Nisbet Community Council | Note | <p>The Contributor acknowledges there are no land allocations within Eckford within this LDP2 period.</p>   | <p>Comments noted.</p>   |
| <b>Eddleston</b> | AEDDL010 – Land south of cemetery | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency        | Note | <p>The Contributor states that they are satisfied with the developer requirement, however, they not that they require a FRA which assesses the risk from the Eddleston Water. Any nearby small watercourses should be investigated as there was a mill dam upslope of the site in the past to ensure there are no culverted watercourses through the site. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within the site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at increased risk of flooding.</p> | <p>Comments noted. A relevant site requirement is included within the Proposed Plan.</p>                   |
| <b>Eddleston</b> | AEDDL002 – North of Bellfield     | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection               | Note | <p>The Contributor states that surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage.</p>   | <p>Comments noted. A relevant site requirement is included</p>   |



|                            |  | Agency                                      |         |   | within the Proposed Plan.  |
|----------------------------|--|---|---------|---|--|
| <b>Ednam</b>               | General                                | 004 Judith Fulton                           | Support | The Contributor supports the Local Development Plan for Ednam and states the area looks as if it has been waiting for new housing for some time, access to the road is safe and the playing field is nearby.  | Comments noted. It is unclear which site the Contributor is referring to however their support for the Ednam settlement profile is noted.  |
| <b>Eshiels</b>             | BESHI001 – Land at Eshiels             | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | The Contributor states that they are satisfied with the developer requirement, however, they note that they require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Linn Burn and any small watercourses which flow through and adjacent to the site. The River Tweed may also require consideration. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site which may exacerbate flood risk. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at increased risk of flooding. | Comments noted. A relevant site requirement is included within the Proposed Plan.  |
| <b>Ettrick (Hopehouse)</b> | AETTR002 – Hopehouse East              | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | Surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage.  | Comment noted.   |
| <b>Ettrick (Hopehouse)</b> | AETTR004 – Hopehouse North East        | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | Surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage.  | Comment noted.   |
| <b>Eyemouth</b>            | REYEM002 – Former Eyemouth High School | 003 Margaret Davenport                      | Note    | The Contributor is enquiring whether they could purchase a strip of land along the side of their house. Coldingham Road is a quiet road with the exception of the opening and closing of the nearby school then there are parked cars on both sides of the road and people trying to get up and down the road at the same time. The contributor has attached a plan indicating the strip of land.   | Comments notes. The purchasing of land is not a matter to be dealt with as part of the Proposed LDP. The contributors comments have been forwarded to the Council's Estates Department to look into and respond accordingly. |
| <b>Eyemouth</b>            | BEY15B – Gunsgreenhil                  | 1043 Scottish Environment                   | Note    | There is a well located on site.  | Comment noted.   |

|                     |  |   |         |  |  |
|---------------------|--|---|---------|--|--|
|                     | I  | Protection Agency                           |         |  |  |
| <b>Eyemouth</b>     | BEYEM001 – Gunsgreenhil I                        | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | Surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage.   | Comment noted.   |
| <b>Eyemouth</b>     | REYEM002 – Former Eyemouth High School Extension | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | There is a covered reservoir on site which may require investigation.  | Comment noted.   |
| <b>Eyemouth</b>     | REYEM003 – Gas Holder Station                    | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | North Burn is culverted down Northburn Road. There are photos of flooding on Northburn Road from the burn in 1948.   | Comment noted.   |
| <b>Eyemouth</b>     | REYEM007 – Former Town Hall                      | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | We require an FRA which assesses the risk from coastal still water as well as overtopping processes and any interactions with the Eye Water. Redevelopment to a similar or less sensitive use would be supported by SEPA. An increase in vulnerability will only be supported if a detailed FRA can demonstrate the site is free from flood risk and there is safe access/egress available. Sewer flooding will also require consideration. Site may be constrained due to flood risk. The Eyemouth Flood Study (2020) may provide additional information. | Comments noted. A relevant site requirement is attached in the Proposed Plan, in respect of a FRA. |
| <b>Eyemouth</b>     | zEL6 – Hawk's Ness                               | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | Surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage.   | Comments noted.  |
| <b>Fountainhall</b> | AFOUN005   | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | The Contributor states that they are satisfied with the developer requirements. Planning brief states that the risk from the watercourse will need to be addressed and mitigated.  | Comments noted.  |
| <b>Galashiels</b>   | AGALA017 – Coopersknowe Phase 4                  | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | Surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage.   | Comments noted.  |
| <b>Galashiels</b>   | AGALA029 – Netherbarns                           | 006 Bryan Weatherston                       | Support | The Contributor supports the allocation of site AGALA029 Netherbarns within the Plan. There is a clear need for housing around the Galashiels area and   | Support and comments noted.  |

|                   |                        |                    |         |   |                |
|-------------------|------------------------|--------------------|---------|---|----------------|
|                   |                        |                    |         | near the Borders railway and this site makes perfect sense. Having visited the surrounding area many times, I do not believe there would be any negative impact on surrounding attractions.   |                |
| <b>Galashiels</b> | AGALA029 – Netherbarns | 033 Claire Smith   | Support | The Contributor supports the allocation of site AGALA029 Netherbarns within the Plan. The Contributor expresses their desire for this development to go ahead as they wish to relocate to the Scottish Borders.   | Support noted. |
| <b>Galashiels</b> | AGALA029 – Netherbarns | 039 Jean Salmon    | Support | The Contributor supports the allocation of site AGALA029 Netherbarns within the Plan. The Contributor considers this site to be a good idea. It is a beautiful spot, one which the Contributor would be interesting in purchasing a property in.  | Support noted. |
| <b>Galashiels</b> | AGALA029 – Netherbarns | 044 Cathy Copson   | Support | The Contributor supports the allocation of site AGALA029 Netherbarns within the Plan. I am very aware as are many people that the Galashiels area is in dire need of more housing and in addition with the impact of COVID on local businesses causing even higher unemployment at this current time.   | Support noted. |
| <b>Galashiels</b> | AGALA029 – Netherbarns | 045 Rebecca Smith  | Support | The Contributor supports the allocation of site AGALA029 Netherbarns within the Plan. In the current climate, it is extremely important these houses are given approval to be built. Not only is there a shortage of family homes in Galashiels, it will also help the local economy by keeping trades people in jobs and suppliers able to trade. It is apparent people are relocating from the city of Edinburgh for greener spaces, so Netherbarns would be a great opportunity to draw more people to Galashiels, helping to boost the local economy. | Support noted. |
| <b>Galashiels</b> | AGALA029 – Netherbarns | 050 Greg Borthwick | Support | The Contributor supports the allocation of site AGALA029 Netherbarns within the Plan. I support this particular development. Not only would it be a lovely development on the edge of Galashiels but I think it's also important to support a local business in the developer and also give some security to their directly employed personnel.   | Support noted. |
| <b>Galashiels</b> | AGALA029 – Netherbarns | 055 Gail Roberts   | Support | The Contributor supports the allocation of site AGALA029 Netherbarns within the Plan. There is a significant shortage of housing in the area as we know to our experience. The development on the other side of   | Support noted. |

|                   |                        |                                  |          |  |                 |
|-------------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|----------|--|-----------------|
|                   |                        |                                  |          | the road blends in to the surrounding area sympathetically without problems. Galashiels would benefit from the development and the site would appeal to those wishing to move to the Borders thus improving the economy in the area.   |                 |
| <b>Galashiels</b> | AGALA029 – Netherbarns | 101 Jimmy Louth                  | Support  | The Contributor supports the allocation of site AGALA029 Netherbarns within the Plan. The Galashiels housing market is in urgent need of new housing. In this pandemic time with many jobs at risk they believe this scheme provides a local firm the opportunity to provide continuity and security of employment to their workforce. This would also have a knock on effect to subcontractors, material suppliers and local businesses as well.  | Support noted.  |
| <b>Galashiels</b> | AGALA029 - Netherbarns | 130 Rev. Dr Jeff S. Dailey       | Comment  | Contributor applauds the recent resumption of train service to the area, so that now more people can visit the house and grounds at Abbotsford. (130)  | Comment noted.  |
| <b>Galashiels</b> | AGALA029 – Netherbarns | 138 Terry Broome                 | Support  | The Contributor supports the allocation of site AGALA029 Netherbarns within the Plan. Great idea. When people are living on the streets, we need new homes in all areas. Well done Scottish Borders. I visit Abbotsford often and the new houses will not spoil my enjoyment.  | Support noted.  |
| <b>Galashiels</b> | AGALA029               | 163 Deirdre Kelty                | Comment  | The Contributor notes support for housing needs for locals.  | Comment noted.  |
| <b>Galashiels</b> | AGALA029               | 653 Galashiels Community Council | Comments | Some members felt that the houses would not really be visible for the largest part of the year (and when Abbotsford House would be open to the public) and noted that increased planting would improve any negative impact of the development over the years as this grew in stature. It was stressed that the design, colour scheme of houses and their roofs, all of a design sympathetic to the site shown would also mitigate on any visual concerns relating to visitors to Abbotsford House. | Comments noted. |
| <b>Galashiels</b> | AGALA029 – Netherbarns | 777 Carolyn Riddell-Carre        | Support  | The Contributor supports the allocation of site AGALA029 Netherbarns within the Plan. It seems to fit completely with the overall aims of the LDP which are to build sustainable communities with good connectivity. As there has been concern expressed over the possible   | Support noted.  |

|                   |                        |                      |         |   |                             |
|-------------------|------------------------|----------------------|---------|---|-----------------------------|
|                   |                        |                      |         | <p>impact of this site upon Abbotsford, I visited the site yesterday and, standing at the top of the field with my back to the bus stop on the A7, took the attached photographs. Abbotsford was invisible and I must conclude that housing built on this site would be largely invisible to Abbotsford. Therefore it would not impact negatively on a listed building. Notwithstanding this, the development should be subject to a masterplan. The Kingsknowes and Netherbank developments which neighbour the site would be enhanced by the best possible design here. It should be noted that the contributor also includes photographs of the site within their submission.</p>  |                             |
| <b>Galashiels</b> | AGALA029 – Netherbarns | 843 M & J Ballantyne | Support | <p>The Contributor supports the allocation of site AGALA029 Netherbarns within the Plan.</p> <p>The Contributor, as landowner, is fully supportive of the allocation of the site and is committed to provide a masterplan and technical design/survey information to meet the identified site requirements through working with Council Officers and other stakeholders as part of the Development Management process. The Contributor provides updates to the statement of support prepared for the MIR stage of the Proposed Plan which sits alongside the following supplementary documents previously submitted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landscape and Visual Appraisal;</li> <li>• Heritage Assessment – Lichfields;</li> <li>• Evolution of Proposals Timeline; and</li> <li>• Design Code</li> </ul> <p>The Contributor is of the view that the information presented demonstrates how the site could be sensitively delivered and clearly counters some of the misleading and inaccurate press coverage that has in recent months been circulating in local and national news outlets arising from a campaign being pursued by one notable objecting party. The Contributor has consistently promoted the sites merits as a deliverable housing site over the past 14 years.</p> | Support and comments noted. |

In support, the Contributor has submitted plans detailing the evolution of the proposal and a proposed site plan along with a Heritage Statement, Landscape and Visual Assessment and updated Landscape Photography which have been submitted previously. Information included within these statements includes the following points:

- In respect of site context, a timeline of the key stages of the promotion of the site is included. The contributor notes that the timeline shows that the site's allocation for residential development has continuously been supported by officers and members of the Council with various iterations of development proposals being considered through successive development plans. Throughout this process the proposals have changed in response to comments made by DPEA Reporters, Council Officers' assessments and past objectors. The efforts made by the owners to address any negative impacts upon Abbotsford and respond to any perceived shortcomings of the site are evident.
- In respect of effectiveness and delivery, the owner proposes a programme of advance planting to strengthen the established landscape framework and introduce significant areas of new landscape features. Details of this planting strategy are contained in the submitted Landscape and Visual Appraisal, which shows the existing landscape and the extent of proposed new planting.
- The site would be developed over a 24-month period post-grant of planning permission. Assuming 12-24 months to achieve the necessary consents, the site could be delivered in full within the first 5 years of the plan period.
- In respect of accessibility, the site is within walking and cycling distance to the wide range of shops and services within Galashiels town centre which supports sustainable methods of transportation. Vehicular access is available via an existing road junction.
- In respect of Heritage, Design and Visual impact, Abbotsford House and the protection of it and its

grounds has been a repeated consideration in assessments of the Netherbarns site. Concerns over setting of the listed asset have already seen the proposals reduced from 91 dwellings to approx. 45 with carefully considered planting and design parameters set in a bid to be sensitive to the surrounding area. The Heritage Assessment has been informed by the Landscape and Visual Assessment (LVA) and confirms that, while the introduction of further housing will result in a very slight change to part of the setting of Abbotsford, the resultant situation will be characteristically similar to the existing and, overall, the nature of change to the setting will be neutral. No harm would be caused to the special interest of the Category A listed Abbotsford House or the values of the Designed Landscape. The Landscape and Visual Appraisal shows that glimpsed views could potentially be eliminated by year 15 through sensitive materials and established landscaping. During the summer, the new houses will be entirely screened by the existing trees along the bank of the river and those within the parkland on the Abbotsford side. Throughout these months, there will be no change to the setting of Abbotsford. Whilst there would be a minor change to the setting of the listed Netherbarns and Kingsknowes through the development of the site for residential use, it would not affect the special interest of the listed buildings. This reflects that the historic and architectural interest of the farm and Kingsknowes lies predominantly in the building fabric and also the scale of change in the surrounding area, including the construction of the A7 and the development of the bungalow and housing estate. The special interest of the heritage assets would be preserved. The LVA provides guidance on design matters including a high-level masterplan for the site. The lower levels of the site which are more sensitive to the view from Abbotsford House will be free from residential development and will provide open space for the new homes. Development would be focussed on the north western and western

|                   |                        |   |         |  |   |
|-------------------|------------------------|---|---------|--|---|
|                   |                        |   |         | <p>portions of the site where existing and enhanced screening will mitigate views into the site. The Contributor is amenable to the removal of permitted development rights if this would provide some comfort to third party objectors that maintain concerns relating to the allocation of the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In respect of landscape and visual appraisal, the LVA proposes reinforcement of the woodland belt along the southern boundary as recommended by Scottish Borders Council, and the inclusion of a notable proportion of evergreen tree species, combined with the promotion of further tree cover to proposed street frontages and to the northern boundary, which will create tiered year-round screening of the proposed development. The proposals would complement the Abbotsford Landscape Management Plan (ALMP) which proposes felling and restocking of parts of the mature tree belt beyond the south-eastern side of the site. This process would temporarily open up views both into the site and beyond to existing properties at Netherbank. The proposed planting detailed in the LVA will mitigate this effect to the benefit of views from Abbotsford.</li> <li>• It is submitted that the impact of new properties within the site can be adequately mitigated and that betterment can be achieved when considering longer views from Abbotsford toward Netherbarns through additional screening.</li> </ul> |   |
| <b>Galashiels</b> | AGALA029 – Netherbarns | 1021 Graham                                 | Support | The Contributor supports the allocation of site AGALA029 Netherbarns within the Plan. Nothing wrong with the development, Abbotsford House can hardly be seen from that field, due to the large old trees and as long as all buildings are bungalows it should be fine. (1021)   | Support noted.                                |
| <b>Galashiels</b> | AGALA029 – Netherbarns | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Comment | Although the proposed Plan requires a FRA we consider that no FRA is required, the site is adjacent to functional floodplain. A simple topographic information should be sufficient to demonstrate development avoids flood risk.  | Comment noted.                                |
| <b>Galashiels</b> | General / Education    | 653 Galashiels Community                    | General | Should all potential housing sites go ahead over the next ten years, the Council needs to carry out an ongoing   | Comments noted. The Director of Education and |



|                   |   |   |         |  |  |
|-------------------|---|---|---------|--|--|
|                   |   | Council                                     |         | review of the schools provision in Galashiels, due to the increasing number of families and children commensurate with this development of the town.   | Lifelong Learning is consulted throughout the process of the Local Development Plan. |
| <b>Galashiels</b> | Replacement Galashiels Academy / GSGALA010 - Scott Park   | 653 Galashiels Community Council            | General | The Community Council awaits the opportunity to take part in the formal consultation process regarding the new school but has concerns about the efficacy of this, given that it is proposed as a 'virtual' consultation. Despite the current lock down requirements of the Scottish Government, the Community Council feels that plans should be displayed in a public outdoor area, such as the empty shop windows on the Douglas Bridge area. Current displays on some windows show that this area is regularly seen by passers-by and therefore this would be a positive way to improve consultation for those who do not have access to online consultation. Whilst the Community Council are aware that the new school campus will have a specific consultation process developed and notes that the school is not a specific part of the LDP consultation, we hope that these comments will be taken cognisance of by the Council, particularly those with a potential effect upon the Hollybush Valley site/s. | Comments noted. These are matters for the Council's Projects Management Team.        |
| <b>Galashiels</b> | All housing allocations including AGALA029 (Netherbarns ) | 774 Miss J Cairns & S Dyer-Lynch            | Support | The Contributors support all housing allocations proposed within Galashiels including AGALA029 (Netherbarns).  | Support noted.   |
| <b>Galashiels</b> | BGALA006 – Land at Winston Road I                         | 983 NatureScot                              | Support | NatureScot welcome the change to the allocation with the removal of the requirement to give due consideration to biodiversity risk on the site. This has been replaced with a much clearer requirement for assessment of ecology impacts and provision of mitigation.  | Support noted.   |
| <b>Galashiels</b> | BGALA006 – Land at Winston Road I                         | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | The Contributor requires an FRA which assesses the risk from the River Tweed. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood  | Comment noted.   |

|                   |  |   |      |   |                |
|-------------------|--|---|------|---|----------------|
|                   |  |   |      | prevention officer.   |                |
| <b>Galshiels</b>  | EGL16B – South Crotchetkno we          | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note | Surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage.  | Comment noted. |
| <b>Galashiels</b> | EGL20B – Grange                        | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note | Surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage.  | Comment noted. |
| <b>Galashiels</b> | EGL42 – Forest Hill                    | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note | Surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage.  | Comment noted. |
| <b>Galashiels</b> | EGL200 – North Ryehaugh                | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note | Based on the OS Map, the site is sufficiently elevated above the Gala Water. Due to steep topography through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff.   | Comment noted. |
| <b>Galashiels</b> | MGALA002 – South of Cooperskno we      | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note | Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues at this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.   | Comment noted. |
| <b>Galashiels</b> | MGALA003 – Winston Road                | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note | Surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage.  | Comment noted. |
| <b>Galashiels</b> | zCR2 – Huddersfield Street/Hill Street | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note | No FRA required, site adjacent to functional floodplain. Simple site plan/FFL information should be sufficient to demonstrate development avoids flood risk.  | Comment noted. |
| <b>Galashiels</b> | zEL40 – Netherdale Industrial Estate   | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note | As the allocation is for business and industrial safeguarding the Contributor requires an FRA which assesses the risk from the Gala Water. The FRA is required to inform the area of redevelopment, type of development, and finished floor levels. It is important to consider sensitivity of use in line with our land use vulnerability guidance. The Contributor would not support any development which increases the flood risk | Comment noted. |

|                    |   |  |      |  |   |
|--------------------|---|--|------|--|---|
|                    |   |  |      | to existing/proposed development.  |   |
| <b>Galashiels</b>  | zEL41 –<br>Huddersfield<br>Street Mill          | 1043 Scottish<br>Environment<br>Protection<br>Agency | Note | As the allocation is for business and industrial safeguarding the Contributor requires an FRA which assesses the risk from the Gala Water. The FRA is required to inform the area of redevelopment, type of development, and finished floor levels. Sensitivity of use should be considered. The Contributor would not support any development which increases the flood risk to existing/proposed development.  | Comment noted.                              |
| <b>Galashiels</b>  | zEL42 –<br>Wheatlands<br>Road                   | 1043 Scottish<br>Environment<br>Protection<br>Agency | Note | As the allocation is for business and industrial safeguarding the Contributor requires an FRA which assesses the risk from the Gala Water. The FRA is required to inform the area of redevelopment, type of development, and finished floor levels. It is important to consider sensitivity of use in line with our land use vulnerability guidance. The Contributor would not support any development which increases the flood risk to existing/proposed development. The site will likely be heavily constrained due to flood risk. | Comment noted.                              |
| <b>Galashiels</b>  | zRO24 –<br>Heriot-Watt<br>Halls of<br>Residence | 1043 Scottish<br>Environment<br>Protection<br>Agency | Note | Surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage.   | Comment noted.                              |
| <b>Gattonside</b>  | AGATT007 –<br>St Aidans                         | 1043 Scottish<br>Environment<br>Protection<br>Agency | Note | The Contributor previously removed their objection to the proposed development in this allocation. Topographic information showed a sufficient height difference between the River Tweed and property. Should the proposal change from what was previously agreed the Contributor would require an FRA. Surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage.   | Comment noted.                              |
| <b>Gattonside</b>  | EGT10B -<br>Orchard                             | 1043 Scottish<br>Environment<br>Protection<br>Agency | Note | Surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage.   | Comment noted.                              |
| <b>Gavinton</b>    | BGA1 – West<br>Gavinton                         | 1043 Scottish<br>Environment<br>Protection<br>Agency | Note | Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues at this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.  | Comments noted.                             |
| <b>Grantshouse</b> | AGRAN004 –<br>Land North of                     | 1043 Scottish<br>Environment                         | Note | Based on OS Map there is sufficient height difference between site and the Eye Water. Due to steep   | Comments noted. A relevant site requirement |

|                 |  |   |         |   |   |
|-----------------|--|---|---------|---|---|
|                 | Mansefield   | Protection Agency                           |         | topography through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff. | is attached in the Proposed Plan, in respect of a surface water run-off.  |
| <b>Greenlaw</b> | AGREE004 – North of Edinburgh Road                         | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | Surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage.  | Comments noted.   |
| <b>Greenlaw</b> | AGREE006 – Marchmont II                                    | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | Surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage.  | Comments noted.   |
| <b>Greenlaw</b> | BG200 – Marchmont Road                                     | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | Surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage.  | Comment noted.  |
| <b>Greenlaw</b> | BGREE005 – Land South of Edinburgh Road                    | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure that site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at increased risk of flooding.                                   | Comment noted. A relevant site requirement is attached in the Proposed Plan, in respect of a surface water run-off. |
| <b>Greenlaw</b> | MGREE003 – Former extension to Duns Road Industrial Estate | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | Surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage.  | Comment noted.  |
| <b>Greenlaw</b> | SGREE003 – Halliburton Road                                | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | Surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage.  | Comment noted.  |
| <b>Greenlaw</b> | zEL22 – Duns Road Industrial Estate                        | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | Surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage.  | Comment noted.  |
| <b>Heiton</b>   | RHE2B – Heiton Mains                                       | 813 Roxburgh Estates (4 of 5)               | Support | The Contributor supports the continued allocation of Heiton Mains (RHE2B) for housing.  | Support noted.  |
| <b>Heiton</b>   | RHE2B –  | 1043 Scottish                               | Note    | The Contributor states the review of historic maps does   | Comments noted.   |

|                     |                                      |   |         |   |  |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---------|---|--|
|                     | Heiton Mains                         | Environment Protection Agency               |         | not show the presence of any small watercourses on site but there does appear to be a Scottish Water asset through the site which may require investigation. Surface water runoff from nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage.   |  |
| <b>Heiton</b>       | RHE3B – Ladyrig                      | 813 Roxburgh Estates (4 of 5)               | Support | The Contributor supports the continued allocation of Ladyrig (RHE3B) for housing.   | Support noted.   |
| <b>Heiton</b>       | RHE3B – Ladyrig                      | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | The Contributor states the review of historic maps does not show the presence of any small watercourses on site but there does appear to be a Scottish Water asset through the site which may require investigation. Surface water runoff from nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage.   | Comments noted.  |
| <b>Innerleithen</b> | AINNE004 – Kirklands / Willowbank II | 029 William and Olga Cormack                | General | The contributor notes that the landscaped area between their property and the site has been maintained.   | Comment noted.   |
| <b>Innerleithen</b> | AINNE004 – Kirklands / Willowbank II | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | The Contributor states that they require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourses which flow along the boundary of the site. Consideration will need to be given to any culverts/ bridges which may exacerbate flood risk. Due to steep topography through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff.   | Comments noted.<br>A relevant site requirement is included within the Proposed Plan. |
| <b>Innerleithen</b> | MINNE001 – Caerlee Mill              | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | The Contributor states that they should the agreed layout or development type differ from what was previously agreed would require an updated FRA which considers their previous responses. As this area of Innerleithen is at flood risk, it is essential that any new development will have a neutral impact on flood risk and the FRA will inform the area of redevelopment, type of development, finished floor levels and ensure that the development has a neutral impact on flood risk. Furthermore flood resilient and resistant materials may be incorporated. Site will likely be constrained as a result. Consideration should be given to any lade structures through the site and buildings must not be constructed over an existing drain (including a field drain) that is to remain active. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map | Comments noted.<br>A relevant site requirement is included within the Proposed Plan. |

|                     |                                      |   |         |  |   |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---------|--|---|
|                     |                                      |   |         | indicates that there may be flooding issues at this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.  |   |
| <b>Innerleithen</b> | MINNE003 – Land West of Innerleithen | 826 CW Properties                           | Support | The contributor supports the allocation of MINNE003. The contributor states that the proposed site has the potential to provide a logical extension to Innerleithen within a 5 year time period, with accessibility to the town centre and its' related services by means other than the private car.  | Support and comments noted.   |
| <b>Innerleithen</b> | MINNE003 – Land West of Innerleithen | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | The Contributor states that they require an FRA which assesses the risk from the River Tweed. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within the site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. In addition, surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue and may require mitigation measures during design stage. Innerleithen Flood Study (2018) may provide additional information.  | Comments noted. A relevant site requirement is included within the Proposed Plan. |
| <b>Innerleithen</b> | SINNE001 – Kirkland II               | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | The Contributor states that there are two small watercourses, one on northern and other on southern boundary of site.  | Comments noted.   |
| <b>Innerleithen</b> | zEL16 – Traquair Road East           | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | The Contributor states that as the area is at significant flood risk, it is essential that any new development will have a neutral impact on flood risk. They would only support redevelopment of a similar use in line with our land use vulnerability guidance. The FRA is required to inform the area of redevelopment, type of development, finished floor levels and ensure that the development has a neutral impact on flood risk. Furthermore, flood resilient and resistant materials should be used. Innerleithen Flood Study (2018) may provide additional information. | Comments noted. A relevant site requirement is included within the Proposed Plan. |
| <b>Innerleithen</b> | zEL200 – Traquair Road               | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | The Contributor states that as the area is at significant flood risk, it is essential that any new development will have a neutral impact on flood risk. They would only support redevelopment of a similar use in line with their land use vulnerability guidance. The FRA is required to inform the area of redevelopment, type of development,  | Comments noted. A relevant site requirement is included within the Proposed Plan. |

|                 |                                       |   |         |   |  |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------|---|---------|---|--|
|                 |                                       |   |         | finished floor levels and ensure that the development has a neutral impact on flood risk. Furthermore, flood resilient and resistant materials should be used. Innerleithen Flood Study (2018) may provide additional information.  |  |
| <b>Jedburgh</b> | General                               | 009 Steve Scott                             | General | The Contributor provides their thoughts on potential improvements to the town of Jedburgh. These include: a new museum, changes to Mary Queen Scots House, the Castle Jail, the Dunion and the old School Buildings. The Contributor also suggests organising two festivals as well as various other improvements.  | Comments noted. However the suggestions put forward by the Contributor do not fall within the remit of the Local Development Plan. |
| <b>Jedburgh</b> | RJ27D – Wildcat Cleuch                | 066 James Spence                            | Support | The contributor supports the continued allocation of this site. The contributor is currently marketing the property for sale and have had significant interest over the last 12 months and therefore expect it to be deliverable in the short term.   | Support and comments noted.  |
| <b>Jedburgh</b> | RJEDB003 – Howden burn Primary School | 983 NatureScot                              | Support | The contributor welcomes the requirements for redevelopment of this site.   | Support noted.   |
| <b>Jedburgh</b> | RJEDB003 – Howden burn Primary School | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | The Contributor has reviewed historic maps and cannot find any evidence of a small watercourse. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues in this area. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.   | Comments noted. A relevant site requirement is included within the Proposed Plan.  |
| <b>Jedburgh</b> | RJEDB006 – Jedburgh Grammar School    | 983 NatureScot                              | Support | The contributor welcomes the requirements for redevelopment of this site.   | Support noted.   |
| <b>Jedburgh</b> | RJEDB006 – Jedburgh Grammar School    | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | The Contributor notes that redevelopment the land use type. The Contributor requires an FRA which assesses the flood risk from the Jed Water, Skiprunning Burn, and small watercourses which flow through/ adjacent to the site. The flood risk is complex at this location. Consideration should be given to any upstream and downstream structures and culverts which may exacerbate flood risk. It is important to consider sensitivity of use in line with our land use vulnerability guidance. Site will be constrained due to flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map | Comments noted. Relevant site requirements are included within the Proposed Plan.  |

|                 |   |   |      |  |  |
|-----------------|---|---|------|--|--|
|                 |   |   |      | shows that there may be flooding issues in this area. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.  |  |
| <b>Jedburgh</b> | AJEDB010 - Queen Mary Building              | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note | The Contributor states there is a long history of flooding in this area in 1947, 1947, 1966, 1982, Aug 2002 and Oct 2002, August 2012 and Dec 2013. Development must occur outwith the risk of flooding. Flood resilient and resistant materials should be used.   | Comments noted. There is an approved Planning Brief for the site which makes reference to flood risk within the site and the need for a FRA. |
| <b>Jedburgh</b> | AJEDB018 - Land East of Howdenburn Court II | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note | The Contributor states that review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues in this area. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.  | Comments noted. A relevant site requirement is included within the Proposed Plan.  |
| <b>Jedburgh</b> | BJEDB001 - Wildcat Wood and extension       | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note | The Contributor states that review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.   | Comments noted.  |
| <b>Jedburgh</b> | RJ14B - Oxnam Road                          | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note | The Contributor states that review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues at this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.  | Comments noted.  |
| <b>Jedburgh</b> | RJ2B - Lochend                              | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note | The Contributor states that review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.   | Comments noted.  |
| <b>Jedburgh</b> | RJ7B - Annfield                             | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note | The Contributor states that review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues at this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.  | Comments noted.  |
| <b>Jedburgh</b> | RJEDB001 - The Anna                         | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note | The Contributor states that there is a long history of flooding in this area in 1947, 1947, 1966, 1982, Aug 2002 and Oct 2002, August 2012 and Dec 2013. Would only support commercial/retail development at this site on condition that there was no increase in flood risk locally. No residential development acceptable and no | Comments noted. A relevant site requirement is included within the Proposed Plan.  |



|                 |                                      |   |      |   |   |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------|---|------|---|---|
|                 |                                      |   |      | development on top of culvert.  |   |
| <b>Jedburgh</b> | RJEDB002 - Riverside Mill            | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note | The Contributor states that as the area is at significant flood risk, it is essential that any new development will have a neutral impact on flood risk. We would only support redevelopment of a similar use in line with our land use vulnerability guidance. The FRA is required to inform the area of redevelopment, type of development, finished floor levels and ensure that the development has a neutral impact on flood risk. Sensitivity of use should be considered. Furthermore, flood resilient and resistant materials should be used. No residential development. | Comments noted. A relevant site requirement is included within the Proposed Plan.   |
| <b>Jedburgh</b> | zEL31 - Wildcat Gate                 | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note | The Contributor states that review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues at this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.   | Comments noted.   |
| <b>Jedburgh</b> | zEL32 - Hartrigge Park               | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note | The Contributor states that review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues at this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.   | Comments noted.   |
| <b>Kelso</b>    | AKELS009 - Broomlands North          | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note | Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues at this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.   | Comments noted. It should be noted that this site is under construction and is significantly developed.   |
| <b>Kelso</b>    | AKELS022 - Hendersyde (Phase 1)      | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note | Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues at this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.   | Comments noted. There is an approved Planning Brief for the site which makes reference to consider potential surface water flood risk and the need for further investigation. |
| <b>Kelso</b>    | AKELS026 - Nethershot (Phases 1 & 2) | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note | Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues in this area. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.   | Comments noted. A relevant site requirement is included within the Proposed Plan.   |
| <b>Kelso</b>    | BKELS003 -                           | 1043 Scottish                               | Note | Small watercourse flows along southern boundary.  | Comments noted.   |

|              |                                     |   |         |  |   |
|--------------|-------------------------------------|---|---------|--|---|
|              | Wooden Linn                         | Environment Protection Agency               |         | The surface water flood map picks up this low lying area. FRA required to assess the risk of flooding  | A relevant site requirement is included within the Proposed Plan.                                       |
| <b>Kelso</b> | BKELS006 - Wooden Linn II           | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Woodend Burn and tributary. Consideration should be given to any culverts/bridges which may exacerbate flood risk. Due to the steepness of the site we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at an increased risk of flooding. | Comments noted. Relevant site requirements are included within the Proposed Plan.                       |
| <b>Kelso</b> | RKE12B - Rosebank 2                 | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | Site appears to rise reasonably sharply but would be required to be assessed via a FRA.  | Comments noted. A relevant site requirement is included within the Proposed Plan.                       |
| <b>Kelso</b> | RKE1B - Broomlands East             | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues at this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Based on topographic information available there is sufficient height difference between the allocation and the River Tweed.   | Comments noted. It should be noted that this site is under construction and is significantly developed. |
| <b>Kelso</b> | RKELS002 - Former Kelso High School | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues adjacent to this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. No mention of this in 2013 Proposed Plan (adopted May 2016)   | Comment noted. A relevant site requirement is included within the Proposed Plan.                        |
| <b>Kelso</b> | SKELS005 - Hendersyde (Longer Term) | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues at this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.  | Comment noted.  |
| <b>Kelso</b> | zEL205 – Spylaw Road/ Station Road  | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues at this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.  | Comment noted.  |
| <b>Kelso</b> | AKELS021 – Nethershot (Phase 1)     | 813 Roxburgh Estates (2 of 5)               | Support | The Contributor supports the continued allocation of Nethershot (Phase 1) (AKELS021) for housing.  | Support noted.  |

|                    |                                     |   |                  |   |   |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------|---|------------------|---|---|
| <b>Kelso</b>       | SKELS004 – Nethershot (Longer Term) | 813 Roxburgh Estates (2 of 5)                       | Support          | The Contributor supports the continued allocation of Nethershot (Longer Term) (SKELS004) for housing.   | Support noted.  |
| <b>Kelso</b>       | SKELS004 - Nethershot (Longer Term) | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency         | Note             | Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues at this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer  | Comment noted.  |
| <b>Lauder</b>      | ALAUD001 – West Allanbank           | 075 Graeme Donald MacPherson                        | No comment       | The contributor states that they have no comment to make in relation to the site ALAUD001 as neighbour notified.  | No comment noted.   |
| <b>Lilliesleaf</b> | ALILL003 – West of St Dunstan       | 899 Lilliesleaf, Ashkirk & Midlem Community Council | Support          | The Contributor supports the continued allocation of this site. The Contributor recommends that there be a masterplanning exercise to guide the development of the site.  | Support noted. The Council approved a Mini Planning Brief for the site in April 2011 which provides a framework vision for the development of the site. |
| <b>Melrose</b>     | AMELR013 – Harmony Hall Gardens     | 722 National Trust for Scotland                     | Support          | The Contributor supports the allocation of site AMELR013 for housing development.   | Support noted.  |
| <b>Melrose</b>     | AMELR013 – Harmony Hall Gardens     | 983 NatureScot                                      | Support          | The Contributor supports the site requirement requiring the boundary wall and mature trees are retained.  | Support noted.  |
| <b>Melrose</b>     | Settlement Profile (page 433)       | 1000 Gillian Crosier                                | Support          | The Contributor supports the statement that 'There has been significant recent development at Dingleton Hospital and owing to the sensitivity of the location, it has not been possible to define preferred areas for future expansion beyond the period of this Local Development Plan'. | Support noted.  |
| <b>Midlem</b>      | GSMIDL001 – Midlem Village Green    | 899 Lilliesleaf, Ashkirk & Midlem Community Council | Support          | The Contributor supports the assessment for Midlem.   | Support noted.  |
| <b>Morebattle</b>  | AMORE001 – West Renwick Gardens and | 831 James Wauchope                                  | Support and note | The contributor wishes to support the continued allocation of housing sites AMORE001 and RMO6B. The contributor provides further site details and states the sites are free of constraints and are capable of being   | Comments and support noted.   |

|                            |  |   |         |  |                |
|----------------------------|--|---|---------|--|----------------|
|                            | RMO6B – Renwick Gardens  |   |         | delivered.   |                |
| <b>Morebattle</b>          | BMORE001 – Extension to Croft Industrial Park -<br>BMORE002 – Croft Industrial Park<br>GSMORE001 – Morebattle School Playing Field | 850 Stuart Lang                             | Support | The contributor supports the allocated sites BMORE001, BMORE002 and GSMORE001.   | Support noted. |
| <b>Newstead</b>            | ANEWS005 – The Orchard   | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | The Contributor requires an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourse which is partially culverted through the site. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site. Developable area/ development type may be constrained due to flood risk. The Contributor does not support development over a culvert that is to remain active. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues at this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. | Comment noted. |
| <b>Newtown St Boswells</b> | BNEWT001 – Tweed Horizons Expansion  | 809 John Martin                             | Support | The Contributor supports the continued allocation of this site.  | Support noted. |
| <b>Newtown St Boswells</b> | BNEWT001 – Tweed Horizons Expansion  | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | Not shown to be at risk of flooding. Site lies approximately 15m above the watercourse which is sufficient in preventing the site from being at flood risk.  | Comment noted. |
| <b>Newtown St Boswells</b> | ENT15B – Sergeant Park II  | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | Site lies between 5 - 10m above the neighbouring watercourses based on OS information. As a result the height difference is sufficient to prevent the site from being at risk of flooding.   | Comment noted. |

|                            |  |  |                  |   |   |
|----------------------------|--|--|------------------|---|---|
| <b>Newtown St Boswells</b> | MNEWT001 – Auction Mart                | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency        | Note             | Although adjacent too, appears to be above the risk of flooding.  | Comment noted.  |
| <b>Newtown St Boswells</b> | zRO23 – Mills                          | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency        | Note             | Although adjacent too, appears to be above the risk of flooding.  | Comment noted.  |
| <b>Nisbet</b>              | GSNISB001 – Nisbet Play Area           | 799 Crailing, Eckford and Nisbet Community Council | Support and note | The Contributor notes that there is no land allocated for development within Nisbet. The contributor welcomes the statement that the Nisbet Play Area (GSNISB001) is protected.   | Support noted.  |
| <b>Oxton</b>               | AOXTO010 – Deanfoot Road North         | 824 Michael Ridgeway                               | Support          | The Contributor supports the allocation of site AOXTO010 for at least 30 houses.  | Support noted   |
| <b>Oxton</b>               | AOXTO010 – Deanfoot Road North         | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency        | Note             | The Contributor states that OS Map indicates a sufficient height difference between site and Leader Water. Surface Water Flood Map is potentially picking up the low point of the dismantled railway. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues at this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. | Comments noted.   |
| <b>Peebles</b>             | Settlement Profile – New Bridge        | 065 Gordon Sanderson, 747 Colin Clelland           | Support          | The Contributors state that they support the introduction of a second bridge over the River Tweed in Peebles.   | Support noted.  |
| <b>Peebles</b>             | MPEEB007 – March Street Mill           | 901 Moorbrook Textiles                             | Support          | The contributor supports the continued allocation of this site.   | Support noted.  |
| <b>Peebles</b>             | APEEB021 – Housing South of South Park | 938 Elaine Wright                                  | Query            | The Contributor states that site APEEB021 is under construction and questions why it is subject to public consultation. Furthermore, there are 71 houses being built, so why does the Plan say 50?  | Site APEEB021 has been carried forward from the Adopted Local Development Plan 2016. The site has planning consent and development has already commenced. Whilst it is accepted that the indicative capacity set out in the Plan is lower |

|  |  |  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|
|  |  |  |  |  | <p>that the planning consent granted and under construction, all housing allocations and those mixed use and redevelopment allocations with housing potential have indicative site capacities. The introductory text for Volume 2 of the Plan states that the indicative capacity figure suggests the number of housing units the site could accommodate. This broad figure takes account of matters such as the site area of the allocation and the densities of existing surrounding housing. However, planning applications can be submitted for schemes which, for example, may incorporate smaller flatted units which in turn can increase the number of units on the site. This in itself does not necessarily mean the proposal could not be supported as other key considerations remain to be addressed. For example, consideration must be given to the design quality of the proposal and ensuring infrastructure can accommodate any proposed extra units.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|

|                |  |   |         |  |   |
|----------------|--|---|---------|--|---|
|                |  |   |         |  | Consequently, the site capacity stated is indicative only and should not be taken as a definitive maximum number of units a site could accommodate. |
| <b>Peebles</b> | APEEB031 – George Place                  | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | The Contributor states that they require the provision of a FRA which assesses the flood risk from the Eddleston Water. Development is likely to be constrained on this site due to flood risk. Eddleston Water Flood Study (2018) may provide further information.  | Comments noted.<br>A relevant site requirement is included within the Proposed Plan.  |
| <b>Peebles</b> | APEEB056 – Land South of Chapelhill Farm | 691 Gareth Smith and Paula Smith            | Support | The Contributors state that on behalf of the family of the owner of Chapelhill Farm, they are pleased that consideration was given to the inclusion of site APEEB056 within the Plan and support the site. They state that they see the obvious benefit of further residential development taking place in a location close to the outskirts of the town with good linkages to the main Peebles – Edinburgh Road.  | Support and comments noted.   |
| <b>Peebles</b> | APEEB056 – Land South of Chapelhill Farm | 829 Wemyss & March Estate                   | Support | The Contributor supports the allocation of site APEEB056 within the Proposed Plan  | Support noted.  |
| <b>Peebles</b> | APEEB056 – Land South of Chapelhill Farm | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | The Contributor states that they require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Eddleston Water and small watercourses which flow along the southern and north eastern boundary. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site which may exacerbate flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within the site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at increased risk of flooding. Eddleston Water Flood Study (2018) may provide further information to | Comments noted.<br>A relevant site requirement is included within the Proposed Plan.  |

|                |  |   |         |   |   |
|----------------|--|---|---------|---|---|
|                |  |   |         | support FRA.  |   |
| <b>Peebles</b> | Land north of Kingsland Primary School | 966 Ruth Noble                              | Query   | The Contributor queries if there are any proposals for future development in the area of land to the north of the Kingsland Primary School.   | At the time of writing, there are no plans for development at this location.      |
| <b>Peebles</b> | MPEEB006 – Rosetta Road                | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | The Contributor states that they require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Gill Burn and other small watercourses which flow along the northern, southern, and western boundaries. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site which may exacerbate flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues at this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage. | Comments noted. A relevant site requirement is included within the Proposed Plan. |
| <b>Peebles</b> | MPEEB007 & GSPEEB008                   | 002 Vicki White                             | Support | The Contributor supports the inclusion of Key Greenspace GSPEEB008 within the Plan. The site assists in the people’s mental and social health.  | Support and comments noted.   |
| <b>Peebles</b> | MPEEB007 – March Street Mill           | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | The Contributor states that although no evidence of a culverted watercourse can be found on historic maps they would highlight the potential risk during site investigations. They would also stress that no buildings should be constructed over an existing drain/ lade that is to remain active. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues at this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.   | Comments noted. A relevant site requirement is included within the Proposed Plan. |
| <b>Peebles</b> | RPEEB001 – Dovecot Road                | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | The Contributor states that the settlement profile states that a FRA will be required to inform development at this site which they are satisfied with. It is important to consider sensitivity of use in line with our land use vulnerability guidance. Re-development should not increase flood risk elsewhere.   | Comments noted. A relevant site requirement is included within the Proposed Plan. |
| <b>Peebles</b> | RPEEB002 – George Street               | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | The Contributor states that they require a FRA which assesses flood risk from the Eddleston Water. Development is likely to be constrained on this site due to flood risk. It is important to consider sensitivity of use in line with our land use vulnerability guidance. Re-   | Comments noted. A relevant site requirement is included within the Proposed Plan. |



|                |  |   |         |  |  |
|----------------|--|---|---------|--|--|
|                |  |   |         | development should not increase flood risk elsewhere. Eddleston Water Flood Study (2018) may provide further information to support FRA.   |  |
| <b>Peebles</b> | RPEEB003 – Tweedbridge Court                 | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | The Contributor states that they require a FRA which assesses the flood risk from the Eddleston Water. Development is likely to be constrained on this site due to flood risk. It is important to consider sensitivity of use in line with our land use vulnerability guidance. Re-development should not increase flood risk elsewhere.   | Comments noted.<br>A relevant site requirement is included within the Proposed Plan. |
| <b>Peebles</b> | zEL2 – Cavalry Park                          | 753 Pearson Donaldson Properties            | Support | The contributor states that they support the Council in ensuring that Safeguarded Business and Industrial Site zEL2 – Cavalry Park remains allocated within the Proposed Plan.   | Support noted.   |
| <b>Peebles</b> | zEL2 – Cavalry Park                          | 830 Karen Graham                            | Support | The Contributor states that they support the continued Safeguarded Business and Industrial Site zEL2 – Cavalry Park.   | Support noted.   |
| <b>Peebles</b> | zEL2 – Cavalry Park                          | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | The Contributor states that should the application differ from what they have previously agreed then they would require a FRA which assesses flood risk from the River Tweed.  | Comments noted.  |
| <b>Peebles</b> | SPEEB003 – South West of Whitehaugh          | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | The Contributor states that they require a FRA which assesses the flood risk from the Haytoun Burn. Haytoun Burn included within Peebles Flood Study (2018) and may provide information to support FRA.  | Comments noted.<br>A relevant site requirement is included within the Proposed Plan. |
| <b>Peebles</b> | SPEEB004 – North West of Hogbridge           | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | The Contributor states that they require a FRA which assesses the flood risk from The Cut and the small watercourse which is located on the southern boundary. Buildings must not be constructed over an existing drain (including a field drain) that is to remain active. Site just upstream of Haytoun Burn included within Peebles Flood Study (2018) but may provide some information to support FRA. | Comments noted.<br>A relevant site requirement is included within the Proposed Plan. |
| <b>Peebles</b> | SPEEB005 – Peebles East (South of the River) | 753 Pearson Donaldson Properties            | Support | The contributor states that they support the introduction of site SPEEB005 as Potential Longer Term Mixed Use.   | Support noted.   |
| <b>Reston</b>  | AREST005 – Land East of West Reston          | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | Sufficient height difference between the site and the Eye Water and lade.  | Comment noted.   |

|                |  |   |         |  |                             |
|----------------|--|---|---------|--|-----------------------------|
| <b>Reston</b>  | BR5 – West Reston                              | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | Surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage.   | Comment noted.              |
| <b>Reston</b>  | zRS3 – Reston Station                          | 041 Andrew Leach                            | Support | We are supportive of the proposal to build a new rail station on this site, and have already been in consultation with the applicants and submitted our views. Car parking will need careful consideration particularly with regard to surfaces and any future potential flood risk from run off.  | Support and comments noted. |
| <b>Reston</b>  | GREST001 – Sports Field & GREST002 – Play Area | 948 Reston and Auchencrow Community Council | Note    | Two areas in Reston are increasingly becoming paramount for safeguarding as these are the only green spaces available to the village (GREST001 & GREST002). Should any planning be sought in the future to any of the proposed development areas outlined by the plan, it is a requirement for the two green space areas to be secured only as green space.  | Comment noted.              |
| <b>Selkirk</b> | ASELK021 – Philiphaugh North                   | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | As the site is adjacent to the flood extent as derived by Halcrow (2006) and there are uncertainties associated with the peak flows on the LPB the Contributor would recommend consideration of flood resistant and resilient measures. Areas closest to the burn should remain as greenspace and ground levels should be profiled to slope away from the development to prevent ponding. Surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage. | Comment noted.              |
| <b>Selkirk</b> | ASELK033 – Angles Field                        | 068 Sir Michael Strang Steel                | Support | The contributor states that they support the continued allocation of the site and note that they have had developer interest in the site.  | Support noted.              |
| <b>Selkirk</b> | ASELK033 – Angles Field                        | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | The Contributor is aware that significant restoration work has been undertaken on the Long Philip Burn as part of the Selkirk Flood Protection Scheme which is not reflected in the SEPA Flood Maps. The site is likely to be constrained by flood risk and will require a detailed FRA.   | Comment noted.              |
| <b>Selkirk</b> | BSELK001 – Riverside 7                         | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | Site is located behind Selkirk FPS and protected to events greater than a 1:200 year including sufficient climate change allowance. There is a residual risk from surface water ponding behind defences.   | Comment noted.              |
| <b>Selkirk</b> | ESE2 – Kerr's Land                             | 1043 Scottish Environment                   | Note    | Based on the surrounding topography, it is unlikely that the site will be at risk from the Pot Loch. Surface water   | Comment noted.              |

|                |                                     |   |         |   |                |
|----------------|-------------------------------------|---|---------|---|----------------|
|                |                                     | Protection Agency                           |         | runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage.  |                |
| <b>Selkirk</b> | ESE10B – Lingle Road                | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | Located behind Selkirk FPS and protected from 1 in 200 year flood event plus an allowance for climate change. Site requirements states development is restricted to 0.75ha of this site. Should the application differ from what has been previously agreed we would object and require a FRA. Review of the available topographic information shows that the site lies at the foot of a steep hillside and therefore may be at risk of surface water flooding. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.   | Comment noted. |
| <b>Selkirk</b> | MSELK002 – Former Heather Mill Site | 298 Equorium Property Company               | Support | The Contributor states that they support the continued allocation of the site.  | Support noted. |
| <b>Selkirk</b> | MSELK002 – Former Heather Mill Site | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | This proposed change to the land use is understood to be an increase in vulnerability and is reliant on the FPS to protect the site from the Ettrick Water. In line with the Contributor's current guidance, the allocation is in a built-up area and protected to events greater than a 1:200 year including sufficient climate change allowance. There is a residual risk from surface water ponding behind defences. The Council should be mindful that allocating land for housing will increase the number of persons reliant on a FPS to protect them from flooding. The Contributor would stress that FPSs have a finite design life. The Contributor would be more supportive of a land use type that is similar to the current land use. | Comment noted. |
| <b>Selkirk</b> | RSELK001 – Forest Mill              | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | Site is located behind Selkirk FPS and protected to events greater than a 1:200 year including sufficient climate change allowance. There is a residual risk from surface water ponding behind defences. Mill Burn culverted through the site.  | Comment noted. |
| <b>Selkirk</b> | RSELK002 – St Marys Church          | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | Surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage.  | Comment noted. |
| <b>Selkirk</b> | RSELK003 – Land at                  | 1043 Scottish Environment                   | Note    | The Mill Burn is shown to be culverted adjacent to the site. Investigation of a potential culvert beneath the site  | Comment noted. |

|                    |                                   |   |         |  |                 |
|--------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---------|--|-----------------|
|                    | Kilncroft/Mill Street             | Protection Agency                           |         | should be considered. The Contributor recommends that contact is made with the local Flood Prevention Officer who may be able to provide further information relating to the culvert. It is important to consider sensitivity of use in line with our land use vulnerability guidance. Re-development should not increase flood risk elsewhere.  |                 |
| <b>Selkirk</b>     | RSELK004 – Souter Court           | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | It is important to consider sensitivity of use in line with our land use vulnerability guidance. Re-development should not increase flood risk elsewhere. Surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage.   | Comment noted.  |
| <b>Selkirk</b>     | zEL11 – Riverside 2               | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | Site is located behind Selkirk FPS and protected to events greater than a 1:200 year including sufficient climate change allowance. There is a residual risk from surface water ponding behind defences. Culvert through the site.   | Comment noted.  |
| <b>Selkirk</b>     | zEL15 – Riverside 6               | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | Site is located behind Selkirk FPS and protected to events greater than a 1:200 year including sufficient climate change allowance. There is a residual risk from surface water ponding behind defences. Culvert through the site  | Comment noted.  |
| <b>Sprouston</b>   | RSP2B – Church Field              | Roxburgh Estates (813) 4 of 5               | Support | The Contributor supports the continued allocation of Church Field (RSP2B) and consider the site a logical location for residential development.  | Support noted.  |
| <b>Sprouston</b>   | RSP2B – Church Field              | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | The Contributor states that based on OS Map the site is elevated above the River Tweed. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map and nearby steep topography shows that there may be flooding issues in this area. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and the proposed development is not affected by surface runoff. | Comments noted. |
| <b>St Boswells</b> | zEL19 - Extension to Charlesfield | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency |         | The Contributor states that review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.   | Comments noted. |
| <b>St Boswells</b> | zEL3 - Charlesfield               | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection        |         | The Contributor states that review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues. This should be investigated further and it is   | Comments noted. |

|                    |  |  |         |  |  |
|--------------------|--|--|---------|--|--|
|                    |  | Agency   |         | recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.  |  |
| <b>Swinton</b>     | MSWIN002 – Land Adjacent to Swinton Primary School | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency        | Note    | Surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage.   | Comment noted.   |
| <b>Swinton</b>     | zEL45 – Coldstream Road                            | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency        | Note    | Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. | Comment noted.   |
| <b>Tweedbank</b>   | MTWEE001 – Site East of Railway Terminal           | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency        | Note    | Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. | Comment noted.   |
| <b>Tweedbank</b>   | zEL39 – Tweedbank Industrial Estate                | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency        | Note    | Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. | Comment noted.   |
| <b>Ulston</b>      | General  | 799 Crailing, Eckford and Nisbet Community Council | Note    | The Contributor acknowledges there is no reference to Ulston within the Proposed Local Development Plan.   | Comments noted.  |
| <b>Walkerburn</b>  | AWALK005 – Caberston Farm Land II                  | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency        | Note    | The Contributor states that surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage.   | Comments noted.<br>A relevant site requirement is included within the Proposed Plan. |
| <b>Walkerburn</b>  | TW200 Caberston Farm Land                          | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency        | Note    | The Contributor states that surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage.   | Comments noted.<br>A relevant site requirement is included within the Proposed Plan. |
| <b>West Linton</b> | TWL15B – School Brae                               | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency        | Note    | The Contributor states that surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage.   | Comments noted.<br>A relevant site requirement is included within the Proposed Plan. |
| <b>Westruther</b>  | BWESR001   | 820 Douglas Virtue                                 | Support | The contributor supports the inclusion of the allocation (BWESR001) for business and industrial land within the Proposed Local Development Plan. As the owner, the   | Support and comments noted.  |

|                         |  |   |         |  |  |
|-------------------------|--|---|---------|--|--|
|                         |  |   |         | contributor supports the proposed allocation and wishes to confirm his intention to facilitate redevelopment of the site for employment purposes within the plan period.   |  |
| <b>Yetholm</b>          | BYETH001 - NW of Deanfield Place   | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | The Contributor states the OS Map indicates a sufficient height difference between the site and The Stank Burn.  | Comments noted.  |
| <b>Yetholm</b>          | RY1B - Deanfield Court   | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | The Contributor states that surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage.   | Comments noted.  |
| <b>Yetholm</b>          | RY4B - Morebattle Road   | 1043 Scottish Environment Protection Agency | Note    | The Contributor states that surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage.   | Comments noted.  |
| <b>Yetholm</b>          | RY4B - Morebattle Road   | 831 James Wauchope                          | Support | The contributor supports the allocation of RY4B.   | Support noted.   |
| <b>OTHER</b>            |  |   |         |  |  |
| <b>Action Programme</b> | Section 2 - Key Strategic Projects and Major Infrastructure Proposals - Green Networks | 937 Earlston Community Council              | Note    | The contributor notes the reference to "Completion of the Earlston to Leaderfoot multi use path", timescale Unknown. The Contributor has been waiting for this since the second phase was completed in early 2019 and understand the officer who went on secondment to SOSEP is now dealing with the project again. Is there a timescale for this that can be shown in the plan? | Comments noted. There is feasibility currently underway at this location which will be completed later this year. If a suitable route can be found that has support from local landowners and key stakeholders, the challenge will then be to attract funding to the project. Therefore the completion of the project is unknown at the present time, but is currently being progressed by officers. |