

Comments re the appeal for 2 houses East of Delgany (22/00008/RREF)

Response to Applicant's Review Statement

Please read in conjunction with the appellant's review statement. Appellant's points taken systematically and numbering and headings kept the same in both documents

General comments

This application for review is being made despite the fact that the initial application was refused because of failure to fulfil the requirements of the Scottish Borders Local Plan for Development (2008) (HS2). The refusal document states:

"The development would be contrary to Policy HD2 of the Scottish Borders Local Development Plan 2016 and the New Housing in the Borders Countryside Supplementary Planning Guidance 2008 in that it would not relate sympathetically to the character of the existing building group. The proposal would not respect the scale, siting and hierarchy of buildings within the existing group and would degrade its strong sense of place. This conflict with the Local Development Plan is not overridden by any other material considerations."

The Scottish Borders Council (SBC) planners make it very clear that nothing will override this. Nothing has materially changed since the refusal decision was made. The position/size/type and location of the proposed development and its surrounds are still exactly as they were when the refusal decision was taken and I refer the reader to the document "21_00739_PPP Officer's Report" which clearly describes in detail why the application failed. It seems extraordinary that this application for review has been made and no new arguments were found in it.

My comments for the review body are related to errors, inaccuracies of fact and incorrect interpretation.

Introduction and overview

Location

Point 1.3

- Location – "R and K Drysdale manufacturing warehouse". This is incorrect. It is a vegetable packing and processing centre. It is some distance from the site as the crow flies, and there is no direct access with Old Cambus. It is in a quarry, so not visible to Old Cambus. I fail to see its significance.

Point 1.5

- The A1107 does not run along the southern edge of the site. There is a lane which has been variously referred to by the applicants as a road where the average speed is 40 miles per hour, or an access track (depending on which part of the appellant's first submission you read in their Planning Supporting Statement). In fact, it is an adopted road with no passing places, in poor condition because of potholes primarily due to farm traffic. It is impossible to sustain 40mph safely because of potholes, bends and banking.

Point 1.7

- Re Ref. No: 21/00997/PPP

The applicants have had many thefts of machinery (local knowledge). Their planned site is downhill from the steading so would not impose on the delightful old farmhouse and cottages or the skyline. They have had full planning permission for this proposal in the past on 2 occasions, but unfortunately this lapsed. It would be adjacent to the site of their business. However, no decision has yet been made regarding the proposal despite it having been submitted in June 2021, a month after the submission under consideration for appeal. It seems odd that further approval has not yet been granted, given that it has been granted before.

The proposal

Point 1.8

- The applicant says this is considered an attractive and desirable location for “self builders”. Where did this idea come from? There are no self built houses in Old Cambus.

Reasons for refusal and review

Reasons for review of decision

Point 2.1

- Whilst it is the absolute contravention of HS2 (see Policy Scottish Borders Local Development Plan 2016 (LDP)) that makes this planning application untenable (and cannot be overcome as one cannot alter topography), it was framed by a number of other factors which also make the application inappropriate. Some could have been addressed in mitigation, but the appellant chose to ignore them.

These contributory factors were from Consultees. The following quotes have all been considered important enough to include in the relevant Officer’s report.

- Archaeology – “If a full application were to be progressed, then it would need to take these issues into account. An archaeological field evaluation would be recommended.” (Never done)
- SBC Contaminated land – “I recommend that if the questionnaire is not returned, the following condition is attached to the Planning Permission in order to ensure that the development is suitable for its proposed use.” (never done)
- Environmental Health- “I therefore recommend that the Applicant complete an Agricultural Questionnaire providing information relating to the previous use of the site. If the Applicant does not return the questionnaire, it is important that the potential for contamination is considered when issuing the Planning Permission. I recommend that if the questionnaire is not returned, the following condition is attached to the Planning Permission in order to ensure that the development is suitable for its proposed use”.....(never done)

Environmental health also requested a noise impact assessment which was done, ingenuously, when the machinery concerned was not operating. Not surprisingly, no problems were demonstrated. (No report has been received, even now, which was done at a time when the machinery was operational.)

- Community council – “In addition the community have the following concerns: Policy HD3 is also relevant. It is felt that this proposal is unacceptable under HD3 for the following reasons:
 - Residential amenity particularly of West Mains farmhouse and the steading will be adversely affected in terms of overlooking and privacy;
 - Open space and ecology will be adversely affected;
 - More modern (assumed) design will not fit within the existing residential area;
 - Visual impact (see SLA concerns below);
 - Loss of "open space"
 Special Landscape Area (SLA) - Policy EP5 - this area is part of the Berwickshire Coast SLA, specifically CO45 and CO47, and as such these developments will negatively impact the current impression of the hamlet in this context. The proposals will dominate on a ridge, removing the focus on the existing farm buildings and negatively impact the SLA, coastal views and views from laybys on Coldingham Moor road (A1107), which offer uninterrupted and spectacular views of the coastline looking north. Indeed in some situations the proposal may change the skyline when viewed from the south. The SPG on SLAs states "In assessing proposals for development that may affect Special Landscape Areas, the Council will seek to safeguard landscape quality and will have particular regard to the landscape impact of the proposed development, including the visual impact. Proposals that have a significant adverse impact will only be permitted where the landscape impact is clearly outweighed by social or economic benefits of national or local importance"

Point 2.2

- The assertion that the proposal is not contravening Policy HD2, LDP is not right. The decision to refuse has indeed taken account of the “local characteristics of the area and building group” and most certainly do take account of the nature of the proposal. The appellant also talks about “other material considerations” but do not say what they are.

Point 2.3

- What factors? See Point 2.2 above. The only compliance this proposal has with the Local Development plan is that of the “100%” rule” - that no more houses must be built if these two are accepted.

Point 2.4

- Nobody except the appellant ever suggested there was any requirement for two more houses in this particular area and it remains that only the appellant does so now. (repeated in Point 3.4) The only LDP guideline that the proposal adheres to is that 2 houses would not be exceeding the 100% rule. This must be what they mean by “scope for growth”. Policy HD2 makes it very clear that there are other restrictions that apply when wanting to build than simply numbers. The council have taken these many factors into consideration and the applicants are incorrect in saying they are unreasonable.

Review of decision and Grounds of Appeal

Planning Policy context

- This is correct.

Review of reason for refusal

- The subsequent points listed by the applicant have been presented in a rather repetitive, random and confusing manner. However, I comment below:

Point 3.2

- The appellant demonstrates they understand the reason for refusal.

Point 3.3

- The appellant demonstrates that the Council have gone to some lengths to explain why this decision was made very clearly.

Point 3.4

This point is a copy of the explanation sent by the Officer to the applicants for clarification. However, it importantly mentions some of the considerations the council looked at when making their decision. They include:

- That the development would be considered harmful to the building group and the surrounding area. *(This is obvious by looking at the area in general, but also looking at the skyline views from the top of the A1107's two viewpoint laybys as shown below).*



- The proposed development would not be in keeping with the building group's sense of place. (The proposed area for development is next to a group of pretty 18th Century cottages and the 18th Century farmhouse, currently being beautifully restored to its former glory by its stonemason owner).
- The proposed buildings would not be sufficiently well related to the farmhouse and existing building group. (The new houses would dominate and overlook the current buildings as they would be higher up the hill that all the buildings lie on. This would make the farmhouse subservient. The appellants' visualisations are inaccurate -at least in part - because the perspective has been seriously distorted and extensive artistic license used – such as the removal of an entire garage and some front gardens as well as squashing the cottages together with the proposed new builds (see communication and photographs from Dr Fiona Jewkes, on the Planning Portal under Applications section).
- The applicants have not demonstrated that noise would not harm the amenity of future residents of the houses. (The applicants have made no attempt to contact the owners of the tree surgeon business to arrange a time to assess the noise, despite being told repeatedly by others (such as myself) that by the nature of the business the noise is intermittent and arbitrary. They have also failed to ask other neighbours (again, such as myself) of our experiences).
- Whilst there is indeed numerical capacity for the 2 buildings, there is actually no requirement for them. The local economy does not require them. It is likely they would become second or holiday homes. It is appreciated that, overall, more dwellings should be built in the Scottish Borders, but it is also recommended in planning guidance that they are built in identified (suitable) areas. More suitable alternative locations for development have indeed been recommended within the area of Cockburnspath for housing development, in the Local Development Plan. The proposed area in this application is in fact a Special Landscape Area (SLA), where planning guidance advises should only exceptionally be developed and with rigorous regard to exceptions.

Point 3.5

- I am not sure what the applicant means by “scope to grow”. The understanding of the word “sympathetically” extending to the building of these 2 houses is also an individual matter. However, it

can be demonstrated by the large number of objections to the site being developed that the majority of people do not consider this proposal "sympathetic development". Despite it having theoretically space for 3 more dwellings, in fact this steading and farmhouse are already a self contained space with its own "sense of place".

Point 3.5 (1)

- "Sensitively" in this context is also a matter for individual opinion. (see Point 3.5 re objectors). The visualisations bear very little resemblance to reality. The scale, alteration of perspective and artistic license required to make the units look appealing and as if they fit in are quite extraordinary. (See letter and Photographs from Dr Fiona Jewkes below).

Point 3.5(2)

- If Scottish Borders Council had visited at a time the business was chopping up wood, they would certainly have been aware of a great deal of noise. Maybe they would have asked when the machinery was going to be in use before attending.

Point 3.6

- It is agreed that National Government have dictated that the Borders should have more houses and local areas have already been identified in LDPs. The identified areas are closer to Cockburnspath, with better amenities and transport, which government prefers to be used. Planning Guidance dictates that building on an SLA (such as Old Cambus West Mains) should generally be avoided, unless there are over-riding circumstances to the contrary. Old Cambus West Mains consists of several old farm buildings and 3 cottages. Its charm is in the quiet, unspoilt countryside and stunning views. It has its own sense of place already.

Grounds of Appeal

Building group Pattern

Point 3.7(a)

- This reiterates the guidance regarding building Group Pattern from Guidance HD2 of the LDP

Point 3.7(b)

- The cumulative impact of the proposal on the landscape and amenity of the area has been carefully considered by the Council. They are right to conclude that the impacts will be unacceptable.

Point 3.7 (c)- see also Point 1.7

- This is relevant because there was another housing application put in about a month after this one, to be built at a different part of Old Cambus West Mains. (21/00997/PPP)
- It still has not had a decision made as to whether it will be accepted or not. The applicant is the owner arboreal business who wish to build next to his yard. They have experienced a lot of thefts from the yard. It is difficult to understand what the hold-up is, as they have had permission to build there twice before but unavoidable circumstances let the approval slip. Nobody (as yet) local has opposed the plan and it would not sit in an overbearing position. It would be placed down hill slightly so would not be easily seen. It would provide local jobs for local people. The problem here is, that if it is approved before this appeal, it will automatically be turned down as the amount of allowable housing at the steading would be exceeded. It is a great pity that it has not been able to be looked at sooner as, in my view, it would be a welcome addition at Old Cambus.

Point 3.8

- I agree that if the plan were approved this would be one option. However, the appellant is writing a) as if it has already been approved and b) it is essential to build the houses here. Nobody asked the appellant to extend the already complete steading by 2 moderately large modern houses. Other, much less offensive sites are available in the surrounding area which do not overlook and dominate the farmhouse. For example, there are 2 quite large sites which have been identified in the Local Development Plan (Cockburnspath) (ie in this area) which have already got planning permission for building. They also have access to the amenities that most modern families want and need – public transport, gas, sewers, village shop, primary school etc.
- Additionally, the current proposal loses the gate entry by the farmhouse, leaving only one gate to the field for agricultural use, on the main road (the busy A1107). Moving the gate near to the boundary of Delgany is absolutely unacceptable, as the boundary fence of Delgany will be rapidly destroyed by farm animals (eg cows and to a lesser extent sheep). (After the animals push through the gate they

will “splay out”, pushing on the fence of Delgany which is not built to withstand such pressure.) Cows can cause many thousands of pounds of damage. Because of their heavy weight, they cause divots and holes in lawns which can be very expensive to repair and re-lay.

- The other side of the rectangle, nearest to the farmhouse, stands next to the site of an old sheep dip in a disused sheep fold (the appellants did not fill in the Agricultural Questionnaire which would have highlighted this – she simply queried a sheep fold).
- This steading already has the “farmhouse, steading and cottages” arrangement the appellant describes. Another 2 big modern houses put on the other side of the farmhouse would destroy its typical nature and sense of place, as they would be too close to Delgany.

House Design

Point 3.9

- The appellant is right - this is not a document to decide the exact design and the Council would indeed have sway over this.

Point 3.10 and Point 3.11

- However, the appellant does not take into account that the houses (however constructed) would be built on a hill and ridge and any new dwellings where the plots are sited, would take the dominance of the steading buildings away from the farmhouse (which is one of the HD2 reasons for the application being refused). Two big houses on a hill cannot be constructed in such a way as to get round this, because of the relative elevations.
- Visualisations
I am including my own comments and photographs from the Planning Portal Applications section (Doc 09), after seeing these comments. I sent them to the Council Officer responsible when I saw the visualisations the appellant posted on the Planning Portal (as it was outside the “comments from Neighbours” timeline) and I felt the need to draw them to the attention of others. I was asked by the Officer to put the document on the Portal as well. The appellant complains she had had no feedback from the council about the visualisations – I can assure her this at least was on the site.
- I am including them below with my comments, in full for convenience.
- My visualisations only include 1 of their photographs. (I have altered the order in which the photographs were on the original email for clarity). The other visualisations are equally misleading. Note that in all of them, they have had to not only add in the new Computer Generated Images (CGI), but the architects have “rebuilt” the 2 cottages in the foreground (West Mains Cottages 2 and 3, (in the foreground) and deleted the whole garage and front garden of cottage 3, as well as removing the small wood hiding Delgany from view.
- The result is that the houses appear like a cosy cluster, not a spread out area, because the perspective has been cleverly altered by the manipulations made.

“Dear Mr Duncan,

I write to highlight that the visualisations submitted by the applicants for these 2 houses do not represent reality, now or future. I believe them to be frankly misleading. I am writing to you because of my concern that “somebody” needs to be aware of the gross misrepresentation the images generate. All the visualisations are inaccurate, but I have concentrated on the one I consider the most misleading.

The perspective of the cluster of buildings in the area under discussion has been substantially altered, making it appear as if the farm cottages and the 2 new houses would be essentially blended together almost as one cohesive unit. The farmhouse cannot be seen in this picture because of the angle, and this allows for this misleading appearance, but the farmhouse, a wide track and parking for 6-7 cars is, in fact, in between the cottages and the proposed new buildings! They have even inserted my own house, Delgany, peeping through the trees in the background, to make it appear only a couple of trees away, when in fact the wood on that side of my property is far too dense to allow it to be anywhere near visible and the applicant's photo shows the true distance it lies from the farmhouse!.

The discrepancies between the visualisations and reality are many, and I am sure you are an expert

ant having to interpret such material. Many misrepresentations can be seen by comparing my photo and the visualisation image. For example, the applicant has completely removed a full size garage from the foreground and "rebuilt" the two cottages in the foreground to alter their apparent size and width, so as to be able to blend the two new building layouts and the farm cottages almost as one entity, obliterating the width for the farmhouse, parking and track.

Whilst I am aware that photographic angles etc can be taken to enhance a subject matter etc, even taking this into account these visualisations must surely be classed as not being true to life. They must have been computer generated as they are actually impossible in reality! I enclose one of the applicant's "visualisations" and a real photograph that I took myself as well as a true photo taken by the appellant's team to demonstrate the proposed building location showing an area from my house to the farmhouse, to give a true idea of scale.

I have not manipulated my snapshot on any way. I have trimmed the visualisation slightly to let it fit on the page.

I do please ask you and your team to kindly bear this in mind when looking at the applicant's visualisations. I have put the annotated photos on a Word document attachment for comparison.

With many thanks,

Best wishes

Fiona Jewkes

DR FIONA JEWKES

My photograph of the 3 farm cottages – note the 2 foreground ones are connected, the third



(lower) is a detached house. The farmhouse cannot be seen from this view, but the largest house in the distance and the two trees lie next to it. My house is lost in the dense trees (even on a clear day).



Visualisation 3. The cars between the end cottage and the farmhouse appear to be in front of the nearest proposed new dwelling. Delgany appears to be only a couple of trees away from the further proposed new build (see agent's photo below, taken from middle of front of Delgany).



- *Agent's photograph enclosed to give an accurate perspective of the true distance, taken from Delgany looking over the proposed building site to the farmhouse. The tree next to the farmhouse (can just be seen by the hedge) is the same tree as by the telephone pole in my picture. Cottages are round the bend.*

Point 3.12

- The houses proposed would not have similar frontage to the farm house (a walled garden) nor the cottages (small front gardens surrounded by a dry wall construction which have been removed by the one visualised house). They can be seen, however, in my photograph. They are not of a similar scale in reality – the third “visualised” house at the front of the visualised photo is in fact 2 cottages.

Point 3.13

- There are no large houses in Old Cambus West Mains. The proposed new builds are larger. They would be modern and would not fit in architecturally with the already complete steading.

Point 3.14 /15

- The appellant is quite wrong in this respect. The appellant has not heard the noise due to visiting to assess it when the tree works were not using their heavy machinery. They are therefore not in a position to say that “noise is not an issue”. The Noise Impact Assessment was also done when the machinery was not working. The appellant has been told this many times. The machinery is used as required and this is variable in time and duration. The noise generated when it is operational remains a problem. Please see the objection letter from Mr Tom Dixon, owner of TD trees, who describes the type of machinery used.
- As nobody has so far measured the noise successfully, I found a document on line <https://www.hse.gov.uk/research/rpdf/rr618.pdf> written by the Health and Safety Executive, providing the information that from 11 woodchippers they tested, only one was less than 115dB (it was 113dB). This is obviously measured next to the chipper concerned, but at that level hearing can be permanently damaged after only a brief exposure. Whilst it is not my assertion that this noise would be actually dangerous (because of the distance from it), it explains why the noise is so loud (even at Delgany). More than one woodchipper would, of course, be considerably louder.

- The use of the words “will not harm the ...new houses” is presumptive.

Point 3.16

- The appellant claims that the land manager for the applicant has never heard the noise under discussion. This is not surprising as he does not live locally and almost certainly has never visited often enough to catch the machinery when working. I have, myself, heard the loud noise many, many times and would not want to live any closer. The appellant and her colleagues simply have not been there at the time it has been working.

Point 3.17

- The appellant says she does not believe that there is ever any noise. Quite simply she is wrong. I cannot make this clearer.

Point 3.19

- It is not for the appellant to decide whether the noise is significant or not. See Point 3.14-3.17

Point 3.22 / 3.23

- It is not for the appellant to consider noise should not be a barrier to this appeal.

Summary of Grounds of Appeal

Point 3.24

There is indeed numerical capacity for the 2 houses. However, in every other planning respect, the 2 proposed dwellings would be out of place. The chief underlying problems are

- that they would lie uphill and on the ridge of a hill (see photo Point 3.4).
- that they would spoil the sense of place that the old farm buildings have.

It is not possible to mitigate these issues.

Other considerations which are against having the houses are:

- There are other approved, more suitable places to build, such as at the edge of Cockburnspath village where most facilities are available (such as public transport).
- The houses would not fit in with the existing 18th Century buildings .
- The houses would affect the skyline (see objection letter and photo Caroline Tempest).
- There is no current need for employment at Old Cambus West Mains.
- There is no need for housing at Old Cambus West Mains, in economic or other terms (see Community Council objection in initial application).
- The houses would probably become second or holiday homes.
- There are grossly inadequate facilities at Old Cambus West Mains for the average household in the area (see objection letter Fiona Jewkes and others).
- The building would destroy wildlife and hedges (see multiple objection letters). The Ecology Report is not on the Planning Portal, though is cited by the appellant.

Point 3.25

- The siting of the houses in the field is not fixed, as they imply .
- There are a number of areas round the edge of the farm where they would fit in and be less obtrusive (down the hill) or they could be built at an alternative site

However, this should not be an argument, given the huge number of reasons for not building here in the first place.

Point 3.26

- Nothing the Council can do in designating the architectural design of the proposed houses will overcome the fact that they would be placed on a ridge “uphill” from the farm (topographically) and would be modern.
- They would continue to dominate the hamlet and the skyline whatever steps are taken.
- They would still not fit in with adjacent buildings which are more than 200 years old.

Point 3.27

- It is not unreasonable to include this in the planning refusal as the issue has to be investigated.
- The applicants have persisted in investigating this in a way that is unsuitable for the noise concerned.
- Asking the Council to go and listen for the noise is pointless – the noise will be there when the machinery is being used and will not be there when it is not. As a neighbour, I can assure everybody (yet again) that the noise of the timber being processed is intermittent, loud and mainly

unpredictable. (see Point 3.14 re measurement of noise (dB) of woodchippers
<https://www.hse.gov.uk/research/rrpdf/rr618.pdf>

Conclusions of APPELLANTS

Point 4.1

- It is unacceptable to introduce new spurious ideas in the conclusions. What is the significance of self builders? This is the second time (Point 1.8) this has been raised in this appeal document and it has not been raised before in the initial proposal. There is no self built property at Old Cambus West Mains.

Point 4.2

- The refusal of the planning permission was by the SBC Council, per normal regulations. What "delegated assessment" do the appellants refer to? The refusal of the planning was ratified by Julie Hayward, Team Leader, Development Management Planning, Housing and Related Services Corporate Improvement and Economy Scottish Borders Council.
- They do not comply with Policy PMD2 nor H2 of the Scottish Borders LDP 2016 nor the Supplementary Guidance on Placemaking and Design 2010 nor the document New Housing in the Borders Countryside 2008.

Point 4.3

- Old Cambus West Mains has a special sense of place of its own, where having 2 new houses located at one end of it would be most undesirable as they would almost link with Delgany

Point 4.4

- Design plans for a house cannot overcome the topography of the area (on a ridge on the top of a hill), nor the age difference of the current and proposed houses.

Point 4.5

- This is, of course, simply not true (previously mentioned). See the email sent from Tom Dixon to the Planning dept at the original application.

Point 4.6

I appreciate that due process must be done, but in my opinion, the appellants have given no arguments that have not previously been explored thoroughly and competently by the SBC Planning Department and led to their decision of REFUSAL.

My overall comments and opinion of the appeal document

I have read the document and commented extensively. It is extremely repetitive in its message. Overall:

- 1) Nothing has materially changed since the initial application and decision by the SBC Planning Dept. of REFUSAL which I feel to be correct.
- 2) This is in terms of:
 - guidance (H2 Local Development Plan 2016, Supplementary Planning Guidance on Placemaking and Design 2010 and New Housing in the Borders 2008)
 - The topography – shape and lie of the ground - of course, cannot change. A hill/ridge is a hill/ridge. The Planning Dept would doubtless be able to modify the design of the houses, but of course cannot modify the hill and ridge they would stand on, overlooking and dominating the steading and marring the overall view and the old steading buildings
 - Facilities in the area– these are still grossly inadequate for most households and remain unchanged (described by Dr Fiona Jewkes and others in their objections to the initial application). Most are provided at Cockburnspath, 3 miles away
 - Unfortunately, there is no public transport to the village 3 miles away and the village is the other side of the dangerous A1
 - The appellants seem to not wish to look at other more favourable sites - those at the edge of Cockburnspath village are already recommended in the LDP. If these sites are not owned by the applicant and that is a prerequisite, there are probably plenty of others on the landowner's land closer to the village of Cockburnspath, and other places on the same side of the A1.

- 3) Noise. The appellants have failed to address this. It is a subsidiary, but valid consideration compared to the location, and to deny it is unreasonable. They could arrange a Noise Assessment at a prearranged time. Woodchippers are very noisy. They have not tried to do this and this surely should have been done before declaring that the noise is a myth.
- 4) The appellant has ignored requests for further archaeological investigation by the Archaeology Officer.
- 5) The appellant has ignored the request by the Contamination Officer for further information.
- 6) The appellant has ignored the request by the Environmental Health Officer regarding an Agricultural Questionnaire.
- 7) The Ecology Questionnaire seems to have gone missing despite it being in the appellant's references and there are local concerns about bats (many) and a nesting barn owl locally.

Overall, I consider that the appellant is acting inappropriately in requesting an appeal. Both of their applications (initial and present) do not comply with Policy HD2 Supplementary New Housing in the Borders Countryside 2008. There is physical space for the 2 houses, but as the Officer's report so competently states:

"the houses would be harmful to the character of the building group and that of the surrounding area. The proposed development is not considered to be in keeping with the building group's sense of place or sufficiently well related to the farmhouse and the existing building group."

In my view, more practical sites should be considered, rather than attempting to obtain planning permission to build on a site which clearly would compromise the natural beauty of the area and is lacking facilities, especially when there are other better alternatives.

I hope my comments are helpful to the Committee. If I can be of further help please do contact me on [REDACTED]

References

New housing in the Borders countryside

https://www.scotborders.gov.uk/directory_record/7443/new_housing_in_the_borders_countryside/category/28/approved_planning_guidance_2008

Local Development Plan 2010 https://www.scotborders.gov.uk/downloads/file/2017/ldp_-_volume_1_policies_2010

New housing in the Borders LDP settlement Plan

https://www.scotborders.gov.uk/directory/77/settlement_profiles_2010

Supplementary planning Guidance Placemaking and Design

https://www.scotborders.gov.uk/directory_record/7444/placemaking_and_design/category/28/approved_planning_guidance_2010

Health and Safety Laboratory for the Health and Safety Executive 2008 RR618 Noise Emissions and exposure from Mobile Woodchippers <https://www.hse.gov.uk/research/rrpdf/rr618.pdf>

Other documents referred to are from SBC Planning Portal (Ibox) Initial application (21/00739/PPP)

1 – Decision Notice

2 – Officers Report

3 – Application forms

- 4 – Amended Site Layout
- 5 – Visualisations
- 6 – Planning Support Statement
- 7 – Agent Photo of Proposed Site
- 8 – Correspondence Agent and Officer
- 9– Noise Impact Assessment
- 10– Correspondence Agent and Environmental Health Officer
- 11- Agreement of Recommendation

From the Planning Portal (Idox) Appeal 22/00008/RREF

- 1-Review Statement
- 2- Notice of Review Form

Dr Fiona Jewkes,

Delgany

Cockburnspath

Scottish Borders

TD135YS

26th March 2022