

Wednesday, 17 August 2022



Local Planner
Development Management
Scottish Borders Council
Newtown St. Boswells
TD6 0SA

Development Operations
The Bridge
Buchanan Gate Business Park
Cumbernauld Road
Stepps
Glasgow
G33 6FB

Development Operations
Freephone Number - 0800 3890379
E-Mail - DevelopmentOperations@scottishwater.co.uk
www.scottishwater.co.uk



Dear Customer,

Pease Bay Holiday Home Park, Cockburnspath, TD13 5YP
Planning Ref: 21/01081/FUL
Our Ref: DSCAS-0070818-3XY
Proposal: Change of use of land and plot layout to form extension to caravan park

Please quote our reference in all future correspondence

Audit of Proposal

Scottish Water has no objection to this planning application; however, the applicant should be aware that this does not confirm that the proposed development can currently be serviced. Please read the following carefully as there may be further action required. Scottish Water would advise the following:

Water Capacity Assessment

Scottish Water has carried out a Capacity review and we can confirm the following:

- ▶ There is currently sufficient capacity in the Rawburn Water Treatment Works to service your development. However, please note that further investigations may be required to be carried out once a formal application has been submitted to us.

Waste Water Capacity Assessment

- ▶ Unfortunately, according to our records there is no public Scottish Water, Waste Water infrastructure within the vicinity of this proposed development therefore we would advise applicant to investigate private treatment options.

Please Note

- ▶ The applicant should be aware that we are unable to reserve capacity at our water and/or waste water treatment works for their proposed development. Once a formal connection application is submitted to Scottish Water after full planning permission has been granted, we will review the availability of capacity at that time and advise the applicant accordingly.

Surface Water

For reasons of sustainability and to protect our customers from potential future sewer flooding, Scottish Water will not accept any surface water connections into our combined sewer system.

There may be limited exceptional circumstances where we would allow such a connection for brownfield sites only, however this will require significant justification from the customer taking account of various factors including legal, physical, and technical challenges.

In order to avoid costs and delays where a surface water discharge to our combined sewer system is anticipated, the developer should contact Scottish Water at the earliest opportunity with strong evidence to support the intended drainage plan prior to making a connection request. We will assess this evidence in a robust manner and provide a decision that reflects the best option from environmental and customer perspectives.

General notes:

- ▶ Scottish Water asset plans can be obtained from our appointed asset plan providers:
 - ▶ Site Investigation Services (UK) Ltd
 - ▶ Tel: 0333 123 1223
 - ▶ Email: sw@sisplan.co.uk
 - ▶ www.sisplan.co.uk
- ▶ Scottish Water's current minimum level of service for water pressure is 1.0 bar or 10m head at the customer's boundary internal outlet. Any property which cannot be adequately serviced from the available pressure may require private pumping arrangements to be installed, subject to compliance with Water Byelaws. If the developer wishes to enquire about Scottish Water's procedure for checking the water pressure in the area, then they should write to the Customer Connections department at the above address.
- ▶ If the connection to the public sewer and/or water main requires to be laid through land out-with public ownership, the developer must provide evidence of formal approval from the affected landowner(s) by way of a deed of servitude.
- ▶ Scottish Water may only vest new water or waste water infrastructure which is to be laid through land out with public ownership where a Deed of Servitude has been obtained in our favour by the developer.

- ▶ The developer should also be aware that Scottish Water requires land title to the area of land where a pumping station and/or SUDS proposed to vest in Scottish Water is constructed.
 - ▶ Please find information on how to submit application to Scottish Water at [our Customer Portal](#).
-

Next Steps:

▶ All Proposed Developments

All proposed developments require to submit a Pre-Development Enquiry (PDE) Form to be submitted directly to Scottish Water via [our Customer Portal](#) prior to any formal Technical Application being submitted. This will allow us to fully appraise the proposals.

Where it is confirmed through the PDE process that mitigation works are necessary to support a development, the cost of these works is to be met by the developer, which Scottish Water can contribute towards through Reasonable Cost Contribution regulations.

▶ Non Domestic/Commercial Property:

Since the introduction of the Water Services (Scotland) Act 2005 in April 2008 the water industry in Scotland has opened to market competition for non-domestic customers. All Non-domestic Household customers now require a Licensed Provider to act on their behalf for new water and waste water connections. Further details can be obtained at www.scotlandontap.gov.uk

▶ Trade Effluent Discharge from Non-Domestic Property:

- ▶ Certain discharges from non-domestic premises may constitute a trade effluent in terms of the Sewerage (Scotland) Act 1968. Trade effluent arises from activities including; manufacturing, production and engineering; vehicle, plant and equipment washing, waste and leachate management. It covers both large and small premises, including activities such as car washing and laundrettes. Activities not covered include hotels, caravan sites or restaurants.
- ▶ If you are in any doubt as to whether the discharge from your premises is likely to be trade effluent, please contact us on 0800 778 0778 or email TEQ@scottishwater.co.uk using the subject "Is this Trade Effluent?". Discharges that are deemed to be trade effluent need to apply separately for permission to discharge to the sewerage system. The forms and application guidance notes can be found [here](#).
- ▶ Trade effluent must never be discharged into surface water drainage systems as these are solely for draining rainfall run off.
- ▶ For food services establishments, Scottish Water recommends a suitably sized grease trap is fitted within the food preparation areas, so the

development complies with Standard 3.7 a) of the Building Standards Technical Handbook and for best management and housekeeping practices to be followed which prevent food waste, fat oil and grease from being disposed into sinks and drains.

- ▶ The Waste (Scotland) Regulations which require all non-rural food businesses, producing more than 50kg of food waste per week, to segregate that waste for separate collection. The regulations also ban the use of food waste disposal units that dispose of food waste to the public sewer. Further information can be found at www.resourceefficientscotland.com

I trust the above is acceptable however if you require any further information regarding this matter please contact me on **0800 389 0379** or via the e-mail address below or at planningconsultations@scottishwater.co.uk.

Yours sincerely,

Angela Allison

Development Services Analyst

PlanningConsultations@scottishwater.co.uk

Scottish Water Disclaimer:

"It is important to note that the information on any such plan provided on Scottish Water's infrastructure, is for indicative purposes only and its accuracy cannot be relied upon. When the exact location and the nature of the infrastructure on the plan is a material requirement then you should undertake an appropriate site investigation to confirm its actual position in the ground and to determine if it is suitable for its intended purpose. By using the plan you agree that Scottish Water will not be liable for any loss, damage or costs caused by relying upon it or from carrying out any such site investigation."

Paul Duncan
Council Headquarters
Newtown St Boswells
MELROSE
Scottish Borders
TD6 0SA

Our Ref: 4137
Your 21/01081/FUL
Ref:

SEPA Email Contact:
planningsoutheast@sepa.org.uk

1 March 2022

dcconsultees@scotborders.gov.uk

Dear Paul

Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Acts

Planning Application: 21/01081/FUL

Change of use of land and plot layout to form extension to caravan park

Land West Of Pease Bay Holiday Home Park Cockburnspath Scottish Borders

SEPA Reference: 4137

Thank you for your consultation which was received by SEPA on 28 January 2022 in relation to the above application. We understand the reason for consultation is flood risk.

We previously provided comments on planning application 19/01709/FUL where we objected on the basis of flood risk and waste water drainage.

Advice for the planning authority

We have reviewed the information supplied with this planning application and have found it to be insufficient to allow us to determine the potential impacts. We therefore **submit a holding objection** and request that determination be deferred until the information mentioned in paragraph 1.3 below and Section 2 below has been provided for our assessment. Please see details and further advice below.

1. Flood Risk

- 1.1 We have been asked to comment on an extension to Pease Bay Holiday Park to include 19 additional static caravans/lodges.
- 1.2 Based on SEPA Fluvial Flood Maps, the site is partially at risk during a 1:200 year event as well as a 1:1000 year event, which this type of holiday accommodation has to take cognisance of due to falling within the most vulnerable land-use category. The lodges are generally set back from the watercourse but it is unclear what height differences exist between the lodges and the



Chairman
Bob Downes
Acting Chief Executive
Jo Green

Angus Smith Building
6 Parklands Avenue, Eurocentral,
Holytown, North Lanarkshire ML1 4WQ
tel 01698 839000 fax 01698 738155
www.sepa.org.uk • customer enquiries 03000 99 66 99

Cockburnspath Burn. The Flood Risk and Drainage Assessment (dated April 2021) supplied in support of the application provides spot heights for the road and possibly finished floor levels of the lodges, but no further topographic information is supplied in the Proposed Design drawing (21001-004, dated 16/04/2021). The topographical survey also supplied in the report is of too poor quality to identify any of the elevations. Cross-sections through the site have also been provided in November 2021 but none have included the watercourse. We would note that some channel dimensions and capacity have been provided but without wider context and model information, surveyed channel cross-sections, and catchment hydrology, we cannot comment further except to highlight that a velocity of 4.7m/s is well above 'normal' limits.

- 1.3 Therefore, we object to the application based on a lack of information. In the first instance, we would recommend that a legible topographic survey is provided, including the bed and banks of the watercourse, and further clarity is provided on existing and proposed site levels, all related (or confirmed) to mAOD (metres above ordnance datum), as cut and fill is required to create level development platforms. Should we be unable to determine the flood risk to the site from the Cocksburnspath Burn, we may require a detailed Flood Risk Assessment, which follows SEPA guidance.
- 1.4 We would also note that the council should be satisfied with the Microdrainage reports as the FSR method is identified as the rainfall model.

2. Waste water drainage

- 2.1 The information states that the foul water will be discharged through the existing outfall directly to sea. This is not the case, the current outfall is into the burn. However, we see in Appendix E that the pipe is shown to go into the burn. This needs to be clarified.
- 2.2 In addition, as this is a new plant, it will require a new licence. Also, if the discharge is into the burn before entering the sea, we need confirmation that the treatment levels are sufficient for the specific Q95 flows of the river.

3. Other planning matters

- 3.1 For all other planning matters, please see our [triage framework and standing advice](#) which are available on our website: www.sepa.org.uk/environment/land/planning/.

Advice for the applicant

4. Regulatory advice

- 4.1 Details of regulatory requirements and good practice advice, for example in relation to private drainage, can be found on the [regulations section](#) of our website. If you are unable to find the advice you need for a specific regulatory matter, please contact a member of the local compliance team at: ELB@sepa.org.uk

If you have queries relating to this letter, please contact planningsoutheast@sepa.org.uk including our reference number in the email subject.

Yours sincerely

Silvia Cagnoni

Senior Planning Officer
Planning Service

Ecopy to:

Paul.Duncan@scotborders.gov.uk
christopher.bradshaw@tetrattech.com

Disclaimer This advice is given without prejudice to any decision made on elements of the proposal regulated by us, as such a decision may take into account factors not considered at this time. We prefer all the technical information required for any SEPA consents to be submitted at the same time as the planning or similar application. However, we consider it to be at the applicant's commercial risk if any significant changes required during the regulatory stage necessitate a further planning application or similar application and/or neighbour notification or advertising. We have relied on the accuracy and completeness of the information supplied to us in providing the above advice and can take no responsibility for incorrect data or interpretation, or omissions, in such information. If we have not referred to a particular issue in our response, it should not be assumed that there is no impact associated with that issue. For planning applications, if you did not specifically request advice on flood risk, then advice will not have been provided on this issue. Further information on our consultation arrangements generally can be found on our [website planning pages - www.sepa.org.uk/environment/land/planning/](http://www.sepa.org.uk/environment/land/planning/).

Response On Development Affecting Trunk Roads and Special Roads

The Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997

**The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure)
(Scotland) Regulations 2013 S.I.2013 No 155 (S.25)**

Town and Country Planning (Notification of Applications) (Scotland) Direction 2009

To Scottish Borders Council Environment and Infrastructure Newtown St Boswells Melrose TD6 0SA	Council Reference:-	21/01081/FUL
	TS TRBO Reference:-	NSE/61/2021

Application made by Mr Graham Hodgson per Tetra Tech, QuayWest Trafford Wharf Road Manchester M17 1HH and received by Transport Scotland on 05 July 2021 for planning permission for change of use of land and plot layout to form extension to caravan park located at Land West Of Pease Bay Holiday Home Park Cockburnspath Scottish Borders affecting the A 1 Trunk Road.

Director, Roads Advice

1. The Director does not propose to advise against the granting of permission
2. The Director advises that planning permission be refused (see overleaf for reasons).
3. The Director advises that the conditions shown overleaf be attached to any permission the council may give (see overleaf for reasons).

To obtain permission to work within the trunk road boundary, contact the Area Manager through the general contact number below. The Operating Company has responsibility for co-ordination and supervision of works and after permission has been granted it is the developer's contractor's responsibility to liaise with the Operating Company during the construction period to ensure all necessary permissions are obtained.

TS Contact:-	Area Manager (A1) 0141 272 7100 Buchanan House, 58 Port Dundas Road, Glasgow, G4 0HF
Operating Company:-	NEW SOUTH EAST
Address:-	Bear House, Inveralmond Road, Inveralmond Industrial Estate, Perth, PH1 3TW
Telephone Number:-	0800 0420188
e-mail address:-	SEplanningapplications@bearsotland.co.uk

Transport Scotland Response Date:- 08-Jul-2021

Transport Scotland Contact:- Gerard McPhillips

Transport Scotland Contact Details:-

Roads - Development Management

Buchanan House, 58 Port Dundas Road, Glasgow, G4 0HF

Telephone Number:

e-mail: development_management@transport.gov.scot

NB - Planning etc. (Scotland) Act 2006

Planning Authorities are requested to provide Transport Scotland, Roads Directorate, Network Operations - Development Management with a copy of the decision notice, and notify Transport Scotland, Trunk Roads Network Management Directorate if the recommended advice is not accepted.

**Cockburnspath and Cove Community Council – Comments on Planning Application 21/01081/FUL
– proposed extension to Pease Bay Caravan Site/Verdant Leisure**

Cockburnspath and Cove Community Council discussed this application in outline at its meeting on 14th July, and the planning sub committee has subsequently met to discuss it further. We have received many comments regarding this from neighbours who will have a view of the extension to the site (Old Cambus and Delgany) as well as direct neighbours along the Pease Bay road itself.

This is the third such application on this site, and whilst we acknowledge that there have been further measures to mitigate the landscape and visual impact of the extension, we continue to have concerns, as do neighbours.

Underpinning Policies within the LDP (PMD1 and PMD2) refer to Sustainability and Quality Standards. **PMD1 (Sustainability)** relates to the protection of natural resources, landscapes, habitats and species; encourages the efficient use of resources, particularly non renewables; encourages walking, cycling and public transport in preference to the private car; encourages support to community services and facilities and the provision of new jobs and support to the local economy.

This application destroys gorse land (which is such a feature of our coastline) and changes the coastline and its appreciation, by coming “out of the bowl” of the current development boundaries of the site; it does nothing to encourage less reliance on vehicle use and in fact will contribute to an increase in road use and car transport; it does not encourage the efficient use of resources – eg solar power; rain water collection etc. Further, as stated in our previous objection to this development, there is virtually no support to the local economy, as visitors are encouraged to remain on site and use the on-site provisions. Whilst there is a minimal (usually seasonal) employment bonus, this is temporary in nature and the assertion that it will create further 3.5 jobs is ludicrous, even when using the developer’s own figures. Whilst a couple of lawn bowlers who stay at the site at weekends, use Cockburnspath Bowling Club, the site does not otherwise contribute to the local economy.

In the **Planning Statement** in support of this application (section 5.2 in particular) some claims are made which we consider spurious:

5.2.8 Based on the composition of the proposed development, there is the potential for an additional 90 people to be present which would make a positive contribution to the local economy through visits to local shops, attractions, pubs and restaurants.

5.2.9 Whilst there would be economic benefits arising from the development of the additional lodges, it is recognised that most of these benefits will be realised from the hire fleet lodges. The existing site contains 30 hire fleet units which provide approximately 1,500 bookings per annum, with an average of four people per booking (the hire fleet can accommodate up to six people) which equates to approximately 6,000 visitors per year. Based on these observed trends and maximum occupancy, the addition of seven hire fleet units could potentially attract between 1,400 to 2,100 additional holiday makers per year to the area.

5.2.11 In addition to this direct employment, the proposals will also help support jobs indirectly via supply chains and provides a boost to the local economy through patrons to the site using local services and facilities and providing a customer base to other local facilities, such as pubs

We would comment, as above, that visitors to Pease Bay do not contribute to the local economy in any measurable way. There are two local shops within Cockburnspath, access to these being wholly dependent on cars (Mr Neep and the new Cockburnspath Community Store); the nearest pub (outwith Pease Bay itself) or restaurant is located in Dunbar, or Coldingham. Visitors are encouraged

to remain within the park which has its own pub, restaurant and leisure complex and we consider the addition of the numbers of visitors anticipated, to only have benefit to Verdant Leisure. We cannot see that any workers during the construction phase etc will drive to Cockburnspath for goods, when they have them next door, on the Pease Bay site. Such statements are, quite frankly, misleading, and designed to attempt to create a sense of benefit where there is none.

PMD2 (Quality Standards) states that development should be in harmony with its surroundings and can be satisfactorily accommodated within the site. The extension proposed will bring the Leisure Park outwith the current landscape “bowl” in which it sits, and impact the road usage and residential amenity of neighbours even more so than currently. In addition, when viewed from Old Cambus (Delgany bungalow and West Mains farm and steading) it will have an adverse visual impact on the coastline. It will have a major impact on Old Linhead (adjacent) removing the current “boundary” between this private home and the leisure complex, impacting on privacy, creating the potential for more noise, and will have negative impacts on the Southern Upland Way (road and track); the Berwickshire Coastal Path; the Hutton Way (which we are trying to support given the tercentenary of James Hutton) and the Berwickshire Cycle path.

Specific Policies within the LDP worthy of mention in support of the underpinning policies above, fall into the following categories

Landscape and Visual effects – Policies EP3, EP5, EP11, EP13, EP14 are all relevant here.

EP5- The area is part of the Berwickshire Coast SLA, and the significance of the proposal to protrude the development outwith its current “bowl” will have an adverse impact on the SLA as mentioned previously. The policy states that the Council will seek to safeguard landscape quality and will have particular regard to the landscape impact of the proposed development including visual impact. It will only be permitted, where the landscape impact is clearly outweighed by social or economic benefits of local or national importance. Please see under PMD1 above regarding benefit to the local economy – this is minimal.

EP14 – Coastline – This policy links to EP5 and states that the coastline is designated for its nature and landscape value. Development will only be permitted where it is located in specific areas, (which don’t include Cockburnspath/Pease Bay) or the benefits clearly outweigh any damage to the landscape character. Any benefits of this development, in our opinion, do not outweigh the level of landscape damage.

EP11, EP3 and EP13 also relate to the protection of greenspace – particularly important here to neighbours at Old Linhead as a “separation boundary” and to the protection, rather than damage, to the gorse sea braes which are such a feature of our coastline here. Local biodiversity is not being respected nor supported in this application.

We would also add that last year, during extensive periods of rain, there was significant landslip at Pease Dean (opposite the proposed site) and along the sea braes. Coastal erosion and landslip are becoming more and more of a feature of living in this area, and we are concerned that the work proposed to create a tiered site may contribute to further landslip.

Roads and access:

ED8 (Caravan and Camping Sites) states that extensions to existing caravan sites will be supported in locations that can support the local economy – as mentioned above, this is not the case – and must not cause unacceptable environmental impacts. Particularly in this respect, neighbours and the community council have the strongest of concerns regarding the Pease Bay road access to the site:

- The road is narrow and most of its length relies on passing places
- The road has a national speed limit of 60mph

- The verges are already badly eroded especially as it narrows beyond the Wig Wam development and this, according to neighbours, has been largely caused by the large cranes used to move lodges at Pease Bay Leisure Park (see photos below)
- No pavements exist, and part of the road is also the Southern Upland Way.
- It is also part of the cycle network in this area
- Pedestrians and cyclists currently feel unsafe on the road due to the speed and volume of traffic, most of which is accessing Pease Bay
- The addition of 19 lodges may mean an increase in cars of 38 – 40. Many lodges currently have 2 cars associated with them, and “fleet hire” lodges may attract more as they sleep 6 in each.
- Traffic surveys completed some years ago, took measurements of traffic volume in November and February – in February the site is shut and November is off season. Further traffic census should be completed during June, July and August when traffic is at its peak.
- Farm access to Linhead farm is becoming more and more difficult as their land and driveway exit on to the Pease Bay road above the caravan site, and on a bend. Slow moving farm machinery takes its life in its hands exiting and crossing the road already without the addition of any new lodges. (see photo below).
- Cove Farm Cottages (4 homes) and all of New Cove (encompassing Cove Farm and associated neighbours numbering 9) also access and egress on to this road and are all finding the increase in traffic a big issue due to the narrowness of the road, and users of the caravan site being unaccustomed to road etiquette re passing places - many are also driving close to the national speed limit.

Below are a couple of photos of traffic coming into conflict on the road currently.





IS4 and IS5 relate to transport and development, infrastructure and the protection of access routes. There is no sustainable transport to Pease Bay which relies entirely on car use. No bus services or other links provide any form of access. IS5 aims to keep open any route and access rights, and these are being gradually eroded (SUW, Cycle paths and Berwickshire Coastal Path) due to the level and speed of traffic to Pease Bay. Also, the SUW will be negatively impacted (adjacent to Old Linhead) as it runs adjacent to the new proposed extension, which will be much closer than at present.

HD3 seeks to protect the residential amenity of neighbours and in our opinion and those of neighbours this proposal will negatively impact on their peaceful enjoyment of their properties from potential noise, increased traffic close to garden grounds (which is already an issue) in particular Old Linhead and Cove Farm Cottages. The potential for damaging effects on all of the properties having access to the Pease Bay road however, is obvious. Indeed, Old Linhead already suffers noise nuisance, and it is inconceivable to further impact on their amenity.

South of Scotland Destination Alliance (SSDA) emphasises post COVID recovery – this application isn't about recovery, it's a business case, and the addition of 19 lodges will have a minimal impact on recovery, if any. It does however, capitalise on the current situation which is encouraging "staycations". It does nothing to promote the clean type of tourism this area wishes to see – walking, cycling etc. There are no green credentials to be supported either. We further understand that Verdant Leisure is attempting to sell their sites at Pease Bay and Thurston Manor nearby.

Construction access:

It is unclear from the application where vehicle construction access will come from. There is a suggestion that this may be from the south, via the A1107, over the Pease Bridge, turning left into the D149 downhill into the park site. We doubt this will be possible in that access over Pease Bridge will be difficult for larger vehicles, and may not even be possible for cranes/lodges which additionally, we doubt will be able to come down the very steep southern access to Pease Bay and over the Ford, which was damaged recently. This route however would have less impact on others who reside in the area, although the nearby Alpaca farm and Pease Lye Kennels would be impacted should this be the proposed construction route. The Pease Bridge is a historic bridge, which

underwent significant repair at the expense of the Council in recent years. It was not built to withstand this type of traffic and is already having to cope with Drysdale's Quarry and farm transport.

Should construction access be off the A1 down the D149/Pease Bay road, to site it will require a traffic management analysis as it is the main access route to cottages, farms and of course Pease Bay Leisure Park itself. In the past, access has been by this latter route, when Verdant Leisure has been bringing in vans and lodges. (see photo above).

Despite the latter being the "simpler route" for traffic, please be aware that there is considerable concern from home owners on the road down to Pease Bay, about such access, as very large traffic will be passing their drives, and gardens, and cause further erosion to verges and tarmac. (see photo below).

The Agent has indicated that they intend to use the D149 for construction access, but the exact route will be agreed under CMP should the application succeed. They are however, aware of the complications of coming from the south.

We would recommend that a TMP be proposed should this application be successful, as it is going to be a lengthy construction period, and require significant soil extraction and landscape remodelling, plus the addition of a further 19 lodges, all of which will need to be transported to site.

Whatever construction route is used, it will cause a great deal of difficulty to those who reside in the area and use the country roads for walking, cycling and access to their properties.

Road condition:

Currently the road is in poor condition, and we append two photos – the first is adjacent to Cove farm and farm cottages, showing tramlines created by a crane, when its stabiliser legs came into contact with the tarmac. The second shows the ruts and poor verges further down towards Linhead farm. Although we acknowledge that other traffic uses this route, the larger heavier vehicles, which are causing such damage, are accessing Pease Bay. In addition to the construction type traffic, there are routine deliveries to the Pease Bay shop, pub, gas supplies and many many supermarket delivery vans which also contribute to the increasing volume of traffic.





In conclusion:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this application.

The Community Council has no difficulty in promoting and supporting responsible tourism to the area, and certainly appreciates that this can have positive impacts on the local economy. However, there are, in our view, no positives to this application, and the disbenefits far outweigh the very minimal benefits to Cockburnspath and Cove.

We have therefore taken the unusual position of objecting (rather than simply mirroring local concerns) to this application on the basis of

- Landscape and visual impact which cannot be satisfactorily mitigated (particularly the SLA)
- Road access re increased visitors, and during construction plus the impact on an already difficult and dangerous road
- Negative impact on important walking and cycling routes which we feel should be promoted rather than made more difficult to use
- Negative residential amenity impacts on other homes and farms in the area
- Lack of economic benefit to the local community
- Damage to roads – which are not suitable for the type of traffic proposed, particularly during the construction phase.

Cockburnspath and Cove Planning Sub Committee
P Hood, K Tulloch, and N Simpson
24th July 2021



CAUTION: External Email

Dear Sirs

Thank you for uploading the agent's response to objectors to the proposed extension to Verdant Leisure's Pease Bay Park.

Having read the response - particularly that of economic benefit to the local community - I can confirm that Cockburnspath and Cove Community Council stand by the concerns originally expressed.

K Tulloch
Planning sub committee
Cockburnspath and Cove Community Council

Sent from my iPhone

Consultation Reply

ASSETS AND INFRASTRUCTURE

To: HEAD OF PLANNING AND REGULATORY SERVICE

FAO: Paul Duncan

Your Ref: 21/01081/FUL

From: HEAD OF ASSETS AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Date: 19/07/2021

Contact: Raffaella Diesel

Ext: 6977

Our Ref: B48/3101

Nature of Proposal: Change of use of land and plot layout to form extension to caravan park
Site: Land West of Peas Bay Holiday Home Park, Cockburspath

In terms of information that this Council has concerning flood risk to this site, I would state that The Indicative River, Surface Water & Coastal Hazard Map (Scotland) known as the “third generation flood mapping” prepared by SEPA indicates that the site is at risk from a flood event with a return period of 1 in 200 years. That is the 0.5% annual risk of a flood occurring in any one year.

The Indicative River & Coastal Flood Map (Scotland) has primarily been developed to provide a strategic national overview of flood risk in Scotland. Whilst all reasonable effort has been made to ensure that the flood map is accurate for its intended purpose, no warranty is given.

Due to copyright restrictions I cannot copy the map to you however, if the applicant wishes to inspect the maps they can contact me to arrange a suitable time to view them.

A Flood Risk Assessment was provided in support of this application. The FRA by Tetra Tech includes an output from a MicroDrainage model for the proposed filter drains on the site. I note that the MicroDrainage output shows ‘Flood’ at the 15 minutes and 30 minutes 1:100 year plus climate change events (summer and winter).

I would ask that the applicant rerun the MicroDrainage model to check the risk of flooding to the site up to a 1:200 year + 35% climate change event. The model summary outputs should be submitted the Planning Authority.

Additionally, I would also ask the applicant to provide a post-development flow path drawing for the site, to show that when flooding occurs on the site from the filter drains, flood waters are diverted away for the caravans. The drawings should consider any flooding modelled up to a 1:200 year + climate change event.

With regards to the proposed filter drains, I would ask the applicant to supply more details on the proposed construction of the filter drains and perforated pipes, including on inlets and expected infiltration volumes.

The FRA also states that “...it is not considered necessary to provide attenuation given that the burn drains into the sea within the existing leisure park.”

As the proposed surface water outfall is to the Cockburnspath Burn, the burn flows into the sea approximately 200m downstream of the site and the high tide line for Peas Bay is at the bottom of the sand dunes, some attenuation and flow control needs to be provided within the site.

Regarding flood water attenuation, it would be acceptable to provide onsite storage for a 1:30 year + 50% climate change event.

Usually we would ask for discharge rates from a site to either be equivalent to the 1 in 1 year greenfield runoff rate or 5l/s, whichever is lower. Given that the Greenfield runoff rate for this site- as calculated in the FRA - is 0.15l/s, it seems unlikely that such a low flow can be achieved. Therefore, a discharge rate of 5l/s/ha would be acceptable.

Please note that this information must be taken in the context of material that this Council holds in fulfilling its duties under the Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009.

Technician – Flood and Coastal Management

Consultation Reply

ASSETS AND INFRASTRUCTURE

To: HEAD OF PLANNING AND REGULATORY SERVICE

FAO: Paul Duncan

Your Ref: 21/01081/FUL

From: HEAD OF ASSETS AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Date: 08/09/2021

Contact: Raffaella Diesel

Ext: 6977

Our Ref: B48/3101

Nature of Proposal: Change of use of land and plot layout to form extension to caravan park
Site: Land West of Peas Bay Holiday Home Park, Cockburspath

Further on from our response from 19th July the consultant Tetra Tech have provided additional information.

An updated drainage drawing was submitted (drawing no A117626-TTE-00-ZZ-DR-C-0100, rev. P02) which shows that the post development exceedance flows will be routed away from the caravans.

As noted in the last response the microdrainage model indicated flooding for the 1:100 year, 15 min Summer event and now also for the 1:200 year, 15 min and 30 min winter events.

Could the applicant clarify if the flooding during these events has been checked with the post-development flow paths to ensure no flood waters will reach existing or proposed caravans; This is because the post-development flow paths appear to run along the edge of the upper level and no flow paths are shown for the lower level.

Also, the flood depth for the flood events is shown to be over 0.9m. We are however unclear as to where exactly this flooding would occur. I would ask the applicant to clarify this as well.

Regarding the attenuation, we don't have any due concerns releasing water into the burn. However, given the proximity of some of the existing caravans to the burn downstream of the site, we need to ensure that the last section of the burn before it discharges into the sea can take the anticipated 1:200 year + climate change flood water volume without putting any existing caravans at risk of flooding.

Therefore, we would ask the applicant to provide details on the length of the burn from the last cross-section that was taken (mention in the correspondence) to the spring high tide mark. The maximum channel capacity and water depth for a 1:200 year + climate change event for at least 3 sections along this last stretch of the burn should be calculated and submitted.

Please note that this information must be taken in the context of material that this Council holds in fulfilling its duties under the Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009.

Technician – Flood and Coastal Management

Consultation Reply

ASSETS AND INFRASTRUCTURE

To: HEAD OF PLANNING AND REGULATORY SERVICE

FAO: Paul Duncan **Your Ref:** 21/01081/FUL

From: HEAD OF ASSETS AND INFRASTRUCTURE **Date:** 23/02/2022

Contact: Raffaella Diesel **Ext:** 6977 **Our Ref:** B48/3101

Nature of Proposal: Change of use of land and plot layout to form extension to caravan park
Site: Land West of Peas Bay Holiday Home Park, Cockburnspath

Further on from our response from 20th December 2021, the applicant has submitted more calculations on the channel width downstream of the application site.

These calculations appear to show that if the channel was only 2m wide, the water level during a 1:200 year flood event would still be below bank level.

Additionally, the applicant has previously stated that in a letter dated 6th August 2021, that “...Cockburnspath Burn has a catchment of 4.8 km². Greenfield runoff calculations indicate that the greenfield runoff during the 1 in 200 year return period event would be 180 l/s.” and that “the existing channel has a maximum capacity of approximately 470 l/s.” This was again reiterated in their letter from 21st September 2021.

This calculated 1:200 year water level for the Cockburnspath Burn in relation to its bank level- as presented by the applicant- seems unusual. This is because 1:2 year flood events are often considered to lead to ‘bank-full’ water levels.

We have used the FEH catchment data for the Cockburnspath Burn to calculate the greenfield runoff rate for the catchment and for the application site, using the Greenfield Runoff Estimation Tool from UKsuds.

These calculations estimate the 1:200 year discharge rate for the Cockburnspath Burn catchment as 803.2l/s.

The Greenfield Runoff Tool calculated Qbar as 0.94l/s for the 1.2ha site; the FRA showed Qbar for the site as 0.15l/s.

We would therefore ask the applicant to submit their greenfield runoff calculations up to a 1:200 year + climate change event.

Please note that this information must be taken in the context of material that this Council holds in fulfilling its duties under the Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009.

Technician – Flood and Coastal Management

Consultation Reply

INFRASTRUCTURE AND ENVIRONMENT

To: Chief Planning Officer

FAO: Paul Duncan

Your Ref: 21/01081/FUL

From: Head of Infrastructure and Environment

Date: 08/07/2022

Contact: Ian Chalmers

Ext: 5035

Our Ref: 3101

Nature of Proposal: Change of use of land and plot layout to form extension to caravan park
Site: Land West of Pease Bay Holiday Home Park, Cockburnspath

On 23rd February 2022, my colleague Raffaella Diesel responded to this application. This response requested that the applicant to submit their greenfield runoff calculations up to a 1:200 year + climate change event.

In May / June 2022, the applicant submitted additional information to SBC.

Firstly, I note that the new topographical information confirms that the proposed caravans are significantly higher (more than 8 metres) than the Cockburnspath Burn, and are very unlikely to be at risk of flooding at a 1 in 1000 year flood event from the Cockburnspath Burn.

Within the drainage layout drawing "A117626-TTE-00-ZZ-DR-0100-P03", it is shown that the surface water attenuation has been increased to 150m³, on new MicroDrainage calculations; this is appropriate.

The drawing also shows that surface water discharge is shown to be controlled to 2 litres per second by a vortex flow control chamber, rather than the previously un-controlled proposal. This is an appropriate mitigation measure to the issue of flooding to low lying caravans downstream of the application site, as discussed within previous responses.

I, therefore, remove our objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

Please note that this information must be taken in the context of material that this Council holds in fulfilling its duties under the Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009.

Ian Chalmers
Engineer – Flood and Coastal Management

PLANNING CONSULTATION

To: Landscape Architect

From: Development Management

Date: 6th July 2021

Contact: Paul Duncan ☎ 01835 825558

Ref: 21/01081/FUL

PLANNING CONSULTATION

Your observations are requested on the under noted planning application. I shall be glad to have your reply not later than 27th July 2021, If further time will be required for a reply please let me know. If no extension of time is requested and no reply is received by 27th July 2021, it will be assumed that you have no observations and a decision may be taken on the application.

Please remember to e-mail the DCConsultees Mailbox when you have inserted your reply into Idox.

Name of Applicant: Mr Graham Hodgson

Agent: Tetra Tech

Nature of Proposal: Change of use of land and plot layout to form extension to caravan park
Site: Land West Of Pease Bay Holiday Home Park Cockburnspath Scottish Borders

**CONSULTATION RESPONSE TO
PLANNING OR RELATED APPLICATION**

Comments provided by	Officer Name and Post:	Contact e-mail/number:
	Landscape Architect (Officer to fill in own name)	candrews@scotborders.gov.uk
Date of reply	07/10/2021	Consultee reference:
Planning Application Reference	21/01081/FUL	Case Officer: Paul Duncan
Applicant	Mr Graham Hodgson	
Agent	Tetra Tech	
Proposed Development	Change of use of land and plot layout to form extension to caravan park	
Site Location	Land West Of Pease Bay Holiday Home Park Cockburnspath Scottish Borders	
<p><i>The following observations represent the comments of the consultee on the submitted application as they relate to the area of expertise of that consultee. A decision on the application can only be made after consideration of all relevant information, consultations and material considerations.</i></p>		
Background and Site description	<p>This proposal is a further iteration of a previously refused planning application 19/01709/FUL for an extension to the Pease Bay Caravan Park. The site lies within the Berwickshire Coast Special Landscape Area (SLA) and is bordered to the south by a minor public road which also forms part of the Southern Upland Way and the Berwickshire Coastal Long Distance path. https://www.scotborders.gov.uk/directory_record/20043/local_landscape_designations</p>	
Key Issues (Bullet points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential visual intrusion and obstruction of views of the Special Landscape Area from the sensitive receptors including settlements, the public road and long distance footpaths. 	
Assessment	<p>This Planning Application is accompanied by a Landscape and Visual Appraisal that includes an assessment and summary of the effects on landscape and visual amenity and proposals for mitigation. A number of viewpoints identified on Fig 7.1, though poorly keyed into the text, have been illustrated with photographic images and considered in some detail as part of the LVA process. An updated landscape plan, planting plan and schedule have been included with the application.</p> <p>6.0 Effects on Landscape Character</p> <p>At 6.5.2 the applicant notes that to accommodate the lodges on the steep slopes 2no. terraces 40m wide x 218m long and retaining walls would be created. In addition earth works in association with the steep access from the D149 will be required. The report summarises that the ‘scale of change’ of the landform is likely to be small but no supporting information is provided regarding anticipated ground levels, heights of retaining walls, gradients and heights of banking at the terrace ends. I have concerns that the extensive lengths of the 2 terraces and retaining walls possibly 3-4m (?) high or more are likely to have a greater impact on the character of the landscape than assessed. Furthermore the lodges and their associated hardstanding, access road and dark mass of roofs may serve to emphasise the hard engineering of the retaining structures and terraces particularly in close proximity to the site albeit that mitigation planting is proposed.</p> <p>In landscape character terms there is a distinct transition between the contained Pease Bay valley and the open expansive tops. The movement from open landscape to enclosure provides an element of concealment and surprise when descending from the cliff tops into the valley, where suddenly the view opens out and the rugged coastline comes into view. The proposed lodges are on the threshold of the transition where the views are most dramatic. Low ridge heights have been indicated to limit intrusion on the views but this has not been supported with details of proposed ground levels, lodge types and ridge heights to show how this will be achieved. The single section through the site is insufficient to support this proposal.</p>	

Effects on visual amenity

The visual amenity of the proposal remains a concern from a number of viewpoints.

Fig 7.5 (view from the road close to Old Cambus West Mains) is an example of a view where the proposed extension will be seen separately from the existing site. It demonstrates how the extension will appear as a spur rising up out of the valley in this instance separated from the existing caravan park by its elevation and the intervening headland. Although it is a small part of a panoramic view and at some distance from the viewer there is the potential for the site to appear as an anomaly in the view and draw the eye of the viewer. The visualisations Fig 7.6 is a poor quality photograph in which the proposal is not well represented by the photomontage.

Fig 7.8. For walkers, cyclists and drivers heading south east on the D149 the view of the site will be of roof tops below road level. For those heading north west on the same road the lodges will be seen stepping up the hill towards Old Linhead. Although the LVA describes the ridge heights remaining below road level to minimise intrusion in the view there is insufficient information to support this in the form of cross sections, building heights, retaining wall heights and proposed levels. For walkers on the D149 particularly those descending the road the lodges will appear close to the viewer. The scale of rooftops in close proximity to one another in addition to the hard construction of the access road, parking and retaining wall in my view may contribute to a greater magnitude of effects than described. The Armco roadside barrier and proposed fence may also exacerbate the negative effects. I have concern that the low planting proposed to allow retention of views may not sufficiently mitigate the proposal from these locations.

I'm not convinced by the photomontage 7.9 photographed in fairly overcast winter conditions where no element of parking, access road, terracing or decked areas are shown. The lodges also appear to be much further away from the road edge than shown in the drawings. I consider the magnitude of change for people travelling north westwards from Greenheugh Point is likely to be greater than assessed. From the east of Pease Bay where the coastal path meets the road the extent to which the development climbs up out of the 'bowl' will be seen clearly. The density of development with 2 rows of lodges will be more apparent from this location especially as views out from the lodges facing eastward will be desired, potentially limiting options for and success of mitigating planting.

Fig 7.10 from the beach demonstrates again how this site extends out of the valley. A roof line of the 2 tiers or photomontage would have been valuable in providing a clearer picture of the situation as experienced from the beach. In this case I can't agree that the scale of change would be **small** as the double row of lodges would appear on a vertical face of the cliff, (in comparison to much of the existing site on the horizontal plane) facing the viewer and covering a significant portion of the enclosing cliffs. Again it is likely that open views are maintained from the lodges and therefore the existing and proposed mitigating planting will be at risk of removal or being cut back to open up views.

Cumulative Effects

Cumulative visual effects would arise from some viewpoints and sequential effects from the footpath and road network. In my opinion these effects are likely to be considerable particularly on approach from Old Linhead south eastwards where the densely developed site would appear in the foreground of views of the existing caravan park. Cumulative effects may also be greater than assessed in local views when heading westwards on the Berwickshire Coastal Path where the site would be seen as an extension to the current caravan park leading up the hillside, albeit that it won't breach the cliff containment of Pease Bay. However cumulative effects should lessen over time if the proposed planting reaches maturity, never the less from a number of viewpoints this proposal will be seen as a significant extension to the existing situation having potential adverse impacts on visual amenity.

	<p>An in depth colour assessment has been carried out of the potential colours for the lodges concluding that mid-dark, olive-greens should be used for harmony and to be recessive in the views. While I broadly agree with this assessment and recommendations the results need to be applied to lodge roofs as well as ancillary structures such as under-build, decking, railings, stilts, which have a tendency to stand out in views, drawing the eye to the development with negative visual impacts. Roof colour and texture would be important in views on approach from the west looking down on to the lodges from the minor road. To clearly describe colour recommendations, the colours should be identified by reference numbers on the colour charts shown.</p> <p>I maintain my position from the previous applications in which I recommended that a single tier layout set further back from the road edge could be supported. This should enable a reduction in the extent and height of the terrace and retaining wall construction required. While I am generally satisfied with the approach to planting the additional space should allow further planting to screen, soften and filter the row of lodges in views and improve assimilation of the site into the wider landscape. A lower elevation for the lodges would also achieve a closer link visually to the existing caravan park where mitigation planting could relate to the wooded sides of the burn.</p>			
Recommendation	X Object	<input type="checkbox"/> Do not object	<input type="checkbox"/> Do not object, subject to conditions	<input type="checkbox"/> Further information required
Recommended Conditions				
Recommended Informatives				

PLANNING & REGULATORY SERVICES

To:	Head of Planning & Regulatory Services					
F.A.O.	Paul Duncan					
From:	Planning & Regulatory Services					
Contact:	Erica Hume Niven	Ext. 6704	Ref:	21/01081/FUL	Date:	22/07/21

Nature of proposal:	Change of use of land and plot layout to form extension to caravan park
Site:	Land West Of Pease Bay Holiday Home Park Cockburnspath

Comments: ACCESS

Core Paths

According to the records held in the Planning & Economic Development Section there is one core path adjacent to this area of land, as shown on the attached plan as a purple line. Details as follows:

Core Path Code	Core path name	Length
189 (Scottish Borders section only)	Southern Upland Way- starts Port Patrick and ends at Cockburnspath	344km

Core paths are protected by law under the Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003 s.19 ‘The local authority may do anything which they consider appropriate for the purposes of ... keeping a core path free from obstruction or encroachment.’

Further comments

I note from the visual landscape report, specifically the plans and annotated map shown in fig.5.2 and 7.2 respectively, that the proposed extension to the caravan park will have a low visual impact for recreational walkers. However, consideration should be given to the accumulative impact if more extensions to the park were proposed.

General comments

Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003

There are other tracks in the area that the public would have a ‘right of responsible access’ to under the Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003. This right also extends to most land and inland water in Scotland.

Countryside (Scotland) Act 1967

Please note that Scottish Borders Council does not have a definitive record of every claimed right of way within its area. The Scottish Rights of Way and Access Society, the community council and local residents may have evidence of existence of claimed rights of way that have not yet been recorded by SBC.

Rights of Way are protected by law under the Countryside (Scotland) Act 1967 sec. 46 'It shall be the duty of a...planning authority to assert, protect, and keep open and free from obstruction or encroachment any public right of way which is wholly or partly within their area.'

Please note: There are a number of statutory provisions contained in both public and private Acts under which public paths may be formally diverted. (s.37 Countryside Act 1967, s.199 Town & Country Planning Act 1972, s.9 &12 Roads Act 1984) The diversion of a path may only be undertaken if the planning authority can be satisfied that the diversion will result in the efficient use of land or that a shorter or more convenient path will be created. It should be noted that formal diversions of paths involve a lengthy legal process.

Erica Hume Niven

Access Ranger

**CONSULTATION RESPONSE TO
PLANNING OR RELATED APPLICATION**

Comments provided by	Roads Planning Service	Contact e-mail/number:	
Officer Name and Post:	Keith Patterson Roads Planning Officer	kpatterson@scotborders.gov.uk 01835 826637	
Date of reply	29 th July 2021	Consultee reference:	
Planning Application Reference	21/01081/FUL	Case Officer: Paul Duncan	
Applicant	Mr Graham Hodgson		
Agent	Tetra Tech		
Proposed Development	Change of use of land and plot layout to form extension to caravan park		
Site Location	Land West Of Pease Bay Holiday Home Park Cockburnspath Scottish Borders		
<i>The following observations represent the comments of the consultee on the submitted application as they relate to the area of expertise of that consultee. A decision on the application can only be made after consideration of all relevant information, consultations and material considerations.</i>			
Background and Site description	This site has been subject to previous applications which have been withdrawn or refused.		
Key Issues (Bullet points)			
Assessment	<p>Whilst I have no objections to the principle of this development, I do have concerns regarding the gradients of the road within the site, the new junction which is to be formed and the level difference between the site and the existing public road.</p> <p>In order to consider the proposal further I shall require an Approval in Principle document to be submitted for the proposed retaining structure and an assessment of the need for a vehicle restraint system between the site and the public road as per CD 377 of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. I will also require a long section of the proposed access road showing the first 6m at a gradient of no steeper than 1 in 15 with the remainder being no steeper than in 10.</p>		
Recommendation	<input type="checkbox"/> Object	<input type="checkbox"/> Do not object	<input type="checkbox"/> Do not object, subject to conditions <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Further information required
Recommended Conditions			
Recommended Informatives			

AJS