

SCOTTISH BORDERS COUNCIL

PLANNING AND BUILDING STANDARDS COMMITTEE

5 JUNE 2023

APPLICATION FOR PLANNING PERMISSION

ITEM: **REFERENCE NUMBER:** 22/01734/FUL

OFFICER: Mr C Miller
WARD: Leaderdale and Melrose
PROPOSAL: Erection of 110 dwellinghouses including associated roads, drainage and landscaping
SITE: Land North Of Allanbank House, Manse Road, Lauder
APPLICANT: Whiteburn Projects

PLANNING PROCESSING AGREEMENT

A Planning Processing Agreement has been agreed for Committee presentation by 5 June 2023.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The site is located on the western side of Lauder, on the southern side of the B6362 Stow Road. The site consists of a grazing field with a gradual slope from south-west to north-east, totalling 3.78HA. Areas of maturing woodland lie between the field and the north, west and eastern boundaries, the latter being much younger than the other woodland belts. These three areas of woodland total nearly 3HA of land. The site also contains two parkland trees to the northern and western edges.

The site is bordered to the north by one of the woodland belts, the B6362 and an area of private housing north of the road, which stops partially short of the full western extent of the site. A high stone wall runs along the full extent of the northern boundary with a field access and timber gates towards the western corner. There is a wide grass verge between the stone wall and the road, with a footpath on the northern side of the B6352 serving the existing housing development. To the eastern side of the site beyond the young plantation belt lies another area of private housing known as Allanbank Gardens with Lauder Primary School and grounds further to the south-east.

The southern boundary partly borders a small grazing paddock to the south-western edge and the Category C Listed Allanbank House, Stables and Cottage to the middle and north-eastern part of the southern boundary, separated by post and rail fencing, a beech hedge and occasional mature trees in the grounds of the main house. The western boundary of the site is formed by another woodland belt with a vacant poultry unit beyond the woodland. An informal footpath network runs though the centre of the three woodland belts.

The site is peripheral to the town and not within the Conservation Area, the nearest part of the Conservation Area lying east of the woodland bordering Allanbank Gardens. It is allocated in the Local Development Plan for housing development, specifically as ALAUD001 with an indicative capacity of 100 houses. This allocation has been carried

through into the Proposed Local Development Plan. The allocation includes the woodland belts around three sides of the development and the additional paddock to the southern end of the site, albeit significant parts of the southern, western and northern boundaries are indicated for structure planting and landscaping.

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The application has been amended during the processing of the application and it is the amended version that is in front of the Committee for decision. The original application was submitted in full for the erection of 117 dwellinghouses and flats, 28 of them for affordable rent through SBHA and the remainder private market housing. The housing mix is claimed to be aimed at local needs and the breakdown of housing types is shown in Section 7 of the Design and Access Statement. This shows the vast majority of the housing to be 3 and 4 bedroom detached, semi and terraced houses with 14 units of two bedrooms or below. The majority of the units would be two storey, with some three storey flats at the entrance to the scheme, two single storey cottages next to Allanbank House and several 1.5 storey houses at corners of the private housing element. Designs will feature a number of gable street elevations with a mixture of main wall materials as render with features of reconstituted stone and composite cladding in lined boarding effects. The features are intended to be in darker colours with dark grey windows and doors.

One vehicular access would be taken into the site from the B6362 and the layout would be based upon a series of interconnecting streets and squares. The development would be contained within field, protecting the full width of the existing woodland belts. A footpath and cycle link will be provided at the eastern edge of the development to link with a shared surface roadway on Allanbank Gardens. A further footpath link will connect with the woodland belt to the western edge. The affordable units would be located at the eastern end of the development adjoining the young woodland plantation and Allanbank Gardens. A SUDs pond would be located at the lowest part of the site in the north-eastern corner.

The submission contains a mix of in-curtilage and communal parking and there is a full landscaping scheme, including retention and management of the surrounding woodland, retention of an isolated parkland tree, a linear park stretching through the centre of the site and other hard and soft landscaping treatments within the public areas. A new five metre deep planting belt is also proposed along the southern edge of the site with the small paddock and there are other tree screening proposals between the site and the Allanbank House listed complex.

The revised plans make a number of changes including the following:

- A reduction in overall numbers from 117 to 110
- A reduction of one affordable unit to 27
- Variations in the width and alignment of roads throughout the development
- Changes to layout and surroundings to squares
- A new footpath connecting the site with the Stow Road at the northern corner
- Removal of three storey "Colony" style flats
- An increase in 1.5 storey designs to 11 units with a second house type
- Replacement of a two storey with 1.5 storey house adjoining Allanbank Cottage/Stables
- Changes to mix and position of houses along main northern and western streets
- Retention of two parkland trees and amendment to open space to suit

- Inclusion of childrens' play area

This report will assess the revised version of the plans, with references to the original proposals where necessary to demonstrate how the development has progressed and addressed issues arising. The revised plans were subject to full re-consultation and neighbour notification together with newspaper advertisement. All consultation replies and representations on the Public Portal should be considered even if some also refer to the original submission. Only if representations are specifically withdrawn, will they be removed from the Portal and not considered.

In addition to the submitted plans and drawings, there are also statements and reports in support of the application, as follows:

- Pre-Application Consultation Report
- Design and Access Statement
- Preliminary Ecological Assessment
- Transportation Assessment
- Tree Survey
- Updated Bat and Badger Survey
- NPF4/Community Benefit Statement
- Ground Investigation Report
- Landscape Planting and Maintenance Proposals
- Response to SBC Comments

The application is classed as a 'Major' development under the Hierarchy of Developments (Scotland) Regulations 2009. The applicants publicised and held two public events in Lauder prior to the application being submitted, as well as consultation with Lauder Community Council. The outcome of the public consultation exercise has been reported in a Pre-Application Consultation Report submitted with the application. The requirements of the Development Management Procedure (Scotland) Regulations 2013 have been satisfied. The applicant has held further discussions with the Community Council during the application process.

PLANNING HISTORY

The current allocation for housing on the site has been through full public consultation during the Local Development Plan process, leading to designation as allocation ALAUD001 with an indicative site capacity of 100 units. This allocation has been carried through into the Proposed Local Development Plan for the same number of housing units. The latter has indicated a number of site requirements, including the following:

- One or two accesses from the Stow Road
- Road link into housing development to east
- Extension of Stow Road footpath
- Retention and enhancement of tree planting around boundaries
- Roadside wall retention
- Maintenance of landscaped areas
- Path linkages
- Protection of setting of C Listed buildings at Allanbank House/Stables Cottage
- Gas Pipeline exclusion zone, flood risk and poultry farm buffer mitigation to west of site

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Scottish Borders Council Consultees

Roads Planning: No objections but a series of revisions suggested. Requires at least one vehicular access onto Stow Road, the footpath to be extended, a new footpath link to the Stow Road from the north-eastern corner of the development and the link to Allanbank Gardens non-vehicular. Layout revisions suggested include additional internal footways, an additional vehicular link to the affordable housing, increased communal parking, improved visitor parking distribution, alternatives to in-curtilage parking, EV provision, road surfacing variation, house and plot variation and improvements in featureless streets.

After re-consultation, accepts revised plans but still seeks additional internal linking footways, maintenance proposals for the linear path, measures to prevent vehicles using the Allanbank Gardens path link, equity of parking provision and full swept path analysis.

Education Officer: Developer contributions required for Lauder Primary School and Earlston High School.

Landscape Architect: Further revisions and responses required. Concerned over proximity of houses on the western edge of the development to a maturing woodland belt with resultant loss of light/shading and overbearing impacts. Requires a 15m buffer to ensure problems are addressed and NPF4 Policies met. Only direct impact on woodland trees at access routes through woodland, requiring individual tree surveys and reconsideration of main vehicular route. Requires retention of the parkland trees within site with safeguarding of root protection areas.

Layout requires more variety with staggering house positions, reconfiguration of communal parking and attention to boundary treatments. Small trees should be added within the site, within public spaces and some rear gardens, with beech hedging along the southern edge and enhanced landscaping around the SUDs pond.

After re-consultation, raises no objections but maintains some concerns over distance of houses from western tree belt. Makes recommendations over planting species and seeks conditions relating to woodland management, tree protection and boundary treatments.

Heritage Officer: Sets out the relevant legislative context, including LDP and NPF4 Policies, supplementary guidance etc. Assesses development against six principles of successful places and makes suggestions on layout revisions including focal points, parking arrangements, relation to retained trees, improved connections to path networks, enhanced frontages to the linear park etc. Also seeks maintenance of the woodland belts, retention of walls and full boundary treatments. Seeks greater variation in building forms and density, including an additional 1.5 storey design and attention to square and road end impacts. Building designs need reconsideration including deletion of the three storey Colony flats, more vertically enhanced window proportions and further information on external details. Sustainability features encouraged.

Impacts of development on Category C Listed Allanbank House and Stables/Cottage limited, the main house facing south-east and being protected by buffer open space. The Stables and Cottage still relate to the main house unaffected and orientate in that direction, the rear having been subject to alteration and addition. With proposed

intervening planting, open space and reduction of house types to single storey, the setting would be preserved without impact on character.

After re-consultation with revised plans, welcomes revisions and improvements. One of the retained trees is in a different position and seeks window revisions to houses adjoining the linear park. Still maintains request for more vertical window proportions and seeks specific communal car spaces to be moved.

Housing Strategy: Meets identified housing needs, the affordable element reflected in the Strategic Housing Investment Plan.

Flood Protection: No objections but seeks drainage calculations for surface water run-off from the site, including how the water will be diverted from property. If surface water connects with combined sewer, then discussion with Scottish Water required about options. Seeks condition to obtain surface water routing and drainage calculations. Upon receipt of detailed drainage calculations, withdraws request for condition.

Ecology Officer: Provides a confidential response in relation to badgers, licensing and more detailed surveys perhaps required. Bat and bird interests relating to trees intending to be removed for the access road, further surveys and mitigation required. Further squirrel surveys required and lighting details provided, especially facing the shelter belt. Shares Landscape Officer concerns over pressure on shelterbelt felling and requires Habitat Management Plan for the shelterbelt augmentation and maintenance. More comprehensive tree survey required.

After re-consultation with revised plans, maintains previous comments but also seeks removal of beech trees within the south-eastern hedgerow and one planting species.

Upon receipt of updated surveys, seeks conditions on Species Protection Plans and a licence for badger, bats (including lighting), no development in breeding bird season unless otherwise agreed and a Biodiversity Enhancement scheme.

Access Officer: Response awaited.

Archaeology Officer: No objections but in possible vicinity of a Medieval castle, on western side of Medieval Burgh of Lauder and also several agricultural historic interests with possibility of below ground archaeology. Evaluation work through trenching required as part of a written scheme of investigation, to be secured by planning condition.

After re-consultation with revised plans, maintains original comment.

Neighbourhood Services: Response awaited

Waste Services: Roads do not appear wide enough nor is there provision for refuse vehicles.

Statutory Consultees

SEPA: No remit to comment and would rely on standing advice

Transport Scotland: No objections.

After re-consultation with revised plans, maintains original comment.

Scottish Water: No objections. Water and foul drainage capacity in the public network to accommodate the development although formal consent still required directly from Scottish Water. Surface Water not accepted into public combined sewer.

After re-consultation with revised plans, maintains original comment.

Lauderdale Community Council: No objections but concern and requires clarification over the impacts of the development on sewerage system, school, water, health service and bus capacity. Also notes no playpark proposed, local concerns over the War Memorial junction with the A68 and the need for a new path in the North-East corner.

Non-Statutory Consultees

National Gas Transmission: Response awaited.

Association for the Protection of Rural Scotland: Response awaited.

Berwickshire Civic Society: Neutral. Notes substantial development but well outside Conservation Area. Mitigation by tree belt surrounding which should be protected and augmented with a 50 year plan.

Scottish Badgers: Area is suitable habitat for badger activity. Recommends a survey by qualified consultant, with licensing and a Protection Plan dependent on findings of survey.

REPRESENTATION SUMMARY

Following the neighbour notification and press advertisements, there were a total of 46 representations received in total to the original application and revised plans. 38 of these were objections, 6 in support and 2 neutral. All representations are viewable in full on Public Access and the main points raised can be summarised as follows:

Objections

- Overdevelopment and high density, out of keeping with surroundings
- Inadequate open space provision
- Designs, colours, materials and 3 storey flats prominent and not in keeping with local architecture
- Concerns over link to Allanbank Gardens, may carry vehicles, would not be adopted and difficult in winter conditions
- Affordable development concentrated in one place and not spread throughout, lack of evidence for strategy
- Adverse impacts on setting of Allanbank Cottage/Stables Listed Building
- Link, rear elevations and garden arrangements will cause privacy intrusion
- Inadequate safe capacity for additional traffic on Stow Road and junction with A68
- Inadequate pedestrian provision on Stow Road
- Development not sustainable in transport terms and flawed Transport Assessment
- Contravention of LDP Policies and Placemaking SPG, including lack of Energy Statement
- Surface water and foul drainage concerns, lack of SUDs capacity and lack of Flood Risk Assessment

- Strain on local services such as schools, health centre, football club etc
- Query retention and management of woodland
- Impacts on wildlife
- SUDs area should move back to where affordable housing is
- No EV provision
- Inadequate fencing and walling height
- Insufficient buffer space between development and woodland
- Inadequate planting proposals for eastern woodland belt
- Revised plans do not overcome high density issues nor impacts on ;listed buildings
- New path link welcomed but inadequate and unattractive to use
- Disparity in energy efficiency between private and affordable homes

Support

- Provides much needed new modern housing addressing a shortage
- Sustainable location and infrastructure

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES:

Scottish Borders Local Development Plan 2016

- PMD1 Sustainability
- PMD2 Quality Standards
- PMD3 Land Use Allocations
- IS2 Developer Contributions
- IS5 Protection of Access Routes
- IS4 Transport Development and Infrastructure
- IS6 Road Adoption Standards
- IS7 Parking Provision and Standards
- IS8 Flooding
- IS9 Waste Water Treatment Standards and Sustainable Urban Drainage
- IS12 Development Within Exclusion Zones
- EP1 International Nature Conservation Sites and Protected Species
- EP2 National Nature Conservation Sites and Protected Species
- EP3 Local Biodiversity
- EP7 Listed Buildings
- EP8 Archaeology
- EP9 Conservation Areas
- EP13 Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows
- EP15 Development Affecting the Water Environment
- HD1 Affordable and Special Needs Housing
- HD3 Protection of Residential Amenity

Scottish Borders Proposed Local Development Plan 2022

- EP17 Food Growing and Community Growing Spaces
- IS5 Protection of Access Routes
- IS6 Road Adoption Standards

NATIONAL PLANNING FRAMEWORK 4

- Policy 1 – Climate Crisis
- Policy 2 – Climate Mitigation

Policy 3 – Biodiversity
Policy 4 – Natural Places
Policy 5 - Soils
Policy 6 – Forestry, Woodland and Trees
Policy 7 – Historic Assets
Policy 12 – Zero Waste
Policy 13 – Sustainable Transport
Policy 14 – Design Quality and Place
Policy 15 – Local Living
Policy 16 – Quality Homes
Policy 18 – Infrastructure
Policy 20 – Blue and Green Infrastructure
Policy 21 – Play and Recreation
Policy 22 – Flood Risk
Policy 23 – Health and Safety

OTHER PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

PAN 44 Fitting New Housing into the Landscape 2005
PAN 61 Planning and Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems 2001
PAN 65 Planning and Open Space 2008
PAN 67 Housing Quality 2003
PAN 75 Planning for Transport 2005
Designing Streets 2010

SPG Affordable Housing 2015
SPG Development Contributions 2023
SPG Trees and Development 2020
SPG Landscape and Development 2008
SPG Green Space 2009
SPG Placemaking and Design 2010
SPG Guidance on Householder Development 2006
SPG Waste Management 2015
SPG Biodiversity 2005
SPG Local Biodiversity Action Plan 2018
SPG Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems 2020

KEY PLANNING ISSUES

The main determining issues with this application are compliance with Local Development Plan Policies, Supplementary Planning Guidance and NPF4 on development on allocated sites, density, traffic impacts, design, landscaping, drainage and development contributions.

ASSESSMENT OF APPLICATION

Planning Policy

The site is allocated for housing in the adopted Local Development Plan as allocation ALAUD001, with an indicative site capacity of 100 units. This allocation has been carried through into the Proposed Local Development Plan for the same number of housing units. The latter has indicated a number of site requirements, including the following:

- One or two accesses from the Stow Road

- Road link into housing development to east
- Extension of Stow Road footpath
- Retention and enhancement of tree planting around boundaries
- Roadside wall retention
- Maintenance of landscaped areas
- Path linkages
- Protection of setting of C Listed buildings at Allanbank House/Stables Cottage
- Gas Pipeline exclusion zone, flood risk and poultry farm buffer mitigation to west of site

Although there is no site specific requirement relating to transport listed in the Local Development Plan, Appendix A clearly states that a Transport Assessment will always be sought for any development above 50 units and that the developer would be expected to pay for any off-site roadworks required as a result of their development. A Transport Assessment has been submitted with the application.

Bringing the site forward for housing development reflects the Council's housing land commitments for periods to 2023 and beyond. In terms of the principle of a housing development on this site, the Policy background is one of full support. The proposal is for housing development in compliance with the intended use in Policy PMD3. The site provides a contribution towards Council housing land targets, identified in the previous SESPlan and in line with "Key Outcomes 1 and 2" in the Local Development Plan i.e. effective housing land supply and opportunities for affordable housing.

NPF4 contains a number of relevant Policies relating to large housing developments and their impacts within settlements, including Policy 3 Biodiversity, 4 Natural Places, 13 Sustainable Transport, 14 Design Quality and Place, and especially 15 Local Living and 16 Quality Homes. The applicant has also submitted a NPF4 Statement with the application.

The principle of the development should be assessed primarily against the provisions of the Development Plan in the first instance, as required by Section 25 of The Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997. It is only if there are material factors of sufficient significance that outweigh the provisions of the Development Plan, then determination could be against the provisions of the Plan. Much assessment from respondents and in this report will correctly focus on those material factors, including the impacts and consequences of the increased number of housing units above the indicative capacity, character, residential amenity, environmental issues and infrastructure. This report will contend that those material factors are not demonstrating sufficient adverse effects to the extent that refusal of housing development with a proportion of affordable housing on an allocated housing site would be justified.

The allocation in the Local Development Plan provides a total indicative capacity of 100 houses. However, as discussed with other developments on allocated sites that have been presented to Committee, indicative capacity figures should not be seen as absolute maximum figures or caps. They are designed to ensure that the Council meet their five year housing land supply obligations set by the Government and are included within the Local Development Plan to ensure sufficient effective housing land for the period of the Plan and beyond. The figures are not derived from an exhaustive analysis of the potential layout of every site but on general size and density parameters. Although there may be consequential impacts, the fact that a proposed development exceeds the indicative capacity is not, in itself, justification per se for rejection of an application.

It is possible that, once detailed assessment has been carried out and layouts have been designed, development could prove to be acceptable in excess of the indicative capacity. This has happened on a number of sites throughout the Borders where developments in excess of the stated capacity have still been considered to be acceptable. It is indeed often the case that a higher density can lead to a better form and layout of development. The issue is whether the additional number of units causes significant and demonstrable harm that cannot be addressed or mitigated satisfactorily. In the case of developments including an affordable element, higher densities are also likely as a result of economies of scale and the generally smaller house sizes. The Placemaking and Design SPG also lends support to the benefits of higher densities, including using them in specific parts of a development to help define sense of place.

Members will note a number of objections to the development on the basis of overdevelopment, high density and inappropriate density and layout in comparison with adjoining developments. However, as explained above, larger housing developments incorporating affordable housing elements have tended to increase in density, also reflecting Government placemaking policies and the local living agenda. This development, on the basis of the reduced number of 110 houses from 117, is at a rate of 28.9 houses per hectare which compares favourably to 34.5 houses on a recent private housing development to the south of Lauder or 34.5 per hectare at South Parks in Peebles. The density is higher than the immediately adjoining housing developments to the east and north of the site but, in the overall planning balance, this report contends that, after amendment, the layout and design of the development complies with placemaking and local living policies. It creates a sense of place with a variety of designs and spaces, also respecting its surroundings which include woodland belts on three sides. It utilises a mixture of house sizes and styles to meet local demands, providing a development which, whilst not replicating the low density and larger house types adjoining the site, is still of a scale, massing, height and density appropriate to its surroundings and respectful of neighbouring built form – which are requirements of Policy PMD2.

Layout

The applicant has submitted a Design and Access Statement, which has been amended following revision to the development, and supported by an NPF4 Statement. These contend that the mix of 1-4 bedroomed homes meets local demand and a shortfall of housing land in the Borders, being within short walking distances of facilities in Lauder and public transport links, thus complying with the 20-minute neighbourhoods being promoted in Policy 15 of NPF4. They consider that their proposed layout creates a natural extension to Lauder, maintaining a natural feel to the housing extension through a balance of development and green spaces, with linear connectivity and permeability. The Design and Access Statement concludes that with a range of house types and a layout bisected by a linear park, there is a rich and interesting streetscape forming streets, avenues and squares. The layout is enclosed by existing structure planting that will be retained and augmented, blending the development in with its transitional position between town and country.

Although the application originally proposed 17 houses above the indicative capacity for allocation ALAUD001 in the Local Development Plan, it was considered that the layout and density were in general compliance with LDP Policies PMD2, HD3 and the “Placemaking and Design” SPG, together with the housing, placemaking and local living Policies in NPF4.

The density of the development has been discussed in the previous Section of this report. The use of a number of semi-detached and terraced units makes more effective

use of ground and minimises the detrimental visual effects of increased unit numbers by providing greater space in between houses. Had the application been submitted for the indicative capacity of 100 units on a purely detached house basis, there would have been likely to have been more repetition of narrow gaps between gable walls and an impression of congestion and overdevelopment possible as a result, given that house types would have been likely to be larger in individual footprint.

It is not considered that the layout and density are contrary to Policies or Guidance, inappropriate for the area nor causing any demonstrable harm to the surrounding residential areas or landscape. At 117 units across 3.8 HA, this equates to 30.79 units per hectare which has parallels in recent approvals for housing developments elsewhere in the Borders, mentioned previously.

To comply with Development Plan Policies and the “Placemaking” SPG, any layout and density have to be appropriate to their surroundings and be compatible with, and respect the character of the surrounding area and neighbouring built form. The SPG repeatedly uses reference to the built context. However, the Policies and Guidance do not intend to seek identical or replica layouts and densities throughout a settlement, the importance of interest and variety being stressed.

The overall layout is significantly influenced by the rectilinear shape of the site, the difference in levels from south-west to north-east, the need to connect the site both with the Stow Road and Allanbank Gardens, and the retention of planting belts around three sides. Although the layout has been informed by Guidance such as Designing Streets, the “Placemaking” SPG and the new NPF4 Policies on local living and quality homes, the layout faced significant challenges from the aforementioned factors and attempts to redress all constraints on the site, whilst still providing a development with visual interest and sense of place

The alignment of the houses follows the line of the woodland belts to the north and west of the site, linking internal streets within that and a permeable linear space with footpath through the centre of the site. Various squares, open spaces and parking nodes would link and punctuate the street pattern. Whilst the original submission of 117 houses and flats on this basis was largely acceptable and did not exhibit significant levels of overdevelopment to the detriment of the surrounding natural and built environment, there were a number of issues identified with the application that needed to be improved, resulting from the chosen number of houses and original house types and layout. These were mainly as follows:

- During the pre-application procedure, the applicant was invited to consider the general density and form of the proposals and was advised to take into account the comments of the Heritage Officer. It was recommended that there should be more variation in density and design due to the proposal being uniformly two storey at that stage. Whilst it was acknowledged that upon application, the applicant introduced two bungalows at the south-eastern edge of the site and some 1.5 storey units at the corners of streets in the south-western part of the site, this did not provide the degree of variation and alleviation of uniformity that was identified as an issue at pre-app stage. Only six houses out of 117 units were below two storey height. Whilst a low-density development to mirror surrounding development was not sought, the density, layout and number of two storey houses still caused concern in relation to the setting and achieving varied and successful placemaking. Variations were invited, incorporating the views of the Heritage Officer, to improve the layout and create more variety of building form, height and layout. This should also enlarge and enhance the open spaces already shown within the layout.

- The design of the 1.5 storey unit was supported as it successfully addressed different streets and elevations of the development. As part of the revision to layout, it was recommended that house numbers were reduced where issues were caused and a greater proportion of single and 1.5 storey units proposed, especially to the sensitive edge next to Allanbank listed buildings. It was recommended that this also included an additional single or 1.5 storey house type.
- The concept of three storey units was raised at pre-app stage and whilst there was general support if the remainder of the development was improved in density and variation of building forms and heights, this was not done to the level expected. As this has not yet been achieved satisfactorily and as the location and number of three storey designs were unclear on the original submission, their removal from the proposals was recommended as their design was considered inappropriate and vertically accentuated. They were also the subject of significant objections from members of the public.
- The Heritage and Landscape Officers suggested improving the street and square elevations by varying house elevations, positions and parking. This was commended to the applicant to improve the development at the entrance square and at other squares where the development does not fully address each civic space. It would also allow for focal points at the end of longer streets and full elevations facing the linear open space.
- The northern edge of the development had been improved since the pre-app stage but there was still concern at the uniformity of building lines and designs. This had not been fully addressed by the variations in road line and squares and it was considered that this building line needed greater punctuation and variation than could be achieved by road geometry alone. Similarly, the western edge also exhibited insufficient variation and was likely to be potentially impacted by the requirements of the Landscape Officer and the need for consideration of enhanced 15m setback from the tree lined edge. Variation in distances from this edge were considered not only to improve interest but also create further space from the poultry farm buildings to the west of the site. The opportunity should also be taken to retain the Category B tree within the site at Plot 73 and for additional scarcement at Plot 75.
- privacy loss issues were identified within the development and in relation to Allanbank Cottage/Stables

The applicant responded to these concerns with amended proposals which were the subject of full re-consultation and neighbour notification. In relation to the layout and housing number/variation issues identified, the following revisions were made:

- A reduction in overall numbers from 117 to 110
- A reduction of one affordable unit to 27
- Variations in the width and alignment of roads throughout the development
- Changes to layout, landscaping, parking and surroundings to squares
- A new footpath connecting the site with the Stow Road at the northern corner
- Removal of three storey “Colony” style flats
- An increase in 1.5 storey designs to 11 units with a second 1.5 storey house type, provided at focal points and corners

- Replacement of a two storey with 1.5 storey house adjoining Allanbank Cottage/Stables
- Changes to mix and building line of houses along main northern and western streets
- Retention of two parkland trees and amendment to open space to suit with a new square to the north-east of the site and omission of a house along the western edge
- Inclusion of childrens' play area

These revisions met with acceptance from the Heritage and Landscape Officers who considered that the easing of the density and improvement in housing alignment, mix and increase in open space and landscaping, resulted in a development which was now in compliance with LDP Policies, SPGs and NPF4 Policies in relation to quality and placemaking. The Heritage Officer specifically tested the revisions against the six listed qualities of successful places in NPF4 Policy 14 and now supports the application. Whilst some issues still need to be addressed, they can be handled by planning conditions, including agreement on phasing. There has been no withdrawal of objections from those who lodged objections to the first proposal and Members will need to be aware that their objections still stand, also noting that some have lodged additional comments and concerns following the submission of revised plans. Their main points are that the development is not sufficiently reduced to allay the layout and density fears, whilst still expressing concerns over affordable housing location, road safety and drainage impacts

For the aforementioned reasons, it was not considered that the density and layout of the development were inappropriate for the area nor incompatible with character, albeit some improvements to enhance variety of layout were sought. With the changes now made to the development as listed above, it is considered that the layout is compliant with Local Development Plan Policies, NPF4 Policies and relevant Guidance on placemaking, design quality and local living.

Design

The design of the development must comply with Local Development Plan Policy PMD2, the "Placemaking and Design" SPG and NPF4 Policies such as 14 on Design, quality and place. PMD2 requires developments to be of a scale, massing and height appropriate to their surroundings and finished in materials that complement the highest quality of architecture in the locality.

The Design and Access Statement considers the design approach to comply with Local Development Plan Policy, influenced by the local area in relation to materials. The range of 1-4 bedroomed units in detached, semi and terraced form, with some single storey and 1.5 storey designs is claimed to introduce diversity whilst linking in with local vernacular. All units use dual pitched roofs in one matching grey roof tile to be agreed, with many gable-ended onto street frontages. Given the contribution this makes to placemaking and variety of streetscapes, when mixed with lower house types with side elevations and side roofspans to streets, there is no issue with such alignment, especially when the architectural treatment to the front gables is varied with different materials and feature panels. This is shown on the External Finishes Site Development Plan, showing mixes of cedar lined boarding, render and two types of reconstituted stone.

This mixture of finishes is applied throughout the development, including the affordable housing, to ensure variety and integration. Materials will have to be carefully selected

to ensure that variety of texture and colour is achieved whilst still blending in generally with the colours and tones in the area. Over-use of dark greys, for example, may look appropriate in the former industrial setting of Caerlee Mill where the applicant previously developed, but would be less appropriate on this greenfield, rural fringe site. The main house colourings should be light in tone with some textured feature panelling in matching colours and fewer in darker colours, perhaps at focal points, in squares and on corners. The agreement of the precise colours and feature panels for the walls, roof tiles, windows and doors can be reserved through planning condition.

Discussion at pre-app stage led to an expectation that windows would be given greater vertical emphasis than was actually the case with the application submitted. Whilst some house types have elevations with vertical window emphases, many still have a horizontal emphasis or are fully square. Mullions had been suggested at pre-app stage but there was no evidence, at least with the private house designs, of this being utilised to improve the proportions and appropriateness of the windows in this location. The Heritage Officer had also raised this point to ensure a better connection with local vernacular and compliance with the Placemaking SPG. The houses within Allanbank Gardens, for example, use a combination of mullions and banded window surrounds to improve the vertical emphasis to windows, including some that are triple window arrangements.

Most house types within the proposed development exhibit paired windows of different widths when facing streets and the public realm, the remainder of the house elevations either being to rear gardens or with vertically accentuated single windows on side elevations. The applicant was asked to consider adjustment of the window proportions but had only made revisions to the affordable housing style frontages, albeit most of those are now acceptable - with the exception of Plots 10 and 27 which can be addressed by condition. The matter was raised again with the applicant and the twin frontage upper floor windows within the private house types have now been split with a solid mullion and the windows surrounded with banding. This has resolved the issue and made those house types appear more traditional to the public realm and reflecting window treatments in nearby houses.

In summary and subject to the condition listed, the design of the units and the proposed materials will allow architectural interest, connection and integration with the surrounding urban fabric whilst providing a sense of place and style of townscape and design, in keeping with Local Development Plan Policies, NPF4 Policies and supplementary planning guidance.

Residential Amenity

Local Development Plan Policies PMD2 and HD3 contain safeguards regarding residential amenity, both in terms of general use compatibility but also direct impacts such as privacy and light. This is explored further in the Council's "Privacy and Sunlight" SPG. NPF4 contains limited guidance on residential amenity, concentrating within Policy 16 "Quality Homes" on the impacts of householder developments on their neighbours. The same Policy also requests that the Statement of Community Benefit explains how the proposals would improve the residential amenity of the surrounding area, although it is a challenge to consider how any development of 50 houses would actually improve residential amenity for the surrounding area, especially on a greenfield site such as this one.

The main issues with regard to residential amenity have largely been in relation to the standards within and between the houses in the new development, rather than the impacts of the development on adjoining housing areas to the north and east of the

site. The roadside wall and maturing woodland belt to the north of the site interrupt and conceal any potential issues of privacy between the backs of the new houses along the northern edge of the site and the existing houses north of the B6362. The separation distance is also several times the minimum required.

There have been some concerns and objections expressed from the nearest properties in Allanbank Gardens, in relation to privacy loss both from the development and the pathway leading from the new site. They make several points about the height of the land compared to Allanbank Gardens and potential issues of public access outwith the pathway, between the back of their houses and the eastern woodland belt. Even allowing for the higher floor levels of the nearest houses within the new development to Allanbank Gardens, the houses are not directly face-to-face but are angled to each other and the nearest houses are more than 40m apart. Given these factors and the intervening young woodland, which will be controlled and augmented by the Woodland Management and Biodiversity Enhancement Plan, the development will not contravene LDP Policies and supplementary guidance, either in privacy or daylighting terms.

The potential privacy loss from the path is noted. Whilst it is accepted that usage will result in more pedestrians and cyclists in Allanbank Gardens, the augmentation of the woodland strip and conditions relating to the precise details of the path and screen fencing will allow these concerns to be addressed when considering proposals to approve the Woodland Management Plan and discharge the conditions.

Allanbank Cottage/Stables is the closest existing house to the development, the façade being located 9-10m from the site boundary to the north. However, the development has been amended in this location with one of the nearest house units to Allanbank Cottage/Stables being changed to 1.5 storey design from 2 storey, resulting in a 1.6m ridge reduction. The floor levels on both nearest houses were also dropped by 0.4-0.7m and window positions changed to ensure no habitable room overlooking at upper floors, together with amended boundary screening including fencing and hedging. Privacy buffer distances were also dimensioned on the drawings at 10-12m from the Allanbank Cottage/Stables boundary. Whilst the nearest house on Plot 13 is approximately 13-14m from the corner of the Cottage itself, the gable has been designed to be largely blank with only a bathroom window. Whilst there is further development to the west of the Cottage faced by its sunroom, the distances to the nearest houses are greater at 25-30m which are well in excess of the minimum standards required in the Privacy and Sunlight SPG. Given these design amendments, the proposed screening and planting and the location of the development to the north and east of Allanbank Cottage/Stables, its residential amenity will be preserved within acceptable levels relating to privacy and daylight.

There also needs to be consideration of residential amenity within the development, ensuring adequate separation of proposed houses from each other to enable compliance with the Privacy and Sunlight SPG whilst also allowing for creation and development of place with character and identity in line with the Placemaking and Design SPG and NPF4 Policies 15 and 16. As the development has been criticised by objectors for representing overdevelopment and too high a density, being originally 17 units above the indicative capacity in the LDP allocation, the developer was asked to demonstrate how the separation standards in the SPG were being met by the development. This related not only to back to back distances between windows across private gardens, but also because of the gable-ended design of some of the houses and the apparent overlooking between side windows at close quarters.

The revised layout plan adjusts the development, removing seven houses and realigning the roadways and some squares. Back-to-back distances are now dimensioned on the layout and either comply with the 18m standard or, where closer, have used blank or non-habitable room elevations to ensure privacy retention. A number of houses within the inner part of the development are closer together face to face, some being as close as 8-10m window to window. However, these instances are in public street situations where the front elevations are directly impacted by the public realm in any case, reductions below the 18m being therefore, acceptable in such circumstances. The proximity also helps the interest within the layout, improving variety and creating a stronger sense of place, with similar face-to-face distances used by the same developer at Caerlee Mill in Innerleithen to good effect.

In relation to side window overlooking within the development, the applicant has looked at the instances raised with them and responded with a detailed gable window study. This has shown that in most instances, habitable room windows either do not face other habitable room windows or, if they do, are offset in angle to acceptable levels. However, issues still remain with the houses on Plots 9 and 10 and from the house on Plot 22, being resolved either by the omission of one secondary bedroom window or obscure glazing. This matter can be reserved by condition.

It is concluded that the development provides levels of residential amenity in compliance with Policies PMD2, HD3 and the relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance.

Landscape

The development should comply with the relevant Local Development Plan Policies on landscaping, especially PMD2 and EP13, but also with the associated SPGs on trees, landscaping and development. NPF4 Policies, relating to the natural environment also apply, such as Policies 3 Biodiversity, 4 Natural Places, 6 Forestry, Woodlands and Trees and 20 Blue and Green Infrastructure. In particular, Policy 3 states that any major development will only be supported if it conserves, restores and enhances biodiversity. The site requirements of the LDP allocation also refer to:

- biodiversity mitigation
- retention of parkland trees
- enhancement of the northern woodland belt
- establishment of woodland planting to the south and west
- long term maintenance of landscape areas

The current characteristics of the site are of a large sloping field enclosed on three sides by a relatively wide planting belt of varied maturity. It is understood this planting was carried out a number of years ago by the landowner, the trees within the northern and western belts being more mature than the young planting on the eastern side. The proposed development respects the three planting belts by not proposing any development within them other than road and footpath links. All houses and gardens stop at the fence line separating the field from the woodland planting,

The Design and Access Statement acknowledges that the landscape is a prominent design feature of the site, the proposals retaining the existing woodland structure but proposing new planting to the southern boundary of the site as well as throughout the layout, creating a linear element of planted open space together with other pockets of open space and street planting. A full landscaping plan has been submitted with the

application, which has developed and improved during the processing of the application.

Many of the third party representations and the comments of the Landscape, Heritage and Ecology Officers recognise the importance to the site of its wooded surrounds. At issue is the fact that the applicant has not included the woodland within the red line of the application boundary on a number of the most relevant drawings, whilst showing red line connections to cover the footpath and road links. Given that the applicant has notified the landowner of these links, it is assumed that they can also reach agreement on retention and augmentation works to the woodland belts, together with the footpath system through them.

The retention, augmentation and management of the woodland belts for amenity and recreation purposes remain essential for both existing and proposed residents in the area. The submitted Design and Access Statement refers to woodland belts being "Community Woodland" and the Tree Report recommends a Woodland Management Plan before transfer to a Local Trust. The applicant would be content with the issue being controlled through a planning condition. However, given the woodland remains outwith the application site, a planning condition would not be appropriate as it would not comply with the tests laid down in Government guidance for conditions. The methodology and securing of maintenance would be better controlled by legal agreement should the application be approved. This can also incorporate the Biodiversity Enhancement Scheme as recommended by the Ecology Officer. The benefit of a legal agreement is that the landowner of the woodland belt would also need to be a signatory to the agreement and the retention, augmentation and management of the woodland belt would then be more secure and better controlled.

The Woodland Management Plan would address a number of the points raised by the Landscape Officer in her revised response, with other unresolved points being covered by planning conditions. Whilst some concern over the proximity of the houses to the western woodland belt is maintained, the applicant has dropped a house in this part of the site and has also moved several eastwards. The individual positions of the nearest trees have also now been plotted which reveal that some are at least 15m from the rear facades of the nearest houses. With these improvements and management of the woodland adjoining through the legal agreement, the Landscape Officer no longer objects on this basis.

In terms of the submitted landscaping proposals, the Landscape Officer noted that with the reduction of units to the revised 110, there have been additional planting proposals and hedgerows added to the scheme. The southern boundary has now been augmented with a 5m wide woodland and hedgerow belt to the open paddock adjoining, together with tree planting and hedgerows along the boundary with the Allanbank listed buildings. Additional planting has also been added around the SUDs basin and street trees throughout the development. One individual parkland tree was already being retained to the east of the development but a further existing tree is now being protected along the western boundary, through omission of a house. The communal open and linear green spaces throughout the development were already considered acceptable for the development and area, but have been improved further with the reduction of housing numbers and repositioning/enhancement of squares and communal spaces.

The woodland retention and soft planting proposals are, therefore, now considered appropriate for the site and can be controlled by a combination of legal agreement and conditions. The conditions can also control the management and future maintenance of communal open spaces within the development. The local concerns over these

elements are understandable but it is considered that the proposals are even more sensitive than the allocation in the LDP would allow both in relation to the thickness of the woodland belts now being retained and also the fact that the woodland belt to the east is not proposed for housing development. It is appreciated that this easterly belt is immature at present but with augmentation and management through the Woodland Management Scheme in the legal agreement, it is anticipated that concerns over the visual impacts of the development from Allanbank Gardens can be addressed.

The Landscape Officer does have some further comments about hedgerow positions and species mixes. There are also further clarifications required over fence designs and heights which are not sufficiently detailed in the submitted drawings, including heights in and around public open spaces and along the boundaries with the woodland belts. A planning condition can secure the remaining details and specifications.

Subject to conditions and the legal agreement, it is considered that the development complies with Development Plan Policies and Supplementary Planning Guidance on landscaping, tree protection, open spaces and biodiversity.

Access

Policies PMD2 and IS6 require safe access to and within developments, which should also be capable of being developed to the Council's adoptable standards and in accordance with the guidance in "Designing Streets" and various other relevant Government publications and Guidance Notes. NPF4 Policies 13 Sustainable Transport, 14 Design Quality and Place and 15 Local Living also provide a framework requirement for local access connectivity and sustainable transport methods. In terms of compliance with relevant Policies and Guidance, it is necessary to consider the potential impacts of the development on the traffic network leading to the site, then the actual road, footpath and parking layout of the development itself.

The site requirements of the allocation seek one or two vehicular accesses onto the B6362 Stow road, an extension of the footpath along the southern edge of the road and a minor road link into the housing development east of the site at Allanbank Gardens. There are also requirements for protection of existing paths and new footpath links with the wider countryside along the northern and western edges.

The application was supported by a Design and Access Statement and Transportation Assessment. The former identified the good location of the site in relation to Lauder, complying with 20-minute neighbourhood concepts promoted in Policy 15 of NPF4 with most facilities and public transport links within ten minutes walk of the site. The Statement also defended the provision of only one vehicular link to the B6362 by the interconnected and permeable nature of the development layout with easy and frequent link road and focal square connections between the different parts of the development. With linear footpath links through the centre of the development and a pedestrian link to Allanbank Gardens, the developer contends that accessibility and connectivity complies with local and national guidance and Policies.

The Transportation Assessment supported the good connectivity of the development whilst clarifying that the single junction onto the B6362 can be formed to the required standards. It also states that a minimal number of new vehicle road trips will be added to the public road network at peak times and that this would not affect the operation of adjacent junctions, including the A68 junction.

Although the impacts of traffic have been queried by objectors and the Community Council, neither Transport Scotland nor the Council's Roads Officer have any

objections to the capacity of the road network to accommodate the development, even with the originally submitted 117 houses. Members will note the full response from the Roads Officer who, whilst preferring two accesses onto the B6362, would accept the centrally positioned single access, with roadside footpath link along the site frontage to the east. The Officer also acknowledges that the LDP requirement for a vehicular link to Allanbank Gardens could cause issues of a rat run, unsuitable for the current lightly-trafficked shared surface road. He consequently accepts the application proposal for a strong pedestrian and cycle link instead, linking the new development with the Primary School and remainder of the town.

However, there were a number of issues identified with the development by the Roads Planning Service and which were subsequently raised with the applicant. This includes a new footpath link to the Stow Road from the north-eastern corner of the development, additional internal footways, an additional vehicular link to the affordable housing, increased communal parking, improved visitor parking distribution, alternatives to in-curtilage parking, EV provision, road surfacing variation, house and plot variation and improvements in featureless streets. Residents also had a number of concerns relating especially to the footpath and cycle link leading to Allanbank Gardens, including the suitability of the shared road surface to take the additional usage.

The applicant responded with the following adjustments:

- Reduction in unit numbers from 117 to 110
- Further footpath link to B6362
- Additional footpath linkage within the development
- Increased communal parking to 175%
- Improved distribution of visitor parking
- EV parking for all in-curtilage parking and wiring for 100% provision
- Building lines and road geometry more varied
- Swept Path Analysis proven
- Clarification on linear path

These amendments were passed to RPS for further comment and their response is now to accept the revisions. They still seek additional internal linking footways, maintenance proposals for the linear path, measures to prevent vehicles using the Allanbank Gardens path link, equity of parking provision and full swept path analysis. The applicant has submitted a further revised drawing to address some of these points and the Roads Officer has now accepted this drawing, subject to a condition seeking an additional four parking spaces within the affordable housing development. Further swept path analysis may require minor adjustment but this can be done at Roads Construction Consent stage.

The additional footpath link to the Stow Road is particularly welcomed given the potential desire lines from the development towards facilities in a north-easterly direction such as the Co-op foodstore. This would serve those living in the eastern half of the development and may also reduce the amount of footfall and cyclists that would otherwise use the link to Allanbank Gardens. However, the precise route and connection with the Stow road is not shown on the site layout plan (albeit schematically shown on the Swept Path Analysis drawing) and this would need to be detailed and secured by planning condition. Whilst it does pass through the woodland belt which is not within the application site boundary, the applicant appears to suggest that the path is achievable, in the same manner as the main site access and footpath link to Allanbank Gardens. In matters of access, it is acceptable planning practice to secure

such access across land outwith site boundaries, especially if secured by suspensive planning conditions.

The footpath link to Allanbank Gardens also requires further details to be approved by condition, as the 3m width would be sufficient to be negotiated by cars even though that is not the stated intention. Despite the requirement in the Local Development Plan allocation seeking a minor vehicular link, this is not supported by the local residents nor the Roads Officer who considers that traffic impacts at peak times would be unacceptable in road and pedestrian safety terms. Barriers or bollards would be the most effective method to allow pedestrians and cyclists but not cars, this being able to be secured by planning condition.

The Local Development Plan also requires footpath links with the wider area to the north and west. The access to the Stow Road will be gained via the aforementioned footpath to the north-east of the site together with the footpaths flanking the main site access. These will then join with a footpath which needs to be formed along the southern edge of the Stow Road linking the development with the existing path network that leads from Allanbank Gardens. The details and connections of the remaining path system within the woodland belts can be reserved within the Woodland Management Plan and Biodiversity Enhancement Scheme that will be required within the legal agreement.

As the proposals are now acceptable to Roads Planning and subject to relevant conditions, it is considered that the proposals comply with the provisions of the Local Development Plan and NPF4 in relation to safe and acceptable access to, and within, the site, together with positive contributions to local living. It is not considered that there are other material factors of such significance in relation to road safety and access that would outweigh the terms of the Development Plan in this instance.

Water, Drainage and Flood Risk

Local Development Plan Policies IS8 and IS9 are the most relevant in consideration of the impacts of development of this site on the water environment. Policy IS8 relates to flood risk and IS9 to Waste Water Treatment Standards and Sustainable Urban Drainage. The Council have also produced a SUDs SPG. NPF4 Policies 20 Blue and Green Infrastructure and 22 Flood Risk and Water Management are also relevant to the proposals

Policy IS8 requires development not to be at risk of flooding but also not to materially increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. The allocation has a site requirement which asks that *“..flood risk from a watercourse on the west end of the site should be evaluated and mitigated”*. During pre-application discussions, the Flood Risk Officer confirmed that the site was outwith the 1 in 200 year flood extents shown in SEPA's Indicative Flood Mapping and also that there had been no reports of flooding. He advised that he had no objections regarding flood risk and only required that surface water flood risk be considered in the design of the development, given the size and slope of the site.

The proposals utilise a surface water drainage system and outfall to comply with Scottish Water regulations, using permeable surfacing, attenuating and treating surface storm water at a SUDs pond at the lowest point in the north-eastern corner of the site. The intention is then to connect into the existing Scottish Water network serving Allanbank Gardens via an existing storm sewer. This has led to local objections and representations over the potential for surface water flood risk on the lower-lying Allanbank Gardens and the existing SUDs system and overflow pipes. Scottish Water

themselves have commented that they may not accept connection of surface water into their combined sewer system but that there may be exceptions in the case of brownfield sites. They also state:

“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.”

Given that the connection to a storm sewer in Allanbank Gardens remains within a separate surface water system, it is not clear why Scottish Water do not refer to that surface water connection rather than a combined system. The applicant has confirmed this and that any outfall from the SUDs pond to this system will have to be to the requirements of Scottish Water, including the test that run-off rates should not exceed greenfield rates – which is the present position. The Council’s Flood Risk Officer also asked for, and received, verification of the calculations but still seeks the final agreement of Scottish Water.

Given there is clarity required and given the concerns of local residents, a suspensive condition should be attached to any consent, to ensure an acceptable surface water treatment and discharge is proposed, approved by the relevant regulatory body (Scottish Water) if a connection to the public system is allowed, or SEPA if a direct watercourse connection is sought instead.

With regards to local concerns over water provision and sewerage capacity, Scottish Water has confirmed that there is capacity in the Howden Water Treatment Works for water supply and the Lauder Waste Water Treatment Works for connection of the site to foul drainage networks. Whilst they state that direct approaches still need to be made to them by the developer at the appropriate time, there is no indication at this stage that water or foul drainage capacity would be an issue in approving the proposed development. However, it is standard practice to impose suspensive conditions to ensure water provision and foul drainage are proposed in detail and approved by the Council, after liaison with Scottish Water, before any development can commence on the site.

Subject to relevant conditions, it is considered that the proposed development complies with Development Plan Policies IS8, IS9, 20 and 22, together with supplementary planning guidance, ensuring mitigation of flood risk and the provision of an appropriate water and drainage system without adverse impacts on the existing network and properties using it.

Ecology

The application requires assessment principally against Local Development Plan Policies EP1-EP3 covering international, national and local nature conservation and protected species and the Biodiversity SPG. NPF4 Policies also require to be considered, particularly Policy 3 Biodiversity and Policy 4 Natural Places. Policy 3 requires major applications to restore, conserve and enhance biodiversity. The allocation in the Local Development Plan also contains a site requirement to evaluate and mitigate moderate biodiversity interest. The application has been supported by a Preliminary Ecological Assessment, Tree Survey and Updated Bat and Badger Survey.

The Council Ecology Officer responded to the submissions by seeking further information on badger and bats. Comments on badgers are specific and considered sensitive, but Members will have access to the full consultation response in private papers forwarded with the Committee agenda. She also noted from the Preliminary Ecological Assessment that the shelter-belt offered potential for bats and that two trees being felled for the access road had bird and bat potential. The Ecology Officer requested a roosting survey of one of the trees with bat potential at this stage before application determination.

Squirrel dreys from the Ecological Assessment and a need for further surveys to ascertain if red squirrel are present are noted – in which case licensing and impact assessment would then be required. The woodland also had suitable habitat for mammals and reptiles, as well as justifying some control over the methods of external lighting facing the woodland. The Ecology Officer backed the concerns of the Landscape Officer over the proximity of houses to some of the trees in the shelter belts, expressing fears over the pressure that the woodland would be under in future once houses are occupied and the trees/shading effects begin to grow. A Habitat Management Plan, which would include measures within the shelterbelts, is recommended. Finally, some concerns were expressed over an invasive plant species for the SUDs area and the mix of beech trees within the proposed south-eastern hedgerow boundary.

The applicant responded to the Ecology Officer comments in a separate document and provided an updated climb-and-inspect survey in relation to bat concerns, as well as more detail on badger and squirrel. Other issues they considered could be addressed by condition. Overall, the Ecology Officer now accepts that bat and badger issues have been addressed pre-determination of the application and that conditions can be imposed to seek evidence of any badger licence and a Species Protection Plan for bats, including a sensitive lighting scheme. Other suggested conditions would cover breeding birds and reptiles, through a Biodiversity Enhancement scheme. The latter would replace the previously requested Habitat Management Plan. There are no requirements for a condition in relation to squirrel any longer as recent updated survey work show no evidence of red squirrel.

Given the responses from the Ecology Officer and subject to appropriate conditions covering these matters, it is considered that the proposals would comply with the Development Plan with respect to ecology and wildlife.

Soils

NPF4 Policy 5 now introduces a requirement for the minimisation of disturbance to soils on undeveloped land. Soils should be protected from compaction and erosion through the methods of development and mitigation. Relevant commentary and mitigation in relation to soil impacts can be accommodated within the requirements of the aforementioned Biodiversity Enhancement Scheme.

Cultural Heritage

Archaeology matters are principally controlled by LDP Policy EP8 and NPF4 Policy 7. They require any significant adverse effects to be avoided or weighed up in the overall planning balance, when considering the other social or economic benefits of the proposal. This includes the setting of archaeological assets and proposals should be backed by Cultural Heritage Assessments or field evaluations where significant impacts are identified.

The Archaeology Officer raises no objections to the application after considering the site and what is known about the area. There is the possibility of a medieval castle near to Allanbank House although no physical evidence has yet been found. The site is also west of the medieval Burgh of Lauder with evidence of agricultural activity from that time and the possibility of below-ground features. Trenching evaluation work is, therefore, considered justified across the whole of the site with any finds requiring further excavation recording. This can be achieved by means of a standard suspensive condition attached to any consent, outlining a scheme of archaeological investigation and works on the site. Subject to that, the development would be considered to comply with Development Plan Policies in that there would be no significant impacts on local archaeological assets and, should any finds be discovered, this would be subject to mitigation.

Cultural Heritage impacts are also relevant in relation to the proximity of the site to the Category C Listed Allanbank House, Cottage and Stables which lie close to the south-eastern boundary of the site. Policy EP7 of the Local Development Plan and 7 of NPF4 support development that respects the setting and integrity of statutorily listed buildings, augmented by Government online advice from Historic Environment Scotland. Whilst NPF4 Policy seeks submission of a specific heritage assessment where potentially significant impacts have been identified, it is not considered that the degree of impacts expected in this instance justify a heritage assessment.

The Heritage Officer identified the issue in her first consultation response and Members will note the letters from the occupier of Allanbank Cottage/Stables who opposes the development partly for reason of impacts on the integrity and setting of the building. The relationship with the development was also carefully explored at pre-application stage and a site requirement of the allocation requests careful consideration to avoid adverse impacts.

It was noted with the original submission that there were various design techniques in the vicinity in an attempt to respect and minimise impacts on the setting of all listed buildings on the south-eastern boundary of the site. These included:

- Bungalows at the edge of the site next to Allanbank House
- Intervening tree planting and open space to merge with existing trees at Allanbank House
- Buffer space including a roadway and communal open space between houses and Allanbank Cottage/Stables
- Intervening tree planting and screen fencing
- Limitation of upper floor windows facing Allanbank Cottage/Stables

Whilst these techniques were noted and welcomed, there was still objection from the occupier of Allanbank Cottage/Stables. The Heritage Officer was largely satisfied with the impacts as a result of the various mitigation measures, her view being that the setting and orientation of the listed buildings were to the south and interlinked with each other. She considered that impacts from the development to the north would be limited but she did request consideration of more single storey dwellings.

The applicant was asked to consider further improvement to the southern edge adjoining the listed buildings and, whilst more single storey units were not proposed, one of the nearest house units to Allanbank Cottage/Stables was changed to 1.5 storey design from two storey, resulting in a 1.6m ridge reduction. The floor levels on both nearest houses were also dropped by 0.4-0.7m and window positions changed to ensure no habitable room overlooking at upper floors, together with amended

boundary screening including fencing and hedging. Privacy buffer distances were also dimensioned on the drawings at 10-12m from the Allanbank Cottage/Stables boundary. Whilst final boundary details can be agreed by planning condition, there have been sufficient height reductions and improvements at this edge of the development to conclude that the development will respect the setting of the listed buildings, in compliance with Policy EP7 of the LDP and Policy 7 of NPF4. This is also the view of the Heritage Officer who welcomes the revisions.

The site requirements listed in the Local Development Plan for the land allocation also seek the retention or replacement of the roadside wall along the edge of the Stow Road as it provides further containment to the site. The wall is an important feature which does provide containment and screening to the development, assisted by the woodland. The existing opening has timber gates which can remain. Although a new opening will be formed to gain a centralised access into the development from the Stow Road, the wall will only be removed for the width of the opening as it is set well back with a wide verge and will not need to be reduced or affected by vehicular sightlines or the new roadside footpath. It may also need a further break to achieve the direct footpath link from the north-eastern part of the development. However, the vast majority of the wall appears to be in reasonable condition and a planning condition can secure its retention and maintenance in the future, together with the treatment at the new road and pedestrian access junctions.

Childrens' Play Space

Play provision is advised by the "Greenspace" SPG and by NPF4 Policy 21. The latter states that development will be supported if "*well designed good quality*" provision is made for children's play, proportionate to the development and existing provision. Policy 21 also states that new streets and the public realm should also be considered for their contribution to incidental children's play. The original layout made no specific provision for children's play equipment which led to a number of concerns and objections locally, including from the Community Council. At that point, it was assumed that the developer was looking to make developer contributions to augment existing facilities nearby.

However, the layout now shows an equipped children's play area as part of the linear park adjoining the affordable housing development and accessed on part of the main footpath system through the central part of the site. Management is intended to be by Deed of Condition. The precise layout, equipment and maintenance of the play area can be controlled by planning condition. Given this addition to the layout, the location of existing play facilities in short walking distance near the school (including space for older children's play) and the scale and location of the development adjoining open countryside, it is considered that the development complies with Development Plan Policy and the "Greenspace" SPG.

Hazardous Pipeline Exclusion Zone

The site lies to the east of high pressure gas pipelines, identified in the LDP Allocation Site Requirements as requiring consideration in relation to exclusion zones. This is also reflected in LDP Policy IS12 and NPF4 Policy 23 g). Having assessed the pipeline locations and exclusion zones, the nearest part of the site would be the south-western corner and whilst the woodland belt is partly within the exclusion zone at this location, none of the houses or their gardens would be. The applicant has also sent in servitude information to demonstrate this.

The Health & Safety Executive check has been carried as required by the Policies and there is no reason to oppose the development, according to the results of that check. The development is, therefore, considered to be in compliance with Policies IS12 and 23.

Poultry Farm

The LDP allocation makes reference to the development layout and design needing to take account of potential nuisance from the poultry unit lying to the west of the site. The matter has been raised with the applicant who responded to state that no water had been drawn at the unit since 2006 and that the owner sought disconnection of the water supply in 2021. Given the owner (unsuccessfully) then sought inclusion within the settlement boundary of the LDP, the applicant maintains that the poultry unit should no longer be a point of consideration with their layout.

On the basis of the information provided, it is not conclusive that the poultry unit use has been abandoned albeit length of vacancy and disconnection of services are factors that are often taken into account. Assuming that the use could be resurrected, it would need to operate to modern regulations and ventilation standards. The new houses nearest the unit would also be separated by a substantial woodland belt which would be retained and augmented by legal agreement – and their designs will be efficient, modern and aimed at keeping heat in, thus keeping odours out. There has also been a slight increase in buffer space with the house in the north-western corner and removal of one house in the western row to retain an existing tree.

On the basis of the current position, it is not considered there is sufficient justification to seek further variation of the layout to increase buffer space as there would be significant implications for housing numbers and retention of privacy, all on the basis of resurrection of a use that, at the very least, has lain dormant for nearly two decades.

Developer Contributions

Local Development Plan Policy IS2 requires all housing developments to contribute to infrastructure and service provision where such contributions are considered necessary and justified, advised by the Development Contributions SPG. NPF4 Policy 18 “Infrastructure First” also states :

“The impacts of development proposals on infrastructure should be mitigated. Development proposals will only be supported where it can be demonstrated that provision is made to address the impacts on infrastructure.”

In addition, NPF4 Policy 16 Quality Homes requires both a Statement of Community Benefit to be submitted with any application of more than 50 homes and for any development to ensure at least 25% affordable homes on-site provision.

In relation to the development of land at Allanbank for housing development, it is identified that mitigation in the form of developer contributions are required for education, Borders Railway and affordable housing, to be secured by legal agreement. These are considered necessary, reasonable and related to the infrastructure impacts anticipated. As explained below, it is considered that the development will comply with the relevant Development Plan Policies, including IS2, 16 and 18.

Mitigation includes a requirement for all private housing developments of 17 units and upwards to provide on-site affordable housing units at a ratio of 25%. The development meets this particular requirement through the provision of 27 one to four bedroomed

houses and flats at the north-eastern end of the development. Whilst the provision is 0.25 unit short, this fraction can be accommodated by a one-off commuted sum payment within the legal agreement.

Members will note Scottish Borders Housing Association have already indicated an interest in the provision of the affordable element on this site, identifying significant additional housing need in Lauder. The developer has designed the provision after discussion with SBHA. Similarly, the Council Housing Strategy Team identify the need and development of affordable housing. This is identified in the SHIP. The Council Policy will be met by the provision of the units, subject to agreement of tenure, via condition and a Section 75 Agreement which will also detail the timing of their construction.

A number of objectors raise the location and grouping of the affordable housing element, requesting that it either be placed elsewhere within the development or spread throughout, and integrated more within the development. Some have quoted from the “Placemaking and Design” SPG which states:

“In order to fully enhance social cohesion, the variety of tenure incorporated should always be evenly distributed across a community, and designed so as to be visually integrated into the urban realm.”

It is contended that in the context of the relevant Section in the SPG and the use of the term “community”, the SPG is not necessarily inferring that mixed tenure should be spread across one particular development site, but rather that such provision is spread across a community or settlement. The provision of 27 affordable units at the Allanbank site, even though in one grouping, still meets with this community aspiration to ensure even spread, given that surrounding housing developments are private in tenure.

It is also considered that the development is not segregated or compartmentalised within the development in any event, as the northern element of the affordable housing is both part of the main northern street scene but also terminates in a square based around a retained tree, very much a focal point when viewed through the private housing from the west. The affordable housing also lies between Allanbank Gardens and the remainder of the new development, thus being integrated geographically rather than in a far corner of the development. Furthermore, the footpaths and linear park provide a connectivity through the heart of the affordable housing area to Allanbank Gardens and the rest of Lauder. The layout within the affordable housing section of the development is the same as other layouts throughout the development, with kinked streets, squares, on-street parking and landscaping. The designs of the houses also clearly derive from the same architecture. Finally, it should be noted that this layout is acceptable to SBHA and the Scottish Borders Tenants Organisation and also ensures orderly phased development. They have submitted a full statement defending the nature and location of the affordable housing element and that can be read in full on Public Access. They rehearse and explain the difficulties of “pepperpot” provision dispersed within a development.

In terms of other financial contributions that would be demonstrated to be required by the development, impacts on schools are mentioned by objectors. Whilst acknowledging the concerns that have been expressed over capacity and strain on facilities, the Council Policy is to seek a standard contribution per market unit where school capacity and rolls are of concern to Education and Lifelong Learning. As Members will note from the consultation response, contributions of £4,709 and £10,251 towards Earlston High and Lauder Primary Schools are advised – levied upon each private house and not the 27 affordable units. The site also requires developer

contributions to the Borders Railway. These development contributions would be met through the Section 75 Agreement.

A number of representations, including from a local GP, refer to the current health care provision in Lauder and there are concerns that such a large development could overrun the current provision. Such concerns frequently arise in many towns across the Borders when faced with housing development and population growth. The concerns suggest that the application should either be refused for reasons of impact on health care services or that contributions be sought to support the services. The issue is regularly reviewed during the Development Planning process and, as identified by some objectors, the NHS are consulted when land is allocated and growth planned.

Whilst the Development Contributions SPG states that “...*Any services, infrastructure or facilities may require contributions...*” health care is not listed in the examples of the predominant types of facilities that could be supported with contributions. There has hitherto been no identified need to oppose developments or seek financial contributions on the basis of health care capacity, perhaps reflecting the variety of reasons why there currently may be capacity issues. These may not only relate to population and development growth but also to funding and resource matters which lie outwith the control of the Local Authority or developers. There is also the difficulty of not only assessing how much contribution should be sought, but also how to ensure it is diverted to local facilities that may require it when such services are centrally funded. Ultimately, it would be difficult to establish a clear causal link (and justification to seek contributions) between a proposal to add 10 units above the indicative capacity in the Local Development Plan and the potential impact on health care in the town.

Statement of Community Benefit

Although the application was submitted before the adoption of NPF4 as part of the Development Plan for the Scottish Borders, the applicant was asked to provide a Statement of Community Benefit as per the requirement of Policy 16 for any development totalling 50 or more homes. This is included within the NPF4 Statement submitted by the Planning Consultant for the applicant. This outlines:

- Financial contributions towards Lauder Primary School and Earlston High School as agreed with Scottish Borders Council.
- Financial contribution to the Borders Railway
- the transfer of existing woodland into community management, enabling public access and the implementation of a woodland management plan.
- 27 affordable to rent homes delivered by Scottish Borders Housing Association.
- community engagement, including safety talks with Lauder Primary School.
- support of the Lauder community Defibrillator network, both in terms of maintenance and provision in Allanbank.

It is considered that this Statement, together with the details of the development, meet the requirements set down in Policy 16 of NPF4 and provide proportionate and satisfactory responses to the impacts of the development on the local community.

CONCLUSION

The proposals, as revised, are considered to be an acceptable development of an allocated housing site within the Local Development Plan, providing housing and additional affordable houses to meet local need. The density, design and layout of the development comply with Policies and Guidance and the impacts on landscape,

infrastructure, cultural heritage and residential amenity are considered acceptable, mitigated by conditions where required.

In conclusion and subject to compliance with the proposed schedule of conditions, Informatives and a legal agreement, the development is considered acceptable when assessed against the Development Plan and other material factors.

RECOMMENDATION BY CHIEF PLANNING AND HOUSING OFFICER:

I recommend the application is approved subject to the following conditions, Informatives and a legal agreement to secure development contributions and a Woodland Management Scheme:

Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
Reason: To comply with Section 58 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997, as amended by the Planning etc. (Scotland) Act 2006.
2. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the plans and specifications approved by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved details.
3. All approved residential units shall meet the definition of “affordable housing” as set out in the adopted Local Development Plan 2016 and Supplementary Planning Guidance “Affordable Housing” 2015 and shall only be occupied in accordance with arrangements (to include details of terms of occupation and period of availability) which shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority prior to development commencing.
Reason: The permission has been granted for affordable housing, and development of the site for unrestricted market housing would not comply with development plan policies and guidance with respect to contributions to infrastructure and services, including local schools.
4. No development shall take place until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation outlining an Archaeological Evaluation. This will be formulated by a contracted archaeologist and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. Access should be afforded to allow investigation by a contracted archaeologist(s) nominated by the developer and agreed to by the Planning Authority. The developer shall allow the archaeologist(s) to conduct a programme of evaluation prior to development. This will include the below ground excavation of evaluation trenches and the full recording of archaeological features and finds. Results will be submitted to the Planning Authority for review in the form of a Data Structure Report. If significant archaeology is discovered the nominated archaeologist(s) will contact the Archaeology Officer for further consultation. The developer will ensure that any significant data and finds undergo post-excavation analysis the results of which will be submitted to the Planning Authority
Reason: The site is within an area where ground works may interfere with, or result in the destruction of, archaeological remains, and it is therefore desirable to afford

a reasonable opportunity to record the history of the site.

5. No development to be commenced until a scheme of details for the play facilities shown on Site Development Plan AL PL 01 G is submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the Planning Authority. Once approved, the play facilities then to be completed in accordance with the details at a stage agreed within the Phasing Plan and maintained thereafter in accordance with the agreed scheme.

Reason: To ensure that the development is provided with childrens' play facilities.

6. No development shall commence until samples of materials and colours for all buildings within the development, and the plot layout distribution for those colours, has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved samples.

Reason: To ensure external materials are visually appropriate to the development and sympathetic to the surrounding area.

7. The landscaping proposals shown on the approved drawings shall be carried out in accordance with a programme of implementation and maintenance that shall first be submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the Planning Authority.

Reason: Further information is required to achieve an acceptable landscape scheme for the site.

8. No development to be commenced until an Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan and method statement are submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Planning Authority, including the woodland boundary, access routes and trees within the site. Once approved, the development to proceed in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To safeguard existing woodland and protect the natural environment at the site.

9. No development shall commence, (notwithstanding the details provided in the approved drawings), until a detailed scheme of boundary treatments has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. The scheme shall include the layout/route of all proposed walls and fencing, and their detailed design, height and materials. All boundary treatments within the application site shall accord with the approved scheme and shall be implemented in accordance with an agreed schedule.

Reason: Further information is required to achieve an acceptable boundary treatment scheme for the site.

10. No development to be commenced until proposals for the retention, future maintenance and treatment at the access junctions of the roadside wall along the southern edge of the B6362 are submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Planning Authority. Works to the wall and maintenance are then to be undertaken in accordance with the agreed proposals, including timing for the works.

Reason: To safeguard the visual amenity of the area.

11. Prior to commencement of development, a Species Protection Plan for badger shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. The SPP shall incorporate provision for a predevelopment supplementary survey and a mitigation plan. No development shall be undertaken except in accordance with the approved in writing SPP.

Reason: To protect the ecological interest in accordance with Local Development Plan policies EP2, EP3 and NPF4 Policies 3 and 4

12. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall provide to the Planning Authority a copy of the relevant Species Licence for badgers.
Reason: To protect the ecological interest in accordance with Local Development Plan policies EP2, EP3 and NPF4 Policies 3 and 4
13. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit for approval in writing by the Planning Authority a comprehensive Species Protection Plan for bats, including a sensitive lighting scheme for the site. Thereafter, no development shall take place except in strict accordance with the approved plan.
Reason: To protect the ecological interest in accordance with Local Development Plan policies EP1, EP2 and EP3 and NPF policies 3 and 4
14. No development shall be undertaken during the bird breeding season (March to August), unless in strict compliance with a Species Protection Plan for breeding birds, including provision for pre-development supplementary survey, that shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority.
Reason: To protect the ecological interest in accordance with Local Development Plan policies EP1, EP2 and EP3 and NPF policies 3 and 4
15. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit for approval by the Planning Authority, details of the proposed Biodiversity Enhancement scheme for the site which shall include measures for soil management, breeding birds, bats, badgers and reptiles. Thereafter, no development shall take place except in strict accordance with the approved scheme.
Reason: To protect the ecological interest in accordance with Local Development Plan policies EP2 and NPF4 policies 3 and 4.
16. No development shall be commenced until a scheme of phasing has been submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the Planning Authority. This shall include a programme for completion of all roads, parking spaces, EV charging points, footpaths, drainage, the SUDs/open space features, new planting and all, or a substantial proportion, of the dwellinghouses within each phase.
Reason: To ensure the development is carried out in a manner which ensures that occupied residential units are provided with necessary infrastructure, services and landscaping.
17. Samples of the surfacing materials for the proposed roads, footpaths and parking spaces to be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Planning Authority before the development commences. The development is then to be completed in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: To ensure that the proposed development is laid out in a proper manner with adequate provision for traffic and in a manner which enhances the character and visual appearance of the development.
18. The proposed roads, footpaths and parking spaces/areas indicated on the approved drawings shall be constructed to ensure that each dwellinghouse, before it is occupied, shall be served by a properly consolidated and surfaced carriageway, parking area and footpath/shared surface.
Reason: To ensure that the proposed development is laid out in a proper manner with adequate provision for traffic and pedestrians.
19. No development to be commenced until a fully designed and detailed surface water drainage scheme with SUDs features, attenuation and outfall, is submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Planning Authority in liaison with Scottish Water

or SEPA. The scheme shall include an implementation and maintenance programme. The scheme then to be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the sustainable disposal of surface water in a manner that safeguards neighbouring land/property and to ensure future maintenance for the scheme.

20. No development shall commence until written evidence is provided on behalf of Scottish Water that the development will be serviced by mains foul drainage and water supply. The development then to be implemented fully in accordance with the drainage drawings, numbered 147383/8005 A, 147383/8003 A and 147383/8004 A .

Reason: To ensure the development can be adequately serviced.

21. The footpath links shown to the north-eastern and south-eastern corners of the development, together with the footpath along the southern side of the B6362, to be completed at an agreed stage within the development, in line with the agreed phasing plan and once precise details of the route, geometry and construction of each footpath have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Planning Authority, This shall include a form of barrier or bollard system to prevent usage of the link to Allanbank Gardens by vehicles.

Reason: In the interests of road and pedestrian safety.

22. No development to be commenced until revised upper floor front elevation window designs are submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Planning Authority in relation to house types A10 and A27. Those house types then to be constructed in accordance with the agreed window designs.

Reason: To safeguard the visual amenity of the area

23. No development to be commenced on Plots 17, 18 and 25 until revised window positions for the houses on those plots are submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Planning Authority to better address the linear park bordering the plots. The houses then to be developed in accordance with the revised designs.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and placemaking.

24. No development to be commenced on Plots 9 and 22 until revised window proposals for the houses on those plots are submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Planning Authority to minimise overlooking between houses. The houses then to be developed in accordance with the revised designs.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity.

25. No development to be commenced until a revised drawing is submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Planning Authority detailing an additional four communal parking spaces within the affordable housing element of the development. The spaces then to be completed in accordance with the programme set by Condition 16.

Reason: In the interests of road safety.

Informatives

1. All prospectively adoptable roads, pavements and associated infrastructure will require Road Construction Consent. The applicant should discuss this separately with the Council's Roads Planning Service to establish the scope and requirements of Council adoption.

All works within the public road boundary must be undertaken by a contractor first approved by the Council.

2. Development should be carried out in a manner consistent with British Standard guidance on construction works, to maintain neighbouring amenity, in particular BS5228

DRAWING NUMBERS

Location Plan	AL/Loc 01 A 2206 PL05 A
Site Development Plan	AL PL 01 G
Site Development Plan Landscaping Boundaries	AL PL 02 A
Site Development Plan Roads and Parking	AL PL 03 A
Site Development Plan External Finishes	AL PL 18 A
Site Elevations	AL PL19 A
Site Elevations	AL PL 21
Landscape Layout 1 of 3	2017/01 B
Landscape Layout 2 of 3	2017/02 B
Landscape Layout 3 of 3	2017/03 B
Drainage Construction Details	147383/8005 A
Drainage Sheet 1	147383/8003 A
Drainage Sheet 2	147383/8004 A
Levels Sheet 1	147383/8000 A
Levels Sheet 2	147383/8001 A
Swept Path Analysis	147383/8002 A
Block Plans & Elevations A1-4	2206 PL 06 A
Block Plans & Elevations A5-8	2206 PL 07 A
Block Plans & Elevations A9-14	2206 PL 08 A
Block Plans & Elevations A15-16	2206 PL 09 A
Block Plans & Elevations A17, 18 & 27	2206 PL 10 B
Block Plans & Elevations A19-22	2206 PL 11 B
Block Plans & Elevations	2206 PL 12 A
Plans & Elevations Type 6	2206 PL 05 A
Elevations 3BS BT (Draft)	AL (PL) 07 A
Floor Plans 3BS BT	AL (PL) 06 A
Elevations 3BS (Draft)	AL (PL) 05 A
Floor Plans 3BS	AL (PL) 04 A
Elevations 3BT Semi (Draft)	AL (PL) 09
Elevations & Floor Plans 4BS (Draft)	AL (PL) 10 A
Plans & Elevations 4BD V1	AL (PL) 11
Plans & Elevations 4BD V2	AL (PL) 12
Plans & Elevations Soutra	AL (PL) 13 A
Floor Plans Ailsa	AL (PL) 11
Elevations Ailsa Detached	AL (PL) 12
Floor Plans & Elevations Ronan Detached	AL (PL) 20
Floor Plans & Elevations Ronan Detached V1	AL (PL) 20 A
Floor Plans & Elevations Ronan Detached V2 Plot 13	AL (PL) 22

Approved by

Name	Designation	Signature
Ian Aikman	Chief Planning and Housing Officer	

The original version of this report has been signed by the Chief Planning and Housing Officer and the signed copy has been retained by the Council.

Author(s)

Name	Designation
Craig Miller	Principal Planning Officer



22/01734/FUL

Allanbank, Lauder

