

Application Comments for 15/00100/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 15/00100/FUL

Address: Land And Buildings At Wilton Mills 31 - 32 Commercial Road Hawick Scottish Borders

Proposal: Erection of Class 1 retail foodstore with ancillary works including car parking, access and landscaping

Case Officer: Julie Hayward

Customer Details

Name: Mr Duncan Taylor

Address: 5 Mill Port, Hawick, Scottish Borders TD9 9DG

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Detrimental to environment
- Listed Building
- Trees/landscape affected

Comment: I am writing in 3 capacities - as a Hawick resident, as a teacher of History at the local High School and as Vice President of Hawick Archaeological Society.

In the first case, I feel my pleasure at seeing this grand building will be diminished if it is demolished.

In the second, I remember one of my first pupils asking me why the clock on the Wilton Mills tower was never right - this brought home to me what a landmark it was for all those pupils walking to the school.

In the third, our Society is committed to preserving the built heritage of Hawick and District, and given that this is a Listed building I am surprised that it is even possible to demolish one of the few surviving buildings which highlight the glory days of this textile town. If the building has been allowed to be neglected to the stage it now needs repair to make it safe, then the owner should be required to do this rather than use it as an excuse for demolition.

Application Comments for 15/00100/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 15/00100/FUL

Address: Land And Buildings At Wilton Mills 31 - 32 Commercial Road Hawick Scottish Borders

Proposal: Erection of Class 1 retail foodstore with ancillary works including car parking, access and landscaping

Case Officer: Julie Hayward

Customer Details

Name: Ms A BELL

Address: Hope Cottage Langlands Road, Hawick, Scottish Borders TD9 7HL

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Alterations/Demolition of wall
- Contrary to Local Plan
- Land affected
- Listed Building
- Trees/landscape affected

Comment: Firstly, I strongly object to the demolition of the Listed Building - the Clock Tower.

How can so many listed buildings just be demolished - what responsibility does the Council take in such travesties?

The existing owner has neglected it to such an extent and should be instructed to make it safe at his / her expense, then to find a suitable use for it, instead of waiting for it to be so unsafe it can be demolished and sold off at a huge profit to a developer!

Secondly, I do not see the need for another cheap retailer in Hawick. I do not object to Aldi as a company, but if they are to come to Hawick, why allow them to build next to Lidl and within spitting distance of the High Street and Iceland?

Why not consider Galalaw or Weensland areas to provide a 'shopping experience' for outlying Hawick residents?

Thirdly, the planned drawings of another rectangular 'shed' do not enhance the area and certainly do not replace the wonderful Victorian Gothic of the clock tower.

I can only see a tiny drawing on my screen, but this site seems to incorporate the land which was designated housing on the last Local Plan - what happened to the protected flats for the elderly

and affordable housing on the old YMA(?) site? Was there also not a hotel?

Ref: H15/14kwh02let

24/02/2015

PO Box 28822
Edinburgh
EH14 9AX

Planning and Regulatory Services
Scottish Borders Council Headquarters
Newtown St. Boswells
Melrose
TD6 0SA

Tel: 0131 443 8813

Dear Sir/Madam,

OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION 15/00100/FUL - LAND AT WILTON MILLS LTD, HAWICK - ERECTION OF CLASS 1 RETAIL STORE ETC

On behalf of Lidl UK GmbH I am objecting to the above planning application submitted by Wilton Mills Ltd in relation to land at 31-32 Commercial Road, Hawick.

The grounds of the objection relate to the following:

- Adverse impact on heritage value of the site and the surrounding area.
- Potential retail impact and failure to address an identifiable retail deficiency.
- Conflict with policies contained in the development plan, emerging development plan, Scottish Planning Policy and other material policies.

Impact on Matters of Heritage Importance

The application site is a very sensitive site of historic, architectural and townscape importance. The proposals are for the development of a standard design Aldi supermarket and this development not only has no regard to the sensitivity or importance of the site but will result in the demolition of important listed buildings including the demolition of one building which is a landmark in the townscape of Hawick.

The development would adversely affect each of the following:

- Grade B listed 31 & 32 Commercial Road (former Wilton Mills). A wide range of features are identified in the listing but of particular note is the Clock Tower. Unlike earlier proposals (planning application 14/00742/FUL which was withdrawn in November 2014) this application proposes the demolition of the clock tower. Although the proposed demolition is subject to a separate listed building application it is also a key consideration for the current planning application. The significance of the building is both architectural and historical and the latter can be seen from the listing which states: "*An extensive complex of 19-century mill buildings with prominent clock tower and some fine detailing, which dominates the streetscape of Commercial Road and demonstrates the development of the textiles industry that is central to the history of Hawick...*" (source – Historic Scotland).

The significance of this building is also apparent from the inclusion of these buildings on the Buildings at Risk Register for Scotland which identifies the category of risk as "critical" (web reference: <http://www.buildingsatrisk.org.uk/details/897305>).

- Direct loss of other historic, archaeological or architectural buildings/sites identified in the RCAHMS Canmore record: 32 Commercial Road, Wilton Emporium and Hawick YM RFC Social Club; and Wilton Mills (two separate records).
- Direct loss of premises identified in the Historic Environment Record (Scottish Borders Council): Wilton Works.

- Demolition of listed and other buildings located within the Hawick Conservation Area.

The proposed development will therefore have a serious adverse impact on a prominent and important historic site adjacent to the River Teviot opposite the town centre.

The significance of the site is recognised in the Commercial Road SPG. The application site forms the northern part of the Commercial Road site and "potential concept" for this area is as follows:

- 5.1 The northern development site includes a number of listed buildings, and is most likely to be developed for residential use. The redevelopment of the site requires high attention to detail and design to redevelop the existing listed buildings to the satisfaction of the Council and Historic Scotland and to enhance the town centre and the Conservation Area. Existing features can be reused as design features in a development. Redevelopment of this site will also need to consider the proximity to the town centre and river, the urban character of the area and the previous use.

The proposed development is clearly in conflict with the requirements of the above SPG.

Retail Planning Matters

The SPG also identifies that, in relation to retail development, there is unlikely to be sufficient convenience expenditure capacity to support major new convenience floorspace. This is confirmed in the response of the Forward Planning Section of SBC to the planning application which notes that the lack of quantitative retail capacity for the proposed development is identified in studies undertaken for SBC by both Roderick MacLean Associates and Robert Drysdale Consultancy. Any capacity identified in the earlier of these reports (by RMA) was more than taken up by the Sainsbury supermarket on Commercial Road.

Paragraph 3.11 of the SPG also states that, regardless of the location of the proposal within the Commercial Road site, *"the potential for future food and non-food shopping on the site would require to be justified to the Council by appropriate up-to-date analysis, including a retail impact assessment"*.

Accompanying the planning application is a Retail Assessment prepared by GVA James Barr. The quantitative analysis contained in this Retail Assessment is not reliable and should be discounted. This can be seen by a brief examination of the retail tables set out in Appendix 2 and described in Section 6 of the Retail Assessment:

- Table 2. The source information for the available expenditure is not provided. The expenditure figures per capita appear to be unreasonably high for the Hawick area. For example the per capita convenience expenditure figures are identified to be £2320 per capita in 2011. By way of comparison the UK average identified in the Pitney Bowes Retail Guide 2014-15 (Aug 2014) was £1789 per capita. Table 2 therefore suggests that expenditure in Hawick would be 30% above the UK average. Economic conditions in Hawick would suggest that a figure *below* UK average figures would be more likely to be correct.
- Table 2. No allowance is made for the reduction in available expenditure per capita by special forms of trading including the internet. Table 2 therefore further *overestimates* available expenditure for convenience goods in the catchment area.
- Table 3. Sales densities for independent shops for convenience goods are unrealistically low. Sales densities of at least £4000 psm should be adopted if not significantly higher. Convenience goods shops achieving such low sales densities would be quickly forced out of business. Even adopting the relatively low figure of £4000psm would result in average turnover within the catchment for convenience goods of £59.68m pa.
- A quick comparison between Tables 2 and 3 (regardless of the inaccuracies of the figures shown above) shows that the average turnover of existing floorspace in the catchment area is well above the available expenditure generated (by £13m). If the figures are adjusted to take into account the above corrections then the excess of turnover to available expenditure would be closer to £30m i.e. average turnover would be close to double the expenditure generated within the catchment. This confirms that there is no quantitative deficiency (or "capacity") within the catchment for the proposed development.

- Even if one ignores the above criticisms Table 4 shows turnover from catchment to be £42.96m compared to 2015 expenditure of £43.0m i.e. there is no quantitative retail deficiency (or “capacity”) anyway.
- Table 6. Turnover. The turnover figure adopted for Aldi is too low. The implied convenience sales density is £5244 psm (i.e. £5.26m/1003 sq m net sales). This compares to the Aldi company average from 2014 Retail Rankings of £8261 psm or £7.97m per store. This suggests that, in order to justify the store, the assessment adopts a sales density in the region of 34-37% below the UK average. If such very low sales densities are correct then this simply reinforces the conclusion that there is no market capacity within the catchment to support the proposed store and, if Aldi have to accept trading levels 35% below average, then it is very likely that other existing shops, including those in the town centre and edge of centre, will also be trading well below average and are, therefore, very vulnerable to adverse impact. The alternative to this is that the sales density for Aldi is much too low which means that the Retail Assessment tables (Tables 7 onwards) are substantially underestimating the trade diversion and adverse retail impact.

In conclusion the Retail Assessment is wholly unreliable. The adoption of very low turnover figures confirms that either existing shops are highly vulnerable to impact or that percentage impact figures will be much higher than identified. In reality the true position will be a bit of both – existing stores will be trading below average but Aldi will turnover at a higher level but not, perhaps, at UK average levels. This means that impacts will be in the region of 10-15% but these impacts will be on stores that are already trading below average. They will therefore suffer significant adverse impact and the proposed development will significantly undermine the vitality and viability of Hawick town centre.

Relationship to Development Plan Policies

From the above it is clear that the proposal conflicts with policies contained in the development plan, the emerging LDP, Scottish Planning Policy and Scottish Historic Environment Policy as follows:

- Scottish Borders Consolidated Local Plan (including Structure Plan policies):
 - Policy G1 Development Quality (in particular items 1, 3, 4, 5 and 13)
 - Policy G7 Infill Development (item ii)
 - Policy BE1 Listed Buildings (all aspects of this policy)
 - Policy BE2 Archaeological Sites etc
 - Policy BE4 (in particular items 1, 2, 3 and 4)
 - Policy H3 (conflict with SPG)
 - Policy ED3 Shopping Development (in particular items i and iii)
- Scottish Borders Proposed LDP:
 - Comparable policies to those listed above for the Consolidated Local Plan.
- Scottish Planning Policy:
 - Town Centres - Paras 71 to 73
 - Historic Environment - Para 137, 141-142, 143-144
- SHEP – various provisions relating to Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and other sites of heritage value.

In conclusion the proposed development is contrary to the development plan and other material considerations including Scottish Planning Policy, Scottish Historic Environment Policy, the Proposed LDP and the SPG for Commercial Road. The proposal will adversely affect important features that are of importance to Hawick, the proposal will have a significant adverse impact on the vitality and viability of the town centre, the proposal does not address any retail deficiency (qualitative or quantitative) and there is no demonstrable benefit from the development proposal. For these reasons Lidl UK GmbH object to the planning application and respectfully request that the planning application should be refused planning permission.

Yours sincerely

Keith Hargest
Director

Ref: H15/14kwh02let

24/02/2015

Planning and Regulatory Services
Scottish Borders Council Headquarters
Newtown St. Boswells
Melrose
TD6 0SA

Hargest Planning Ltd

PO Box 28822
Edinburgh
EH14 9AX

Tel: 0131 228 6983



Dear Sir/Madam,

**OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION 15/00100/FUL - LAND AT WILTON MILLS LTD,
HAWICK - ERECTION OF CLASS 1 RETAIL STORE ETC**

On behalf of Lidl UK GmbH I am objecting to the above planning application submitted by Wilton Mills Ltd in relation to land at 31-32 Commercial Road, Hawick.

The grounds of the objection relate to the following:

- Adverse impact on heritage value of the site and the surrounding area.
- Potential retail impact and failure to address an identifiable retail deficiency.
- Conflict with policies contained in the development plan, emerging development plan, Scottish Planning Policy and other material policies.

Impact on Matters of Heritage Importance

The application site is a very sensitive site of historic, architectural and townscape importance. The proposals are for the development of a standard design Aldi supermarket and this development not only has no regard to the sensitivity or importance of the site but will result in the demolition of important listed buildings including the demolition of one building which is a landmark in the townscape of Hawick.

The development would adversely affect each of the following:

- Grade B listed 31 & 32 Commercial Road (former Wilton Mills). A wide range of features are identified in the listing but of particular note is the Clock Tower. Unlike earlier proposals (planning application 14/00742/FUL which was withdrawn in November 2014) this application proposes the demolition of the clock tower. Although the proposed demolition is subject to a separate listed building application it is also a key consideration for the current planning application. The significance of the building is both architectural and historical and the latter can be seen from the listing which states: "*An extensive complex of 19-century mill buildings with prominent clock tower and some fine detailing, which dominates the streetscape of Commercial Road and demonstrates the development of the textiles industry that is central to the history of Hawick...*" (source – Historic Scotland).

The significance of this building is also apparent from the inclusion of these buildings on the Buildings at Risk Register for Scotland which identifies the category of risk as "critical" (web reference: <http://www.buildingsatrisk.org.uk/details/897305>).

- Direct loss of other historic, archaeological or architectural buildings/sites identified in the RCAHMS Canmore record: 32 Commercial Road, Wilton Emporium and Hawick YM RFC Social Club; and Wilton Mills (two separate records).
- Direct loss of premises identified in the Historic Environment Record (Scottish Borders Council): Wilton Works.
- Demolition of listed and other buildings located within the Hawick Conservation Area.

The proposed development will therefore have a serious adverse impact on a prominent and important historic site adjacent to the River Teviot opposite the town centre.

The significance of the site is recognised in the Commercial Road SPG. The application site forms the northern part of the Commercial Road site and "potential concept" for this area is as follows:

- 5.1 The northern development site includes a number of listed buildings, and is most likely to be developed for residential use. The redevelopment of the site requires high attention to detail and design to redevelop the existing listed buildings to the satisfaction of the Council and Historic Scotland and to enhance the town centre and the Conservation Area. Existing features can be reused as design features in a development. Redevelopment of this site will also need to consider the proximity to the town centre and river, the urban character of the area and the previous use.

The proposed development is clearly in conflict with the requirements of the above SPG.

Retail Planning Matters

The SPG also identifies that, in relation to retail development, there is unlikely to be sufficient convenience expenditure capacity to support major new convenience floorspace. This is confirmed in the response of the Forward Planning Section of SBC to the planning application which notes that the lack of quantitative retail capacity for the proposed development is identified in studies undertaken for SBC by both Roderick MacLean Associates and Robert Drysdale Consultancy. Any capacity identified in the earlier of these reports (by RMA) was more than taken up by the Sainsbury supermarket on Commercial Road.

Paragraph 3.11 of the SPG also states that, regardless of the location of the proposal within the Commercial Road site, *"the potential for future food and non-food shopping on the site would require to be justified to the Council by appropriate up-to-date analysis, including a retail impact assessment"*.

Accompanying the planning application is a Retail Assessment prepared by GVA James Barr. The quantitative analysis contained in this Retail Assessment is not reliable and should be discounted. This can be seen by a brief examination of the retail tables set out in Appendix 2 and described in Section 6 of the Retail Assessment:

- Table 2. The source information for the available expenditure is not provided. The expenditure figures per capita appear to be unreasonably high for the Hawick area. For example the per capita convenience expenditure figures are identified to be £2320 per capita in 2011. By way of comparison the UK average identified in the Pitney Bowes Retail Guide 2014-15 (Aug 2014) was £1789 per capita. Table 2 therefore suggests that expenditure in Hawick would be 30% above the UK average. Economic conditions in Hawick would suggest that a figure *below* UK average figures would be more likely to be correct.
- Table 2. No allowance is made for the reduction in available expenditure per capita by special forms of trading including the internet. Table 2 therefore further *overestimates* available expenditure for convenience goods in the catchment area.
- Table 3. Sales densities for independent shops for convenience goods are unrealistically low. Sales densities of at least £4000 psm should be adopted if not significantly higher. Convenience goods shops achieving such low sales densities would be quickly forced out of business. Even adopting the relatively low figure of £4000psm would result in average turnover within the catchment for convenience goods of £59.68m pa.
- A quick comparison between Tables 2 and 3 (regardless of the inaccuracies of the figures shown above) shows that the average turnover of existing floorspace in the catchment area is well above the available expenditure generated (by £13m). If the figures are adjusted to take into account the above corrections then the excess of turnover to available expenditure would be closer to £30m i.e. average turnover would be close to double the expenditure generated within the catchment. This confirms that there is no quantitative deficiency (or "capacity") within the catchment for the proposed development.

- Even if one ignores the above criticisms Table 4 shows turnover from catchment to be £42.96m compared to 2015 expenditure of £43.0m i.e. there is no quantitative retail deficiency (or "capacity") anyway.
- Table 6. Turnover. The turnover figure adopted for Aldi is too low. The implied convenience sales density is £5244 psm (i.e. £5.26m/1003 sq m net sales). This compares to the Aldi company average from 2014 Retail Rankings of £8261 psm or £7.97m per store. This suggests that, in order to justify the store, the assessment adopts a sales density in the region of 34-37% below the UK average. If such very low sales densities are correct then this simply reinforces the conclusion that there is no market capacity within the catchment to support the proposed store and, if Aldi have to accept trading levels 35% below average, then it is very likely that other existing shops, including those in the town centre and edge of centre, will also be trading well below average and are, therefore, very vulnerable to adverse impact. The alternative to this is that the sales density for Aldi is much too low which means that the Retail Assessment tables (Tables 7 onwards) are substantially underestimating the trade diversion and adverse retail impact.

In conclusion the Retail Assessment is wholly unreliable. The adoption of very low turnover figures confirms that either existing shops are highly vulnerable to impact or that percentage impact figures will be much higher than identified. In reality the true position will be a bit of both – existing stores will be trading below average but Aldi will turnover at a higher level but not, perhaps, at UK average levels. This means that impacts will be in the region of 10-15% but these impacts will be on stores that are already trading below average. They will therefore suffer significant adverse impact and the proposed development will significantly undermine the vitality and viability of Hawick town centre.

Relationship to Development Plan Policies

From the above it is clear that the proposal conflicts with policies contained in the development plan, the emerging LDP, Scottish Planning Policy and Scottish Historic Environment Policy as follows:

- Scottish Borders Consolidated Local Plan (including Structure Plan policies):
 - Policy G1 Development Quality (in particular items 1, 3, 4, 5 and 13)
 - Policy G7 Infill Development (item ii)
 - Policy BE1 Listed Buildings (all aspects of this policy)
 - Policy BE2 Archaeological Sites etc
 - Policy BE4 (in particular items 1, 2, 3 and 4)
 - Policy H3 (conflict with SPG)
 - Policy ED3 Shopping Development (in particular items i and iii)
- Scottish Borders Proposed LDP:
 - Comparable policies to those listed above for the Consolidated Local Plan.
- Scottish Planning Policy:
 - Town Centres - Paras 71 to 73
 - Historic Environment - Para 137, 141-142, 143-144
- SHEP – various provisions relating to Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and other sites of heritage value.

In conclusion the proposed development is contrary to the development plan and other material considerations including Scottish Planning Policy, Scottish Historic Environment Policy, the Proposed LDP and the SPG for Commercial Road. The proposal will adversely affect important features that are of importance to Hawick, the proposal will have a significant adverse impact on the vitality and viability of the town centre, the proposal does not address any retail deficiency (qualitative or quantitative) and there is no demonstrable benefit from the development proposal. For these reasons Lidl UK GmbH object to the planning application and respectfully request that the planning application should be refused planning permission.

Yours sincerely



Keith Hargest
Director

Springbank
21, Princes Street
Hawick, TD9 7EJ,
23/2/15.

Application No, Ref.
15/00100/FUL.

For the attention of
Mr Brian Grater.
Mr Simon Wilkinson.



Dear Sirs,

Regards above reference number 15/00100/FUL. I wish to comment on the fact that the site owner/manager has cut down trees which have a "Tree Preservation Order 32" on them, the trees are on conservation land and are listed. On 21/2/15, workmen had cut down trees, when I discovered them felling the trees, I immediately asked them to stop and informed them of the Tree Preservation Order 32, and as the trees were listed they were not allowed to cut them down. I reported this to my local councillor/pravest

Mr Stewart Marshall who lives near me. I object most strongly to the removal of these trees. I wish you to fully investigate this matter and to make sure no more trees are removed from this area of conservation and wild-life. This area is of great value to the environment and natural beauty of Hawaii.

If you require any more details regards this matter please contact me.

I thank you for your kind attentions regards this matter.

Yours sincerely

[Redacted Signature]

Julie Hayward
15/00200/FVL

G & K McCusker Ltd T/A Spar

6 Dickson Street

Hawick

TD9 7EL

03.03.215

Dear Ms Hayward,

I have enclosed a petition against the development of an Aldi in Hawick, signed by some of the people who rely on small shops like mine. Also enclosed is another objection to the Aldi development, which is signed by small shop owners, who, like myself are very worried about there future. As you know, many of us are struggling to survive in this economic climate. I have spent a lot of time talking with many of the small business owners in Hawick and it is clear that many are worried that another supermarket could lead to the demise of some of these businesses. Thus another nail in the coffin of Hawick High Street.

Yours

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

SAY NO TO ANOTHER SUPERMARKET IN HAWICK – ALDI!

- Has no planning permission!
- Will do more damage to the High Street and other small businesses!

PLEASE SIGN AS THIS IS OUR ONLY CHANCE TO STOP THIS!

NAME	ADDRESS	POSTCODE	SIGNATURE
KATHRYN McCUSKER	C10 SPAR	TD9 7EL	
	46 Kroner Avenue	TD9 8DH	
	41 Burnhead	TD9 8HB	
	38 cheviot RD	TD9 0BE	
	54 Princes St	TD9 7EE	
	8 N VIEW WILKINS RD	TD9 7NT	
	42A Princes St	TD9 7EE	
		TD9 7EF	
K. MCMILLAN	11 DELORAINIE COURT	TD9 7GL	
WM LAMIE	27 PRINCES ST	TD9 7EG	
D WALLACE	C10 SPAR	TD9 7EL	
B. HUME	34 HUGH MURDOCH PLACE	TD9 7QJ	
	66 HASSINGTON COURT	TD9 7OH	
	50 Wallfield Rd.	TD9 7EN	
	3, Mayfield Dr.	TD9 7EW	

NAME	ADDRESS	POSTCODE	SIGNATURE
R. McLeod	Princes Street	TD9	
M Stewart	10 of Drum King Place	TD9 0A7	
Mrs J Scott	100 Wallace Court	TD9 7ES	
	9/2 Princes Street	TD9 7AX	
V THOMPSON	107 WALLACE COURT	TD9 7ES	
	67 Holloway Dr.	TD9 8JS	
G Blacklock	20/2 PERVICES ST	TD9 7AY	
	1 HOWLANDS TERRACE	TD9 8SL	
	6/1 Station Building	TD1 7AA	
	43 Hugh McLeod Place	TD9 7CS	
	" "	" "	
	25c Mayfield Drive	TD9 7LW	
	8 Robertson Place	TD9 0DB	
	9 Overhall Cresc	TD9 7TD	
	5 ATKINSON Road	TD9 7BP	
	910 Havelock Street	TD9 7DA	
J. McNEILL	32 HUGH McLEOD	TD9 7QP	
	7 Langlands Rd	TD9 7EP	
	186 WILKINSON RD	TD9 9RN	
M GORNS	4A BAUCE CT	TD9 7ER	
	WILKINSON RD	TD9 9RN	
	16 th Bothwell Court	TD9 7EP	
	7. Wallace Court	TD9 7ES	
	26A Handon place	TD9 7BY	
	22 Mayfield Dr	TD9 7EW	
	29 Haselden Ct	TD9 2QH	
	8c HARDED PL	TD9 7BY	
	HAVELOCK PL.	TD9 7BE	
	13 LOTHIAN ST	TD9 9HD	
	6/1 DEVENANT PL	TD9 8AZ	
	16 th DICKSON ST	TD9 7B	

NO TO ANOTHER
 SUPERMARKET !!!

NAME	ADDRESS	POSTCODE	SIGNATURE
A WOOD	19 HANSFIELD RD	TD9 8AB	
[REDACTED]	20 Dickson St		
M. HILLEN	9 Rosebank Rd	TD9 8DG	
[REDACTED]	Sturges Rd	TD9 8PP	
[REDACTED]	NEWTON FARM	TD9 8PP	
[REDACTED]	22 Housenden Court	TD9 7QH	
[REDACTED]	18 ALENMOOR CT	TD9 7QB	
P BASTON	3 LAING TERRACE	TD9 7AB	
G WILSON	5 HISLOP GARDEN	TD9 8PQ	
F JACOBSON	6 Rosebank Cottages	TD9 0DH	
B CRANSON	BRAMLEA	TD9 8PW	
[REDACTED]	15 ending Court	TD9 7WD	
J GRAHAM	3 HISLOP GARDENS	TD9 8PQ	
A HOWDEN	16 ANCRUM COURT	TD9 7DS	
[REDACTED]	Desport & Gray Silverthorn Rd		
R JOHNSON	50 PRINCES ST	TD9 7LG	
[REDACTED]	TRELAWNEY STABOON		
W. HOBSON	5, BOWHOLE C	TD9 4EP	
[REDACTED]	8 Mayfield Drive	TD9 7EW	
[REDACTED]	15 HASSLEDEAN CI	TD9 7EP	
T O SHORT	3 BRANXHOPE ROAD	TD9 7EU	
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	TD9 7EF	
KAREN LAMMIE	PRINCES STREET	TD9 7EF	
Amyal thors	ROZALIE BARR	TD9 71H	
JOHN ALLAN	EDINBURGH	EH4 4DP	
[REDACTED]	Witton Wood House	TD9 0DJ	
[REDACTED]	Wagholme	TD9 7X?	
[REDACTED]	17 Stoney R	TD9 6EZ	
[REDACTED]	Greensidehall RD	TD9 7HE	
V Cannon	74 PRINCES ST	TD9 7EG	

①

NAME	ADDRESS	POSTCODE	SIGNATURE
[REDACTED]	27 CROMBOUGH ROAD	TD9 0BA	[REDACTED]
LEE MILLAR	9 GREEN TERRACE	TD9 0JG	[REDACTED]
VIC LAW	31B ANCRUM COURT	TD9 7AB	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	15 Hislop Gardens	TD9 8PQ	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	1 HOWLANDS TERRACE	TD9 8SL	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	28 Princess Street	TD9 7AY	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Stamend w/ Dem	TD9 7HY	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Drumming Mews	TD9 0AF	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	16 ALLARS BANK	TD9 4EX	[REDACTED]
SWALLACE	14 chary blyth	TD9	[REDACTED]
J Hunt	14 chary blyth	TD9	[REDACTED]
D. BURGER	3- FRANKLIN RD PL WALK	TD9 70G	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	6. B. LAMON	TD9 70	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	10, HERONHILL CRESC	TD9 9RS	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	16 DEJINEANKY MEWS	TD9 0AF	[REDACTED]
R. Lindores	26 SILVERBURNHILL	TD9 7BW	[REDACTED]
E. WALSH	73 SILVERBURNHILL RD	TD9 7BJ	[REDACTED]
N. MILLER	713 UNION STREET, HANUK	TD9 9LF	[REDACTED]
N. Johnstone	10 Wallace Ct	TD9 7ES	[REDACTED]
E. Armstrong	10 Overhall Crescent	TD9 7JD	[REDACTED]
Roniva	4 Loches Ocs	TD9 7BT	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	hanglands Rd	TD9 7HC	[REDACTED]
S Gullen	14 ^F Howdenbank HK	TD9 75X	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	38 ^A Hugh Milrod	TD9-70J	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Hardenber Cottage Kelburn	TD9 7LP	[REDACTED]
S BROWN	105 MILACIAN DRIVE	TD9 8BS	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	2/1 Myreclaw green	TD9 0AT	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Dodburn Culture	TD9 0PG	[REDACTED]
P WALLACE	45 CROMBOUGH RD	TD9 0BA	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	19 HANSPICED R	TD9 8PB	[REDACTED]

NO TO ANOTHER SUPERMAG
 |||||

NO TO ANOTHER SUPERMARKET!!

NAME	ADDRESS	POSTCODE	SIGNATURE
[REDACTED]	Shawcross Court	TD9 7QH	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	2 Langlands Rd	TD9 7EF	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	1 Mayfield Park	TD9 7DY	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Netherwood Sunnyhill Road, Hewick	TD9 7HT	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	WILLINGDON COURT	TD9 7DN	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Silverbush Road R.C.	TD9 7BN	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	7 BRANKHOLME ROAD	TD9 7BU	[REDACTED]
Neil Comley	78 SILVERBUSHALL RD	TD9 7BW	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	OLD POST OFFICE	TD9 7HY	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	OLD Post OFFICE	TD9 7HY	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	SILVERBUSHALL RD.	TD9 7BW.	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	81 HEAVE-LOGIC PLACE	TD9 7DE	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	29 Silverbushall Road	TD9 7BH	[REDACTED]
John Pickard	12 MARION COURT	TD9 7QU	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	3 D PRINCE OF WALES	TD9 7QD	[REDACTED]
John Baly	160 DIRKSON ST	TD9 7EZ	[REDACTED]
K WALLACE	14 BORTHALGH RD	TD9 0BZ	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	14 BORTHALGH RD	TD9 0BZ	[REDACTED]
L GRAMM	45 CRUMTHALGH RD	TD9 0BA	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	19 CHARLES ST	TD9 8EL	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	HARDEN ESTATE	TD9 7LP	[REDACTED]
John Borthwick	7A ROXBURGH DRIVE	TD9 7QP	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	49E Brunshaw Road	TD9 7RU	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	123 Howgate	TD9 0AB	[REDACTED]
COMPTON / MURPHY	60 Kirk Bruce	TD9	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	11 ANDROM CT.	TD9 7	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]		TD9 7QE	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	10 LUNTON VL	TD9 7GU	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	5 MORRISON PLACE	TD9 0JD	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	PETA COTTAGES	TD9 8PL	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	14 EARL ST	TD9 9PZ	[REDACTED]

NO TO ANOTHER SUPERMARKET

NAME	ADDRESS	POSTCODE	SIGNATURE
Barbara Smith	Wilton Path	TD9 7DS	
	Mayfield Park	TD9 7DY	
	Cuthrie drive	TD9 7QA	
	Mayfield Park	TD9 7DY	
A DORWARD	Wilton Road	TD9 7HL	
D OLIVER	BROOKMEADOW	TD9 7HE	
	46 Kraber Avenue	TD9 8DH	
	124 Roxburgh Drive	TD9 7GP	
	113 S. LUGBULTHALL RD	TD9 7BJ	
John Blair	17 hillen dr	TD9 6BF	
Amy Vosper	47 Oliver Park	TD9 9PL	
	39, Burnhead Rd	TD9 8HB	
	3c Andersen Pl	TD9 7LA	
S McAllister	38A Hugh Wilson St	TD9 7QJ	
N Bonini	8 Fernick Rd	TD9 9PH	
	8 Pollock Place	TD9 8RE	
	Springfield Chesters	TD9 8TH	
	22A Castle St	TD15 2LQ	
J. Pierzak	33 CUMMINGS ROAD	TD9 8BT	
J. GIBBES	30 COMMERCIAL ROAD	TD9 7AD	
R SANDERSON	18 Fernick Rd.	TD9 9PH	
	22 T WILSON TERR	TD9 9W	
L ALLEN BROWN	1a Hassendean Cr	TD9 7QH	
B Arken	28 Manderbank	TD9 75X	
	LILAC COTTAGE	TD7 4NL	
	44 Galahad Rd	TD9 8DW	
	25 WILSON CRESCENT	TD9 7EH	
	8 Roxburgh Dr.	TD9 7GP	
KATRINA MOFFAT	32 PRINCESS ST	TD9 7BY	
L WOOD	33 Atherton Rd	TD9 7BP	
	13 S/B/H Rd	TD9 1B 11	

NO TO ANOTHER SUPERMARKET!!

NO TO ANOTHER SUPERMARKET !!!

NAME	ADDRESS	POSTCODE	SIGNATURE
[REDACTED]	46 Fensall Avenue 18. Mayfield Dr.	TD9 8DH TD97EW	[REDACTED]
Geoff Smith			[REDACTED]
CHASTID	1CL PRINCES ST HAWK	TD9 7EJ	[REDACTED]
Michael Knight	19B Ivanhoe terr	TD9 8EE	[REDACTED]
Marika Valkenich	19C Ivanhoe Terrace	TD9 8EE	[REDACTED]
Jade Williams	14 Borthnugh rd	TD9 0BZ	[REDACTED]
Maryanne William	14 Borthnugh rd	TD9 0BZ	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	7 OVERHALL RD	TD9 7JB	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	46F Princess Street	TD9 7EE	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	5A Anderson Pl	TD9 7LA	AJ. FISHER
[REDACTED]	5A Ander Pl	TD9 7AA	F. FISHER
J.A. HOPE	32 MAYFIELD DR	TD9 7EW	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	MORRISON. C/O	TD9	W BLACKWOOD
VANCE, HOLMSTED	40 PRINCES ST	TD9	V. HOSKIN
[REDACTED]	Borchester	TD9 8JL	[REDACTED]
JACKIE YOUNG	HAWICK	TD9	[REDACTED]
JOHN CARROLLS	HAWICKWOOD LANE	TD9 7QS	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	27 Howden bank	TD9 7JY	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	7 UNION TERRACE	TD9 9QX	[REDACTED]
J DOUGLAS	DOUGLAS ST.	TEL	[REDACTED]
B MERCIER	? CARNARON STREET	TD9 7EB	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	7 Trevelyan Terrace	TD9 0AZ	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Roxdale St	TD9 7LP	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	POWESS	TD9 7ES	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	31. WILTON HILL TERR	TD9 8BB	[REDACTED]
TRADKISS	2E WILTON CRESCENT	TD9 7EH	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	2E WILTON CRESCENT	TD9 7EH	[REDACTED]
P WALLACE	14 BORTHALIC. H	TD9 0BZ	[REDACTED]
A OLIVER	9 WILTON CR	TD9 7EH	[REDACTED]
J CUMMING	4A BRUCE CT	TD9 7ER	[REDACTED]

NO TO A NOTHER
SUPERMARKET !!!

NAME	ADDRESS	POSTCODE	SIGNATURE
MUIR	Deloraine Ct	TD9 7QE	
Foster	Almonor Ct	TD9 7QB	
Arzon	DICKSON ST	TD9 7EL	
	Appletreehall	TD9 8PW	
	WALLINGTON COURT	TD9 7DA	
	15 AOMPS BANK		
	218 Massenden Court	TD9 7QH	
	Bruce Court	TD9 7ER	
	12 Silverthorn Rd	TD9 7BN	
	Cheriot Road	TD9 0BD	
	39E OLIVER PLACE	TD9 9PL	
	Scotburn Hamlet	TD9 7RH	
	75 Princes St	TD9 7EY	
	Simmerfield PK, HAMLET	TD9 7EF	
M FINLAY	8 Dickson St Hamlet	TD9 7EL	
FABULLAH	25 WILKES TERR	TD9	
D AITKEN	21 Silverthorn Rd	TD9 7BN	
R TAYLOR	1 MARFIELD DRIVE	TD9	
C GARCIA	BURBANK LANGLANDS RD	TD9 7EF	
	Denholm		
	CHAY BLITH PLACE	TD9	
A ROBERTSON	3 HAZEL CREST	TD9	
E JEFFREY	1 CRUMHAUGH R	TD9 0BA	
K FARNON	1 CRUMHAUGH RD	TD9 0BA	
	49 MILACLOO DR	TD9 7BY	
	17 MAXTON CT	TD9 7QN	
	21 ANCRUM COURT	TD9 7DB	
	10, Millfield Park	TD9 4DY	
	36 Wellington Court	TD9 7DN	
D GRANT	4 CRUMHAUGH RD	TD9 0BA	
	3 DICKSON COURT		

NO TO ANOTHER
SUPERMARKET ! ! ! !

NAME	ADDRESS	POSTCODE	SIGNATURE
[REDACTED]	4 Bothwell Ct	TD9 7EP	[REDACTED]
BRIAN GRAY	18 MAXTON COURT	TD9 7QP	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	121 ^c Silverbush Hill Rd	TD9 7BL	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	Shirches	N/A	[REDACTED]
D GEGE	11 DRUMWATER, MEWS	TD9 0AF	[REDACTED]
J. ELLIOT	8 BOTHWELL CRT	TD9 7EP	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	75 RIRK	TD7 4NW	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	29 Wilton Hill Terr	TD9 8BE	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	36 RIMMING RD	TD9 0DU	[REDACTED]
MCCRENNON	46 Dickson St Har	TD9 7ER	[REDACTED]
John Scott	260 ALBION CRESCENT	TD9 5EU	[REDACTED]
DENIS WILSON	126 TRINITY STREET	TD9 9NS	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	4/2 Rosedale	TD9 8AD	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	6 W. FLEM HILL	TD9 8BA	[REDACTED]
Michelle Linder	63 Silverbush Hill Road	TD9 7BH	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	106 PRINCE ST	TD9 7AY	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	412 Rosedale St	TD9 8AD	[REDACTED]
MONICA KOBSON	117 OLIVER PARK	TD9 9PL	[REDACTED]
S YADON	220 WENSLEYDENE	TD9 9RW	[REDACTED]
P. HUSK	WHITELIGHT VILLO	TD9 0DE	[REDACTED]
C NUMA	SCHGUR RD	TD9 0BD	[REDACTED]
E. Sutherland and	11 Rosebank	TD9 0DH	[REDACTED]
A. Scott	Hillfield, Main Street ^{Hillfield}	TD6 9JD	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	6 Dickson St	TD9 7EH	[REDACTED]

NO TO ANOTHER SUPERMARKET

SAY NO TO ANOTHER SUPERMARKET IN HAWICK – ALDI!

1
2

- Has no planning permission!
- Will do more damage to the High Street and other small businesses!

PLEASE SIGN AS THIS IS OUR ONLY CHANCE TO STOP THIS!

NAME	ADDRESS	POSTCODE	SIGNATURE
	41, Chay Blyth Pl	TD9 8HY	
	15 Waverley St	TD9 9JT	
	3 Northcote St	TD9 9BQ	
	51 Rosebank Rd	TD9 0DQ	
	16 Auld (21)	TD9 8LS	
	Glebehead Farm Langholm	TD9 7LT	
	Kirkton	TD9 8PQ	
	Hillend drive.	TD9 8DU	
	15 PARK VIEW	TD9 7JF	
	38 Wilson Dr.	TD9 8HP	
	10, SUTRIG (PASC.)	TD9 0EN	
	22 TWIBES TERR	TD9 9LP	
	35 High Street	TD9 9BU	
	35 Meigh Street	TD9 9BU	
	35 High Street	TD9 9BU	

LES IR 9/10/11
MRS GEE

NAME	ADDRESS	POSTCODE	SIGNATURE
John Trobe	M'LAGAN DRIVE	TD9 8DD	
Mrs KATHLEEN A	ITKEN 8 HILLVIEW DRIVE	TD9 8BY	
Jade Williams	14 Borthaugh rd	TD9 0BZ	
	14 Borthaugh rd	TD9 0BZ	
	14 Borthaugh road	TD9 0BZ	
Bruce TAIT	86 SILVERBETHAIL ROAD	TD9 7BT	
ANDREW FAIRBURN	1 DUNFORTH ROAD	TD9 8ED	
CAROL NOBLE	17 LOWSCROFT RD.	TD9 0BT	
	10/1 Noble Place	TD9 9QZ	
	5 GLEBE VIEW	TD9 4JN	
D AITKEN	8 HILLVIEW DRIVE	TD9 8BY	
M TROBE	M'LAGAN DRIVE	TD9 8DD	

NO TO ANOTHER SUPERMARKET!!!
 REGENERATE HAWICK HIGH STREET!

Ms Julie Hayward
Principle Planning Officer
Development Management
Regulatory Services
Scottish Borders Council
jhayward2@scotborders.gov.uk

Dear Ms Hayward

Planning Application 15/00100/FUL – Wilton Mills 31/32 Commercial Road Hawick.

We are writing to you to express our strong concerns at the potential impact of the above planning application on the town centre and on existing businesses. When the original planning application for this site was considered by planning official in September 2014, very strong concerns were raised and the applicants withdrew their application. In our view these concerns are still valid and should be taken into consideration when reviewing the new applications. The key concerns were:

1. This development would lead to an unacceptable impact on the vitality and viability of the town centre.
2. Studies undertaken by the Council have shown that there is no spare grocery retail capacity in Hawick (e.g. the Council's Winter Retail Survey 2013).
3. The proposed site lies out with the town centre and the proposal runs contrary to the town centre first principle.
4. A discount supermarket store would not provide a complementary shopping facility but would in fact provide a similar retailing experience to existing competing stores. The proposed food retail unit would therefore have an unacceptable adverse impact on existing retailers; contrary to development plan policies ED3 and ED5.
5. The overall issue of retail impact in Hawick should be considered as part of the report into the next iteration of the Local Development Plan and therefore the Wilton Mills planning application should not be determined until planning officials have the Reporter's conclusions – possibly in July of 2015.

If this application were to be granted it would simply add to the already alarming decline in the sustainability and viability of businesses in the town centre. This development would simply displace customers and jobs from existing businesses without any long-term sustainable economic benefit to Hawick.

This representation should be considered as an objection to the application.

COMPANY NAME	ADDRESS
SPAR G & McCUSKER LTD. Deaner Pumpa HANICK CYCLES	6 DICKSON ST HANICK. 9 OLIVER PL. HANICK 10 BANTAGE PL
HAMISH D SMITH	4 BOUETREE PL
ROBERT PRINGLE BUTCHERS	56 HIGH ST
THE LITTLE SHOP	18 WILKINSON ROAD
TERREY STANGER	21, MILTON LIND
ANDREW LANCIEZ WILTONS CARPETS	DENHOLM MEAT SUPPLY 8 DICKSON ST
ALISTAIR DUNN Lily of The Valley	75 HIGH ST 2A O'CONNELL ST
The Flower Pot	79 High St
THOMA & Sons Rubbish Pet Shop	47 High St. 9 High St
GIROYS	5 HOWEGATE
HUTTONS BUTCHERS	16 HOWEGATE
THE WARDROBE	1 HOWEGATE
TEVIOT WINES	7 TOWER KNOWE
THE NISIAN GALLERY	HIGH STREET
HUNTERS BAKERS	LOCKPARK IND EST
THINK FITNESS 4 LESS	3 O'CONNELL STREET
G Harrow & Son Homebakery Rum & Milk	Howegate 1 NORTH BRIDGE ST

SIGNATURE



Application Comments for 15/00100/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 15/00100/FUL

Address: Land And Buildings At Wilton Mills 31 - 32 Commercial Road Hawick Scottish Borders

Proposal: Erection of Class 1 retail foodstore with ancillary works including car parking, access and landscaping

Case Officer: Julie Hayward

Customer Details

Name: Ms Fiona Mackie

Address: Haig House 23 Princes Street, Hawick, Scottish Borders TD9 7EJ

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Designated Conservation Area
- Detrimental to environment
- Land affected
- Legal issues
- Privacy of neighbouring properties affected
- Trees/landscape affected

Comment: I wish to bring to the Council's attention that land belonging to my elderly mother at 21 Princes Street has today (21/02/15) been trespassed on and several of her trees cut down in pursuance of the clearance of the adjacent site for building purposes by Aldi. Fortunately, the workmen were responsive to her request to cease cutting down said trees, which all have preservation orders issued by Scottish Borders Council. Neither my mother nor myself had objected thus far to the proposed building, but we do now and in the strongest of terms. We request that someone explain to us immediately why this devastation has taken place, and at whose instruction? The treed area on my mother's property shows clearly in the final planning document, showing the proposed supermarket layout, as separate from the ground where the parking area is to be laid out, so I cannot see why the developers have instructed men to come onto her property at all. I expect someone to contact me as a priority concerning this matter.

From: John Lee [<mailto:j.lee@scotgrocersfed.co.uk>]

Sent: 06 March 2015 08:47

To: Hayward, Julie

Subject: Scottish Grocers Federation Comments on Planning Application 15/00100/FUL

Importance: High

Dear Julie,

Please find attached a letter of comment in respect of the above planning application. Our letter should be regarded as an objection.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Regards

John

JOHN LEE
POLICY AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS MANAGER
TEL: 0131 343 3300 or 077 94 237 326

222 Queensferry Road, Edinburgh, EH4 2BN
Tel: 0131 343 3300, Fax: 0131 343 6147

Ms Julie Hayward
Principle Planning Officer
Development Management
Regulatory Services
Scottish Borders Council

Dear Ms Hayward

5/3/2015

Planning Application 15/00100/FUL – Wilton Mills 31/32 Commercial Road Hawick.

The Scottish Grocers' Federation is the national trade association for the independent convenience store industry in Scotland. We are writing to you to express our strong concerns at the potential impact of the above planning application on the town centre and on existing businesses.

This representation should be considered as an **objection** to the above application

When the original planning application for this site was considered by planning official in September 2014, very strong concerns were raised and the applicants withdrew their application. In our view these concerns are still valid and should be taken into consideration when reviewing the new applications. The key concerns were:

1. This development would lead to an unacceptable impact on the vitality and viability of the town centre.
2. Studies undertaken by the Council have shown that there is no spare grocery retail capacity in Hawick (e.g. the Council's Winter Retail Survey 2013).
3. The proposed site lies out with the town centre and the proposal runs contrary to the town centre first principle.
4. A discount supermarket store would not provide a complementary shopping facility but would in fact provide a similar retailing experience to existing competing stores. The proposed food retail unit would therefore have an unacceptable adverse impact on existing retailers; contrary to development plan policies ED3 and ED5.
5. The overall issue of retail impact in Hawick should be considered as part of the report into the next iteration of the Local Development Plan and therefore the Wilton Mills planning application should not be determined until planning officials have the Reporter's conclusions – possibly in July of 2015.

In our view these are significant obstacles and the new application from the developers does not overcome them or provide a robust justification for the application to be granted. Additionally as this is an edge of centre site it is not in line with the town centre first principle or the sequential test.

If this application were to be granted it would simply add to the already alarming decline in the sustainability and viability of businesses in the town centre. This development would simply displace customers and jobs from existing businesses without any long-term sustainable economic benefit to Hawick. A new store on the Wilton Mills site would surely be in the catchment area for existing stores such as Sainsbury's, Morrisons, the Co-op store in Burnfoot and the SPAR store – the retail impact assessment for this application does not sufficiently take this into account.

John Lee
Public Affairs Manager

From: John Lee
Sent: 27 July 2015 11:44
To: Hayward, Julie
Subject: Grocery Retail Provision in Hawick
Importance: High

Dear Julie, I hope this finds you well.

I hope you don't mind me contacting you, we have spoken briefly previously. As you may recall, Scottish Grocers' Federation is the national trade association for the independent convenience store sector in Scotland, I am writing to you on behalf one of our members, Mr George McCusker, of SPAR Hawick. As you know Mr McCusker is extremely concerned about the potential development of an Aldi store in the town and the potentially negative impact on existing local businesses.

I know you will be busy but it would be very helpful if you can advise me what stage the current Aldi application is at and whether it is likely that the application will be considered by the planning committee. If it is likely that the application will be considered by the Committee is it possible to say what the planning report accompanying the application would recommend?

Our strong view is that the Council should uphold the position that there is no spare grocery retail provision in Hawick and that the application should be refused on that basis. bases on your experience would it be beneficial for us to contact either the Head of Planning or the Convenor of the Planning Committee to highlight our concerns?

I look forward to hearing from you.

Very best wishes

John

JOHN LEE
HEAD OF POLICY AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS



COMMUNICATION.LOBBYING.ADVICE.NETWORKING