

Archived: 02 February 2021 16:22:55

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Mon, 1 Feb 2021 10:56:18 +0000ARC

To: [localplan](#)

Cc:

Subject: Objection to the Proposed Scottish Borders Local Development Plan 2 - Proposed Plan 2020 - Proposed Local Biodiversity Site Ref. 64 - Land at Boondreigh Water

Sensitivity: Normal

Attachments:

[REDACTED]

CAUTION: External Email

Dear [REDACTED]

As discussed the above representation on behalf of Mr Andrew Dobie relates to LBS 64 Land at Boondreigh Water.

Please can this supersede that submitted as per the below correspondence.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

[galbraithgroup.com](#) | [Like us on Facebook](#) | [Follow us on Twitter](#)

Galbraith 

This email and any attachments are confidential and intended solely for the use of the addressee. If this email is not intended for you then please advise us immediately and permanently delete this email and any attachments from your computer system. We do not accept any liability for any harm caused by this email or any attachments to any systems or data and do not accept liability for any personal emails. Unless expressly stated otherwise, this email does not create, form part of or vary any contractual or unilateral obligation. Galbraith is a trading name of the LLP registered in Scotland number S0300208 with registered address 59 George Street, Edinburgh, EH2 2JG

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 25 January 2021 15:02

To: 'localplan' <localplan@scotborders.gov.uk>

Subject: Objection to the Proposed Scottish Borders Local Development Plan 2 - Proposed Plan 2020 - Proposed Local Biodiversity Site Ref. 118 - Land at Boondreigh Water

Good afternoon,

I write in relation to the current consultation concerning the Proposed Scottish Borders Local Development Plan 2 – Proposed Plan 2020.

Please find attached a formal objection on behalf of our client Mr Andrew Dobie. The representation concerns the proposed designation of land under their ownership at Boondreigh Water as a Local Biodiversity Site.

A detailed site assessment and review conducted by LUC is also attached for reference to be read in conjunction with the representation. A site plan highlighting the proposed revised LBS boundary is also attached.

If any further information is required please let me know.

Please acknowledge safe receipt of this submission.

Kind regards,

galbraithgroup.com | [Like us on Facebook](#) | [Follow us on Twitter](#)



[Energy Matters](#) | [Rural Matters](#) | [Commercial Matters](#) | [Forestry Matters](#) | [Property Matters](#)

[Galbraith COVID-19 Update](#)

This email and any attachments are confidential and intended solely for the use of the addressee. If this email is not intended for you then please advise us immediately and permanently delete this email and any attachments from your computer system. We do not accept any liability for any harm caused by this email or any attachments to any systems or data and do not accept liability for any personal emails. Unless expressly stated otherwise, this email does not create, form part of or vary any contractual or unilateral obligation. Galbraith is a trading name of the LLP registered in Scotland number S0300208 with registered address 59 George Street, Edinburgh, EH2 2JG

Mr Andrew Dobie
Boondreigh Water


Dear [REDACTED]

Our reference

Scottish Borders - Local
Biodiversity Sites Review

Date

15 January 2021



**Scottish Borders Proposed Local Development Plan (2020) -
Review of Local Biodiversity Site Selection Process**

Introduction

In 2020, Scottish Borders Council published their Proposed Local Development Plan, setting out their vision for proposed land use within the Scottish Borders during the period 2021 – 2031.

Policy EP3 of the Proposed Local Development Plan, ‘*Local Biodiversity and Geodiversity*’ seeks to safeguard and enhance local biodiversity through the designation of Local Biodiversity Sites (LBS). While LBS do not confer any statutory protection, Policy EP3 states that these sites are ‘critical to the conservation of species’ and/or that they ‘support priority species and habitats that do not have statutory protection but are of national importance or occur in regionally important populations within the Scottish Borders’.

This report has been prepared to provide information to landowners (represented by Galbraith) who have received notice of Scottish Borders Council’s intention to designate LBS on parts of their land. The report includes a high-level review of the Scottish Borders Council’s methodology for the selection of LBS, based on the information provided in Technical Note 4 of the Proposed Local Development Plan¹.

Beyond this review of Scottish Borders Council’s selection method, LUC has also reviewed site-specific details and recommendations for a number of proposed sites. A pro-forma for each reviewed site is appended to this report.

¹ Scottish Borders Council. Proposed Local Development Plan. Technical Note 4 – Local Biodiversity Sites (2020)

Bristol
Edinburgh
Glasgow
London
Manchester

landuse.co.uk

Land Use Consultants Ltd
Registered in England
Registered number 2549296
Registered office:
250 Waterloo Road
London SE1 8RD

100% recycled paper

Landscape Design
Strategic Planning & Assessment
Development Planning
Urban Design & Masterplanning
Environmental Impact Assessment
Landscape Planning & Assessment
Landscape Management
Ecology
Historic Environment
GIS & Visualisation



Review of Selection Process

The approach by which Scottish Borders Council has identified proposed LBS is set out in a specific Technical Note¹ which, in turn, is supported by a series of additional methodological documents².

The selection criteria set out in the Technical Note follows well-established NatureScot guidance³ on identifying LBS and are robust and transparent. Usefully, Scottish Borders Council has made minor, locally relevant adaptations to selection criteria, including the inclusion of metrics for social and community value. A scoring system is used throughout the selection criteria which helps maintain consistency between sites and ensure each factor makes a contribution to the overall importance of the site. The scoring systems allow for consistency between surveyors, reducing the subjective human input.

The wider process by which LBS are authorised and approved includes a robust verification process involving a Steering Group, which largely comprises representatives of nature conservation organisations.

LUC considers that the selection criteria process adopted is scientifically robust and aligns with good practice generally adopted across Scotland. However, we highlight that other than a small number of 'TWIC excursions', the proposed allocations have not been informed by any field work or site surveys. Instead, the methodology states that an assessment on a site's suitability to be designated as a LBS will be made by The Wildlife Information Centre (TWIC), provided sufficient current data is available. 'Current' data for new sites is deemed as plant lists collected within the last 15 years.

Habitat and species distribution and abundance are highly dynamic and change constantly. We consider data that is 15 years old should not be treated as 'current'. In LUCs considerable experience with environmental data collection and interpretation, we consider recent site visits are essential for gaining 'current' baseline data and, where this is not possible, data no older than five years is recommended. We highlight that many planning authorities in Scotland take a similar position and routinely appoint professional ecologists to undertake the necessary habitat and vegetation surveys to inform LNCS allocations, as part of wider evidence collation for Local Development Plans.

Landowners and land managers are to be made aware of any site visits carried out on potential LBS. No landowners represented by Galbraith were approached regarding site visits therefore it is assumed none were conducted.

The condition of important habitats on sites is taken from The Berwickshire BSBI Botanical Site Register⁴ where possible. This is a detailed and scientific collection of habitat condition and rare species and was produced in 2011, so falls within the 15 year limit for 'current' data. However, many of the surveys informing this were conducted a number of years prior to its publication and are therefore not within the 15 year timescale. Using habitat quality data inferred from results of this age (often over 20 years old) is not appropriate for this selection methodology.

We understand that a number of your clients have raised significant concerns about the extent and coverage of proposed LBS and we consider much of this confusion may be attributable to the use of historical data and the lack of contemporary field surveys (or indeed land owner consultation), while LBS proposals were developed.

However, notwithstanding this particular constraint to the method, we consider that many of the issues and uncertainties raised by your clients relate to a lack of transparency and detail in the communication of the selection process.

² TWIC (2017). Local Biodiversity Sites System Methodology (v.4).

³ Guidance on Establishing and Managing Local Nature Conservation Site Systems in Scotland <http://www.snh.org.uk/publications/on-line/heritagemanagement/LNCS/default.asp>

⁴ Berwickshire BSBI Botanical Site Register, M E Braithwaite, 2011

As mentioned above, the methodology utilises scoring systems for the factors which must be considered, according to NatureScot³. No details of the completed assessment for each site has been included in the documents made available by Scottish Borders Council¹ as part of the consultation process. We understand that landowners have received letters from TWIC, advising them of the proposed designation, but again, other than general statements about broad biodiversity and social value, there are no further details. Therefore, it is not possible to determine whether the methodology stated was, in reality, followed. The small and often ambiguous paragraph with the site summary is very generic and does not provide many details. The summary often contains only the name of the site and often does not overlap with the 'notable habitats' listed. This provides confusion to the reader as to what the site is being designated for (i.e. what the important habitats are).

According to methodology documents^{1,2} each site designated by TWIC as a potential LBS should be accompanied by:

- A map of the proposed boundary
- A record for the reasons for selection
- A note on outcomes sought for biodiversity

As far as LUC is aware, with the exception of proposed boundaries, this information has not been made available, either publicly or to affected landowners.

We note that many of your clients have raised concern about the boundary extends of proposed LBS and have questioned why they have included productive and operational land (including grazing pasture and commercial forestry plantations). Again, in the methodology documents², the method states that;


“where very small areas of non-biodiverse habitat (such as amenity grasslands, cultivated land, recently planted woods, conifer plantations) have to be included within a site because they are too small or too integrated into the site to be excluded, a clear rationale for including these areas must be given at the time of assessment”.

We can find no evidence of these justifications having been made as part of the selection process, again, presumably, because no supporting documentation has been provided as part of the consultation process.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the process by which Scottish Borders Council's purports to select Local Biodiversity Sites is scientifically robust, however we highlight that the historic nature of the data often used, and the absence of any field-survey or ground-truthing significantly undermines the value of the process. Moreover, as Scottish Borders Council does not appear to have published their selection assessments, as noted above, the process has not been transparent or accountable.

This is further compounded by a lack of engagement with landowners, which appears to have resulted in poorly defined LBS boundaries.



Board Director for Ecology
MSci (Hons) CEnv MCIEEM MEECW

Boondreigh Water

| | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Designation Summary | Burnside with woodland, wetland and grassland habitats with a high diversity of plants and several rare or priority species. | |
| Notified Notable Habitats | Broadleaved semi-natural woodland | |
| Notified Biodiversity Features | Water quality: Boondreigh Water / Blyth Water has good water quality according to 2016 SEPA data. Habitats rated as 'good' according to the Berwickshire BSBI Botanical Site Register (Braithwaite, 2011) ¹ . | |
| Review Question | Answer | Further Information |
| Has selection criteria been appropriately applied? | Unclear | No detailed working has been made available to landowners to ascertain whether the methodology has been followed when designating this site as a potential LBS. The application of the selection criteria has not been transparent. |
| Have all documents associated with designation been made available to the landowner? | No | The detailed working to determine whether each site meets the requirements to be designated as a LBS was not provided to landowners. These documents were not required to be released following the approved methodology however, had these been made available this would have helped with landowner understanding of the designation process. Lack of transparency in the details of how each site was selected has caused confusion for many landowners. A site statement was provided to each landowner for each potential LBS. A boundary map of the proposed area has been provided and boundary choice reasoning can be inferred but is not explicitly stated. |
| Is the site statement compliant with the methodology applied?* | No | The site statement does not include the following information, as required by the adopted methodology: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The reasons for selection as a LBS. – Assessment notes including boundary decisions detailing rationale for inclusion of non-notable habitats within boundary. – Outcomes for biodiversity The method also requires that where small areas of non-biodiverse habitats are included in a designation, a clear rationale for this is provided at the assessment stage. No rationale has been provided in the site statement. The lack of information has led to landowners being unclear as to purpose of designation, with no information provided to indicate the importance of the site for biodiversity. |
| Has a site visit informed the selection process? | No | Landowners and land managers were at no point informed of surveys, as is specified in the assessment process |
| Has contemporary data informed the selection process?*** | No | A phase 1 Habitat map has been used to identify notable habitats however it is not clear when this habitat data was collected. We cannot say whether the habitat data was contemporary. The aerial imagery of the site (dated 2021) broadly follows the Phase 1 Habitat map provided by TWIC. |

| | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Designation Summary | Burnside with woodland, wetland and grassland habitats with a high diversity of plants and several rare or priority species. | |
| Notified Notable Habitats | Broadleaved semi-natural woodland | |
| Notified Biodiversity Features | Water quality: Boondreigh Water / Blyth Water has good water quality according to 2016 SEPA data. Habitats rated as 'good' according to the Berwickshire BSBI Botanical Site Register (Braithwaite, 2011) ¹ . | |
| Review Question | Answer | Further Information |
| | | <p>The notified notable bird species data was collected in 2011 and 2012 (with the exception of Kestrel). This falls outwith what would be classed as contemporary but would be acceptable under the methodology applied.</p> <p>None of the listed notable species of flowering plants have data collected after 2012. Five of the eight species listed do not have data collected within the last 15 years, their inclusion is not appropriate.</p> <p>Lichen notable species data was collected in 1997 and is therefore not appropriate.</p> |
| Are notified notable habitats appropriate and based on data for the site? | Yes | Broadleaved semi-natural woodland is a Scottish Biodiversity List habitat and its inclusion is appropriate. |
| Are notable species appropriate and based on data for the site? | No | <p>All species listed as notable in the site statement are included in the TWIC data search. As mentioned above, not all of these species have been recorded within the last 15 years and their inclusion in this statement are not appropriate.</p> <p>A large number of notable species were included in the data search from TWIC, many of these were not included in the site statement with no explanation as to the reasoning for this.</p> <p>Badger are included in the notable species. As badger protections relate to the persecution of these animals not their rarity it is recommended that the presence of this species not be considered in the selection criteria.</p> |
| Are notified Biodiversity features appropriate and based on data for the site? | Yes/No | <p>SEPA river quality data is from 2016. This is just within the recommended 5 year limit for contemporary data.</p> <p>The rating of 'good' for the burnside habitat has been calculated using data collected in 1997¹. This is well outside the 15 year limit on 'current' data as specified in the methodology; it is not appropriate to use this data source.</p> |
| Are the boundaries of the LBS appropriate? | No | <p>Following the methodology supplied by the council², boundaries for LBS are normally set by areas of semi-natural or natural habitats. Areas of land not natural or semi-natural will normally be excluded. Aerial and landowner supplied photographs of the site appear to show large areas of the proposed LBS in the south-west as being well grazed improved grassland. This is not a high value habitat and it is suggested that the LBS be narrowed to follow a prominent track and the woodland edge. The remainder of the boundary appears to follow woodland and river edges and encompasses notable habitat, this is therefore seen as appropriate.</p> <p>A suggested LBS boundary map has been provided.</p> |
| Recommendations | Yes | The proposed LBS requires a site visit and contemporary data to ensure baseline data on which the designation is decided is robust. |


¹ Berwickshire BSBI Botanical Site Register, M E Braithwaite, 2011

| | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Designation Summary | Burnside with woodland, wetland and grassland habitats with a high diversity of plants and several rare or priority species. | |
| Notified Notable Habitats | Broadleaved semi-natural woodland | |
| Notified Biodiversity Features | Water quality: Boondreigh Water / Blyth Water has good water quality according to 2016 SEPA data. Habitats rated as 'good' according to the Berwickshire BSBI Botanical Site Register (Braithwaite, 2011) ¹ . | |
| Review Question | Answer | Further Information |
| | | The site statement should be completed with all information which is required to be shared, as detailed in Technical Note 4*. |
| Land use considerations | Yes | The site is grazed under current land use. Planting in the area has been undertaken by the landowner for the promotion of game shooting. There is no onus on the landowner to alter land use in any way should the site be designated as an LBS. No change to access permissions is inferred by the designation of a site as a LBS. |
| Any further points | Yes | Landowners have not been consulted during the selection process and, as a result, do not fully understand the outcomes in the event that their land becomes designated. The lack of data supplied to landowners has prevented landowners from fully participating in the decision-making process. Landowners have only been able to interrogate the data, having purchased it from TWIC at personal expense. The approach to LBS designation at Scottish Borders Council has not been transparent or collaborative and does not represent good practice in nature conservation efforts. |

* According to methodology as published in Chapter 6.9 of Technical Note 4² and NatureScot guidance in Chapter 3.

**Contemporary is classed as data collected within the last five years. Statements made are based on data search records provided by TWIC in January 2021.

² Scottish Borders Council. Proposed Local Development Plan. Technical Note 4 – Local Biodiversity Sites (2020)



Galbraith

Galbraith, 59 George St,
Edinburgh, EH2 2JG
Tel: 0131 2406960
Email: edinburgh@galbraithgroup.co.uk

Boondreigh Water Boundary

Date: 25/01/2021
Revision: -3-

0 100 200 300 m

Page Size: A4 Scale: 1:13500

© Crown copyright and database rights (2021)
Ordnance Survey Licence No. 01100031673

Forward Planning
Council Headquarters
Newtown St Boswells
Scottish Borders
TD6 0SA

Our Ref: 12274-1

25th January 2021


By email (localplan@scotborders.gov.uk) only

Dear Sirs

**OBJECTION TO THE SCOTTISH BORDERS LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2 – PROPOSED PLAN 2020
PROPOSED LOCAL BIODIVERSITY SITE REF. 64 – LAND AT BOONDREIGH WATER, DODS MILL**

I write on behalf of [REDACTED] in relation to 30.4 hectares of land under his ownership at Boondreigh Water.

As detailed in Local Development Plan (LDP) Technical Note 4, it is proposed that 86.4 hectares of land at Boondreigh Water, Dods Mill be designated as a Local Biodiversity Site in the Local Development Plan 2. Of the 86.4 hectares proposed for designation [REDACTED] owns 30.4 hectares. Figure 1 below illustrates the extent of the proposed designation.



Site Ref: 64

Site Name: Boondreigh Water, Dod Mill

Area (ha): 86.4

Site Description

Burnsides with woodland, wetland and grassland habitats with a high diversity of plants and several locally rare or priority species.

Shown on Map 2

Figure 1: Extract from LDP Technical Note 4

59 George Street, Edinburgh EH2 2JG

Tel: 0131 240 6960 | Fax: 0131 240 6961 | edinburgh@galbraithcluster.com | galbraithcluster.com

It is noted that the proposed designation is linked to LDP Policy EP3 – Local Biodiversity and Geodiversity. This policy advises that *“any development that could impact on local biodiversity through impacts on habitats and species should:*

- a) aim to avoid fragmentation or isolation of habitats; and*
- b) be sited and designed to minimise adverse impacts on the biodiversity of the site, including its environmental quality, ecological status and viability; and*
- c) compensate to ensure no net loss of biodiversity through use of biodiversity offsets and ensure net gain as appropriate; and*
- d) aim to enhance the biodiversity value of the site, through use of an ecosystems approach, with the aim of creation or restoration of habitats and wildlife corridors and provision for their long-term management and maintenance.”*

In response to notification of the proposed designation at Boondreigh Water, my client has sought independent ecological advice from LUC. As detailed in the appended assessment, ecologists at LUC have reviewed both the methodology adopted by the Council (in conjunction with The Wildlife Information Centre or TWIC) for the purposes of site selection, and the extent of the designation proposed at Boondreigh Water in terms of its potential adverse impacts on future land use operations. In this latter regard, my client is concerned that the proposed designation includes productive grassland and that confirmation of the site’s designation as a Local Biodiversity Site will negatively impact agricultural operations.

Supported by LUC’s independent review (as summarised below), Mr Dobie wishes to formally object to the proposed designation at Boondreigh Water as outlined in the LDP Proposed Plan and accompanying Technical Note 4.

Procedural Points

As part of the scope of work undertaken by LUC, a review of the methodology that has informed the site selection process used to identify the proposed Local Biodiversity Sites (LBS) has been undertaken.

In LUC’s professional opinion, the site selection criteria used are robust and align with good practice generally adopted across Scotland. However, LUC has raised a number of issues and concerns in relation to the associated methodology. Specifically, the extent of field work undertaken as part of the designation process. In this respect, other than a small number of ‘TWIC excursions’, the proposed allocations have not been informed by any recent field work or site surveys.

In the absence of any field work and surveys, the Council’s methodology states that an assessment of a particular site’s suitability to be designated as a LBS was made by The Wildlife Information Centre (TWIC), provided that sufficient current data was available. For reference, TWIC deem plant lists collected within

the past 15 years to constitute 'current' data.

The identification of the proposed LBS sites has therefore been informed by a 'desk top' review utilising historic data and without the benefit of a recent site visit, our client advises that there was no record of any site visit having been undertaken. Both factors raise serious concerns over the suitability, appropriateness and extent of all of the LBS designations proposed in the LDP Proposed Plan given the potential implications of LDP Policy EP3 on land use activities.

Site Specific Considerations – Boondreigh Water

Following the methodology supplied by the Council, boundaries for LBS are normally informed by areas of semi-natural or natural habitats. Areas of land not comprising natural or semi-natural boundaries will normally be excluded.

Aerial and landowner supplied photographs of the areas within Mr Dobie's ownership appear to show large areas of the proposed LBS as being improved grassland. Figure 2 and 3 highlight this. This is not a high value habitat and it is suggested that the LBS be narrowed to exclude these areas of grazing land.



Figure 2 – Well grazed improved grassland



Figure 3 - Well grazed improved grassland

Given the above comments and recommendations from LUC, the landowner objects to the designation boundary as currently proposed. Figure 4 illustrates a suggested reduced designation boundary for the area within Mr Dobie's ownership, required in order to ensure that land that is used for agricultural purposes is excluded from the proposed designation.




Figure 4 – Reduced designation boundary shown in red

Conclusions

In summary, it is considered that the area proposed for designation within the ownership of Mr Andrew Dobie (30.4 hectares) at Boondreigh Water as a Local Biodiversity Site in the Local Development Plan 2 is not appropriate. In this respect, the landowner proposes that the extent of the designation be reduced to exclude the areas of improved grassland as shown in figure 4. A detailed plan showing this amendment in the context of the total area proposed for designation is also enclosed.

The independent review by LUC also identifies a number of fundamental issues regarding the approach adopted by the Council and TWIC in the designation of the proposed Local Biodiversity Sites (including poor communication with affected landowners), the use of historic data, and the lack of any recent on-site survey work.

Please acknowledge safe receipt of this letter and enclosure.

If any further information is required, please do not hesitate to get in touch.

Yours faithfully,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted name]

for Galbraith

[Redacted address]

Encls: LUC Site Review and Selection Process – Boondreigh Water
Proposed LBS boundary amendment plan

Cc: Client (+ Encls)