

**Johnston, Charles**

---

**From:** Robert Drysdale [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 03 March 2014 14:04  
**To:** localplan  
**Subject:** Objections to Proposed Scottish Borders Local Development Plan  
**Attachments:** ScotBordersLDP-ObjectionsbyRDrysdale-030314.doc

Dear Sir / Madam

Please find attached my representations and objections to the Proposed Scottish Borders Local Development Plan. all of which relate to the Waverley Route / Borders Railway and Volume 2 of the proposed LDP.

I would be grateful if you would acknowledge receipt.

Yours faithfully

Robert Drysdale  
28 Primrose Bank Road  
Edinburgh  
EH5 3JF



# SCOTTISH BORDERS PROPOSED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

## OBJECTIONS BY ROBERT DRYSDALE

### Introduction

The approved South-East Scotland Strategic Development Plan - SESplan - (para 81) supports the reopening of the Borders Railway and its extension from Tweedbank to Carlisle via Hawick (the former Waverley Route).

In line with the approved SESplan, paragraph 3.17 of the proposed Local Development Plan states that the council wishes to see the future extension of the Borders Railway from Tweedbank to Carlisle via Hawick. The route of this extension is included in the Central Spatial Strategy shown in Figure 8.

The future extension of the railway is also shown on the Policy Map in Volume 2 of the proposed plan, identified as 'Railway Safeguarding – IS4'.

Policy IS3 deals with the seeking of developer contributions towards the cost of the new railway. Paragraph 1.3 of the policy states that the route of the future extension of the railway is *"safeguarded in the Proposals Maps"*.

Policy IS4 deals with transport development and infrastructure. One of the transport schemes listed in the policy is the extension of the railway from Tweedbank to Hawick and the English border. The policy states: *"Development which could prejudice the delivery of these schemes will not be permitted. Planned routes and locations to be safeguarded are shown on the Proposals Maps"*.

These various policies and statements confirm a clear policy position adopted by Scottish Borders Council to support the reopening of the former Waverley Route railway from Tweedbank to Carlisle and to protect the route from development within the Scottish Borders council area.

However, despite all these statements and the reference to safeguarding in Policies IS3 and IS4, none of the Settlement Proposals Maps show the safeguarding of the former railway route. Furthermore several of these maps show development proposals which would breach the route of the railway and hinder or prevent its reopening, contrary to the council's policies set out in the LDP and the policy of SESplan.

This is a major error which requires to be corrected for all the affected Settlement Proposals Maps and Settlement Profiles, and also in relation to the proposals for development on a number of sites.

In response to the highlighting of this problem, the council has stated that it cannot show detailed safeguarding of the railway route on each Settlement Proposals Map until detailed assessments of the likely route of the reopened railway have been carried out.

This argument is not accepted. The Policy Map on pages 188 to 193 inclusive of Volume 2 of the Proposed LDP shows the route of the railway to be safeguarded from development by means of a dotted red line, and a cross-reference to Policy IS4. This map is of sufficient scale to show clearly that the safeguarded route is the former Waverley Route railway line from Tweedbank to Melrose,

Newton St Boswells, Hawick, Newcastleton and the Scotland – England border. It makes no sense to have this route clearly shown on the main Policy Map but not on the Settlement Proposals Maps. This is a major and very confusing inconsistency.

In a few locations, it may be necessary to slightly deviate from the original railway route in order to facilitate reopening of the line. In due course, detailed design work on the new railway will reveal whether any minor deviations are required, and their precise locations. However the strong probability is that the reopened railway will follow the route of the original line throughout most of its length, just as the line currently being constructed from Edinburgh to Tweedbank follows the original railway route throughout the Scottish Borders area apart from very minor deviations at Falahill and in Galashiels. The council's policy is not for the construction of a new railway on a new route but the reopening of the former railway, as the Policy Map on pages 188 to 193 makes clear. Pending any detailed investigations of the route of the reopened railway, the default position must be that the entire route of the former Waverley Route railway will be protected from development, in accordance with Policy IS4.

Furthermore it is unacceptable to show development proposals on the Settlement Proposals Maps which would prevent or greatly hinder the reopening of the railway. Such development proposals are in breach of Policy IS4 and the provisions of SESplan.

Consequently I wish to make formal objection to the failure of the proposed LDP - and in particular its Settlement Proposals Maps and Settlement Profiles - to present a consistent coherent stance on the council's policy for protection from development of the railway from Tweedbank to the Scotland – England border, and to request the Reporter appointed to examine the plan to recommend that the following changes be made:

### **DARNICK (page 260, Volume 2)**

The former Waverley Route railway passes to the south of Darnick, but the Settlement Proposals Map does not show the indicative line of the railway to be reopened or the safeguarding of the route. There is also no mention of the future reopening of the railway in the Settlement Profile. I object to these omissions and request the following changes:

#### **Changes required:**

- 1 Settlement Proposals Map (page 262) requires amendment to show route of former railway through the area to be safeguarded from all development.
- 2 Section in Settlement Profile headed 'Infrastructure Considerations' (page 261) to be amended to include reference to future reopening of railway.

### **HAWICK (pages 349 – 359, Volume 2)**

In the Hawick Settlement Profile, on page 350 it is stated that *"The Council has long-term aspirations to see the southward extension of the Borders Railway to Hawick and Carlisle in accordance with SESplan policy. The indicative line of the railway, which is largely coincident with the disused railway line, is therefore protected from development"*.

Despite this statement, the Settlement Proposals Map does not show the indicative line of the railway to be reopened or the safeguarding of the route. I object to this omission.

Furthermore several sites with development proposals will be affected by the reopening, as follows:

**Development site zEL49** (Burnfoot) is a 17-hectare site safeguarded for business and industry. The railway runs along the northern boundary of the site and may require to occupy the edge of the site for its reopening.

**Development site zEL50** (Mansfield Road) is a 5.6 hectare site safeguarded for business and industry. The railway runs along the northern boundary of the site and its reopening may affect future development / redevelopment of the site.

**Development site zEL51** (Lochpark Road / Garfield Street) is a 2.1 hectare site safeguarded for business and industry, and owned by the council. The railway runs through the centre of the site from north to south. Very little if any development would be possible on this site without blocking the reopening of the railway.

**Development site RHAWI001** (Slitrig Crescent) is a 1.6 hectare site safeguarded for housing. The railway runs along the site's eastern boundary. In the section headed 'Site Requirements', it is stated that land in direct proximity to the railway is required to be safeguarded to comply with Structure Plan policy.

**Changes Required:**

- 1 Settlement Proposals Map (page 359) to be amended to show route of former railway to be safeguarded from all development, including any effect on sites zEL49 and zEL50.
- 2 Object to business and industry safeguarding of development site zEL51 (page 354). This requires to be reviewed to take account of requirement for the railway to pass centrally through the site.
- 3 In the 'Site Requirements' for site RHAWI001 (page 355), reference to be made to requirement for buffer zone to be maintained between new housing and railway.

**MELROSE (pages 415 – 418, Volume 2)**

There is no mention of the future reopening of the railway in the Settlement Profile for Melrose, and the Settlement Proposals Map does not show the indicative line of the railway to be reopened or the safeguarding of the route. I object to these omissions.

**Changes Required:**

- 1 Settlement Proposals Map (page 418) to be amended to show route of former railway to be safeguarded from all development.
- 2 Section in Settlement Profile headed 'Infrastructure Considerations' (page 416) to be to be amended to include reference to future reopening of railway.

## **NEWCASTLETON (pages 432 – 436, Volume 2)**

There is no mention of the future reopening of the railway in the Settlement Profile for Newcastleton, and the Settlement Proposals Map does not show the indicative line of the railway to be reopened or the safeguarding of the route. I object to these omissions.

**Development site MNEWC001** (caravan site) is safeguarded for mixed use and is directly on the line of the railway. Under the heading 'Site Requirements', it is acknowledged that the site will be affected by the reopening of the railway, and states that the land safeguarded for the railway should be landscaped. However the Settlement Proposals Map does not show this safeguarding requirement.

### **Changes Required:**

- 1 Settlement Proposals Map (page 436) to show route of former railway to be safeguarded from all development, including any effect on site MNEWC001.
- 2 Section in Settlement Profile headed 'Infrastructure Considerations' (page 433) to be amended to include reference to future reopening of railway.

## **NEWSTEAD (pages 437 – 439, Volume 2)**

The former Waverley Route railway passes from west to east immediately to the south of Newstead, but the Settlement Proposals Map does not show the indicative line of the railway to be reopened or the safeguarding of the route, and there is no mention of the future reopening of the railway in the Settlement Profile. I object to these omissions.

### **Changes required:**

- 1 Settlement Proposals Map (page 439) requires amendment to show route of former railway through the area to be safeguarded from all development.
- 2 Section in Settlement Profile headed 'Infrastructure Considerations' (page 438) should be amended to include reference to future reopening of railway.

## **NEWTOWN ST BOSWELLS (pages 440 – 445, Volume 2)**

The former Waverley Route railway passes from north to south through Newtown St Boswells, but the Settlement Proposals Map does not show the indicative line of the railway to be reopened or the safeguarding of the route, and there is no mention of the future reopening of the railway in the Settlement Profile. The narrative (p 440) merely states that Newtown St Boswells is "*convenient for the Borders Railway*". I object to these omissions.

Furthermore several sites with development proposals will be affected by the reopening, as follows:

**Development site zEL36** (Waverley Place) is council-owned and directly on the route of the railway, but is stated as being safeguarded for business and industry, and shown as such on the Settlement Proposals Map. Were it to be developed for that use, it would block the reopening of the railway.

**Development site ANEWT005** is described as the Newtown Expansion Area, extending to 58 hectares and with capacity for 900 houses. It extends across the former Waverley Route, and development for housing would block the reopening of the railway. In the section headed 'Site Requirements', which describes the planning issues to be considered in the master-planning of the area, no mention is made of the need to safeguard the route of the railway, and the railway is not shown on the Settlement Proposals Map.

**Development sites zRO21 and zRO23** are shown as redevelopment sites immediately to the west of the railway route and could be affected by its reopening.

#### **Changes Required:**

- 1 Object to business and industry safeguarding of development site zEL36 (page 443), which should be deleted.
- 2 In the 'Site Requirements' for sites zRO21 and zRO23 (page 444), reference should be made to probable need for buffer zone between new development and railway.
- 3 Object to omission of reference to protection of railway route in the 'Site Requirements' section for site ANEWT005 (page 442). Reference should be made to requirement to protect former railway route and the need to maintain buffer zones on either side of the railway where no housing may be permitted, and to provide suitable bridges across the former railway route to connect the east and west development areas.
- 4 Settlement Proposals Map (page 445) requires amendment to show route of former railway through the area to be safeguarded from all development.
- 5 Section in Settlement Profile headed 'Infrastructure Considerations' (page 441) should be amended to include reference to future reopening of railway.

#### **ST BOSWELLS (pages 507 – 510, Volume 2)**

The former Waverley Route railway passes from north to south through open countryside to the west of St Boswells, and the route of the disused railway can be seen on the Settlement Proposals Map, but the map does not show the indicative line of the railway to be reopened or the safeguarding of the route. I object to this omission.

#### **Change Required:**

Settlement Proposals Map (page 510) requires amendment to show route of former railway through the area to be safeguarded from all development.

## **TWEEDBANK (pages 525 – 528, Volume 2)**

The Settlement Profile for Tweedbank refers to the proposed 'railway terminal' for the Borders Railway. There is no mention of the intended extension to the railway, and the Settlement Proposals Map does not show the indicative line of the railway to be reopened beyond Tweedbank Station, or the safeguarding of the former railway route. I object to these omissions.

In addition, the following site will be affected by the reopening of the railway beyond Tweedbank:

**Development site zEL59** (north of Tweedbank Drive) is described as a strategic high amenity site of 6.3 hectares safeguarded for business and industry. The former railway passes through the southern part of the site, and development of this part of the site would block the railway route. The 'Site Requirements' make no mention of the need to safeguard the route of the former railway.

### **Changes Required:**

- 1 Object to omission of reference to protection of former railway route in the 'Site Requirements' section for site zEL59 (page 526). Reference should be made to requirement to reserve the southern part of the site for the future railway extension, and the need to maintain a buffer zone along the northern edge of the former railway route where no development may be permitted.
- 2 Settlement Proposals Map (page 528) requires amendment to show route of former railway eastwards from Tweedbank Station to be safeguarded from all development.
- 3 Section in Settlement Profile headed 'Infrastructure Considerations' (page 526) to be amended to include reference to future reopening of the railway extension.

Robert Drysdale  
BA, BPI, MRTPI  
28 Primrose Bank Road  
Edinburgh  
EH5 3JF

3<sup>rd</sup> March 2014