

---

## **Preferred and Alternative Sites**

---

# Berwickshire HMA

## Coldstream

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGAs	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR status
<b>ACOLD014</b>	Hillview North 1 (Phase 2)	Coldstream	Rest of Borders	Housing	100	6.5	<b>Alternative</b>

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designations. The site is currently identified for longer term housing potential within the LDP. The site directly to the south was brought forward as part of the Housing SG (ACOLD011), for 100 units.

SEPA: Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. In addition, the surface water flood map indicates a potential flow path which can indicate a potential small watercourse. Review of Scottish Water information and historic maps does not indicate the presence of a small watercourse. This should be explored further during site investigations.

There is the potential that development on this site could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard within the site.

Foul drainage from the development must be connected to the existing SW foul sewer network. Std comments for SUDS.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with the fluvial (river) 1 in 200 year flood extents but there are small pockets of potential surface water impacts on the Eastern side of the site at a 1 in 200 year flood event.

I would have no objections on the grounds of flood risk. However, I would require that due to surface water risk and the capacity of the development that surface water flooding is considered and it is ensured that any water would be routed around the housing.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	On/Adjacent to site	Greenfield	Local Development Plan: This forms part of an area identified for longer term housing (SCOLD001) Housing SG: The entire longer term site was considered (ACOLD009) and was not identified within the Housing SG Housing SG: Half of the currently proposed site was considered (ACOLD011) and allocated for housing within the Housing SG. It should be noted that (ACOLD013) is also under consideration as part of this process. (ACOLD013) includes the already allocated southern part of the site and omits a northern section of this site

---

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

### Access to public transport

Good

### Access to employment

Good

### Access to services

Good

### Wider biodiversity impacts

Minor

### Site aspect

Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Low biodiversity impact. Site appears to be an arable field hedgerow and on part of the boundary. No obvious connectivity to River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including badger and breeding birds. SEPA CAR construction site licence required.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the north of Coldstream and the area directly to the south is already allocated for housing, as part of the Housing SG. Coldstream has adequate services and employment opportunities. The settlement is also relatively close to Berwick-Upon-Tweed and Kelso, which provide further opportunities. There is public transport which links Coldstream with Berwick-Upon-Tweed, where a railway station is present.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Adjacent to site

### Garden and designed

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE AND DESIGN: No specific issues, need to consider a common approach to boundary treatments etc with the site to the south.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: This response relates to the consultation for site (ACOLD013), which is also under consideration. There is some potential within the site, archaeological investigation may be required.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: Our previous advice on this site (in response to the Housing SG): 'This site lies outwith the current settlement boundary as shown in the LDP but is included as a longer term safeguard (SCOLD001). This would form a significant addition to the existing settlement and would therefore need to ensure measures to deliver natural heritage mitigation and enhancement as part of any future site development'. Expanding on this earlier advice, we recommend that:

- New structure planting/ landscaping, should be planned to improve the setting of the site and to establish a framework for delivery of the remainder of the long-term safeguard site (SCOLD001);
- Existing shelter belts should be retained and enhanced with additional planting. Suitability of locating active travel routes along these linear features should also be considered due to their potential role in providing setting and shelter for users; and
- Open space should provide multiple benefits and be linked into wider habitat and active travel networks.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: Site has an arbitrary SW boundary not related to any landscape feature. It is effectively an extension of ACOLD13 and should not be developed until after ACOLD13 or it would be isolated and potentially intrusive. 20m wide structure planting belt is desirable along the NE and NW boundaries to form a new settlement edge to Coldstream. Otherwise no major concerns.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: No response received.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any objections to the proposal.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: Good opportunity for vehicular access and pedestrian/cycle linkage exists. I am therefore able to offer my support for housing on this site. Two main vehicular links are available; one via the existing industrial site served off the A6112 (though there is intervening land between the industrial development and this site) and another via Hill View. A further more minor link is possible via the westerly end of Priory Bank. Development of this site should not take place until such a time as the intervening area of land between the site and Hill View is developed. Allowance would have to be made for future street connectivity and a Transport Assessment will be required as a prerequisite for the development of this site.

PASSNEGER TRANSPORT: No response received.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No problem in principle with allocating this site. However, the current 2016 LDP shows the vast majority of this site as part of an existing allocation, and shows most of this site as a proposed structure landscaping area. The level of landscaping proposed did appear to me to be excessive. However, it was shown, and justifiable in part. The new allocation should still show/indicate some degree of landscaping to the boundary of the site, unless structure landscaping is no longer being indicated?

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): There is sufficient capacity at Coldstream WWTW. A Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): There is sufficient capacity at Rawburn WTW. A Water Impact Assessment (WIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Improved path/cycle links into town and the wider path network are recommended.

CONTAMINATED LAND: There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received. However, they were consulted on site (ACOLD013) which is also under consideration and raised no objections.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: I believe we previously responded to (ACOLD011) that the landscape separating strip between this site and the Coldstream Business Park should be split between the two sites rather than all be contained within the business park site to ensure sufficient separation, splitting the cost, and allowing this to be implemented early on, depending on which development commences first.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

## Overall assessment

### MIR status

Alternative

### Overall assessment

Acceptable

### Site capacity

100

### Conclusions

The site is currently identified as longer term housing land within the LDP (SCOLD001). The site immediately to the south was allocated for housing within the Housing SG (ACOLD011) for 100 units.

The site would integrate well into the settlement, respect the existing settlement pattern and would have good connectivity with the adjacent allocations. The site would represent a natural extension to the

existing settlement pattern of Coldstream. The site itself is well contained and development of the site will have little adverse impact upon the wider landscape. Further to consultation, the following constraints and mitigation were highlighted;

- Investigation of potential flood risk and surface water runoff and mitigation where required;
- The site is located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Site lies within the 'Lennel' SBC Designed Landscape;
- Protect and enhance existing boundary features (hedgerows and trees) where possible;
- Mitigation for protected species;
- Consideration given to a common approach in respect of the boundary treatments, with the allocated site to the south (ACOLD011). New structure planting/landscaping should be planned to improve the setting of the site and to establish a framework for delivery of the remainder of the longer term site (SCOLD001). Structure planting should be provided along the north east and south west boundaries, which would provide a settlement edge;
- Existing shelter belts should be retained and enhanced with additional planting;
- Open space should provide multiple benefits and be linked into the wider habitat and active travel networks;
- Potential archaeology within the site;
- There are 2 main vehicular links into this site, 1 via the existing industrial estate served off the A6112 and another via Hillview. Allowance should be made for future street connectivity;
- Drainage Impact Assessment required in respect of the water network capacity & Water Impact Assessment required, in respect of the waste network capacity; and
- Improved path/cycle links into the town and the wider path network are recommended.

Although the site to the south was recently allocated, it is considered that there are advantages to developing this site and the existing allocation (ACOLD011) as one. This would allow the development of the 2 sites to be considered together, in respect of any masterplanning/layout and connectivity, preventing the piecemeal development of the wider site. However, it is acknowledged that (ACOLD011) is a recent allocation for 100 units and there are also 3 existing housing allocations within Coldstream. Therefore, there is a question as to whether Coldstream needs an additional allocation for the LDP2 at this point in time. However, on balance taking into consideration the above comments regarding the 2 sites being considered together in terms of layout and connectivity, this site is proposed as an alternative option within the MIR.

---

# Duns

<b>Site reference</b>	<b>Site name</b>	<b>Settlement</b>	<b>RGA</b>	<b>Proposed Use</b>	<b>Indicative Capacity</b>	<b>Ha</b>	<b>MIR status</b>
<b>MDUNS005</b>	South of Earlsmeadow (Phase 1)	Duns	Eastern	Mixed Use	100	9.4	<b>Alternative</b>

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b>	<b>SAC</b>	<b>SPA</b>	<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designation constraint.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the potentially culverted small watercourse which is identified as being located along the northern boundary. We do not support development over culverts that are to remain active. We would note that the OS Map identifies this area as boggy which may constrain development. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues at this site or immediately adjacent. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. There is the potential that development of this site could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There are also identified surface water hazard within the site.

Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network however for a development of this scale it is likely that the foul network and STW will require upgrading. SW should confirm. There appears to be a marshy area in the northern corner of the site which may be drained to culverts under the site. Any such culverts should be removed as part of any development. Confirmation should be made that this is not a Groundwater Dependant Terrestrial Ecosystem.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The site is within the surface water 1 in 200 year flood extent. I would have no objection to the proposal on the grounds of flood risk. I would however ask that due to the size of the development that surface water flooding is considered and it is ensured that water would be routed around housing. DIA/SUDS.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b>	<b>Planning history references</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	On/Adjacent to site	Greenfield	Local Development Plan: (SDUNS001) - identified within the LDP as a potential longer term mixed use site Housing SG: (MDUNS005) - exact same site boundary considered as part of the Housing SG

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b>	<b>Access to employment</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b>	<b>Site aspect</b>
Good	Good	Good	Moderate	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: No response to date. However, the Ecology Officer was consulted on this site as part of the Housing SG and offered the following comments. 'Arable field and improved pastures.

Hedgerow and occasional boundary tree. Wetland area at north of the site, need to safeguard as identified in the LDP (real extent of wetland varies from LDP policy map). Moderate biodiversity impact'.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is acceptable in terms of access to services and public transport. It is relatively close to the centre of Duns and has good employment potential. There are regular buses to Berwick Upon Tweed where there is a main train line to Edinburgh and Newcastle upon Tyne. There are employment opportunities within Duns and within nearby settlements. The site might provide habitats for biodiversity. There is an area of marshy grassland/wet meadow which runs from the park across towards the new high school.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed</b>
Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	On/adjacent to site	Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE AND DESIGN: Boundary treatment, phasing and external colours will be important issues as well as physical and visual connections to Duns.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding development on this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: There is cropmark evidence of an archaeological site within the LDP area. This increases the potential of the site overall. Archaeological investigation is likely. Preservation in situ of the known site is preferred.

---

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable			Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: As part of the longer term safeguarded site (SDUNS001), this site should be subject to the same consideration. If you are minded to support development of this site during the current plan period, further detailed assessment and a site brief will be required.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: Significant issue with this one because it includes a large area of semi natural wetland on the north side. This should be excluded and the boundary re-drawn, possibly with a small separate area of developable land by the Earlsmeadow garages.

No major concerns about developing the arable land to the south other than loss to agriculture but site is also isolated and would require significant road infrastructure which might also create environmental issues! If this area is to be developed then 'permeable' structure planting (i.e. planting with gaps for views) should be provided along the western boundary.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

<b>Physical access/road capacity</b>	<b>Near a trunk road?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	--

NETWORK MANAGER: Access to main road?

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: This area is currently identified as an area for longer term development within the current Local Development Plan. I have no objection to this land being allocated for mixed use development, the main vehicular access being from the A6015 via the existing allocated site to the north west (ADUNS023). A minor access link is possible via the A6112 and Station Avenue. Good pedestrian and cycle linkage is critical in terms of sustainable transport. Allowance must be made for future street connectivity beyond this development and the possibility of a distributor/relief road linking the A6105 and the A6112 south of Cheeklaw needs to be considered for the longer term expansion of the town. A Transport Assessment will be a prerequisite for the development of this site.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Bus infrastructure required.

**Right of way**

On/adjacent to site

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

Not applicable

**Water supply**

Limited

**Sewerage**

Limited

**Gas Supply**

Yes

**Education provision**

Good

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Logical direction of development given the recent housing developments in Duns, along with overlapping MDUNS003 and MDUNS005, would require master planning, to ascertain best areas for different uses, strong landscaping framework needed and would be appropriate.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Duns WWTW has sufficient capacity and a Drainage Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Rawburn WTW has sufficient capacity and a Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Vehicular access to the site needs further consideration with potential upgrading of the road network at Clockmill or potentially through the industrial estate required. The existing access path to the school and public park has recently been upgraded and therefore would provide good non-vehicular access to the site. The area is prone to flooding. (2016 HSG Consultation).

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: We have no objections but would appreciate some clarification of what is proposed as mixed use, beyond the planned events space, and the location and area proposed for non-housing use.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

**Overall assessment****MIR status****Alternative****Overall assessment**

Acceptable

**Site capacity**

100

**Conclusions**

The site is currently identified within the LDP, as part of the longer term mixed use site (SDUNS001). The entire longer term mixed use site is also being considered as part of this process (MDUNS004) and (MDUNS003) which occupies an area to the west. It should be noted that all 3 of these sites were recently considered for inclusion within the Housing SG and none were taken forward as part of that process.

The site has good access to public services, employment and public transport. Furthermore, the site would result in minimal visual impact from the entrance to Duns. The site has good integration and connectivity with the existing settlement. The following constraints and mitigation would need to be considered as part of any development;

- Flood Risk Assessment would be required;
- There is an existing wetland area to the north east corner of the site, there would be a requirement to safeguard this;
- The Landscape Officer suggests removing the wetland area from any formal allocation;
- The site is located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Drainage Impact Assessment (WWTW) & Water Impact Assessment (WTW);
- Potential archaeology within the site and appropriate mitigation would be likely;
- Transport Assessment would be required;
- Structure planting and landscaping would be required in order to mitigate any visual impacts as a result of the development;
- There is a requirement for an events area to facilitate tourism events within this site and the larger mixed use longer term site;
- There is adequate access via the A6015 through the existing housing allocation (ADUNS023) and also a minor access through Station Avenue to the east. Access for this site would be required through the allocations (ADUNS023) and (ADUNS010);



- Minor drainage issues which would need to be addressed; and
- The development must respect the area of greenspace adjacent to the site, 'Duns Park'.

It is acknowledged that there are currently 330 established housing units within the Duns land supply (2017 HLA), 151 of these are considered to be effective, while the remainder are programmed post year 7. However, there is a lack of mixed use allocations currently within the LDP. Therefore, this has the potential to provide an opportunity for a mixture of uses within Duns. Taking the above into consideration, it is considered that this site should be included within the MIR as an alternative option, which could come forward if required. It should be noted that the site must accommodate an element of business land, this will be attached as a site requirement to any allocation. Should the site come forward, the southern part of the longer term mixed use site would be retained for future mixed use development.

---

# Gordon

<b>Site reference</b>	<b>Site name</b>	<b>Settlement</b>	<b>RGA</b>	<b>Proposed Use</b>	<b>Indicative Capacity</b>	<b>Ha</b>	<b>MIR status</b>
AGORD004	Land at Eden Road	Gordon	Rest of Borders	Housing	25	1.5	Preferred

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b>	<b>SAC</b>	<b>SPA</b>	<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any identified International/National designation constraint.

SEPA: The site is next to Gordon STW. May be likely to give rise to odour issues. Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. Due to the size of the development I'd recommend surface water runoff be considered.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b>	<b>Planning history references</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	On/Adjacent to site	Greenfield	Local Plan: (BGO11D) - southern part of the site currently under consideration Housing SG: (AGORD004) - exact same site boundary as currently under consideration

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b>	<b>Access to employment</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b>	<b>Site aspect</b>
Good	Good	Good	Minor	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Site is improved grassland tree-lined boundary and drystone dykes on boundary. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds. Low biodiversity impact.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the east of the settlement boundary and the proposed access is from Eden Road to the south. There is good access to public transport, employment and service within Gordon. These are limited within Gordon itself, however the site is well connected to the settlement and within walking distance of the local amenities within Gordon. Furthermore, Gordon is located close to Kelso (8 miles away), Earlston (6 miles away) and Duns (12 miles away), where there is a wider range of local services and employment opportunities available. Gordon has a bus service which runs to Berwick-Upon-Tweed and Galashiels.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Adjacent to site

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Adjacent to site

### Garden and designed

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: No known archaeological issues.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to the size and location.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: The site links well with the village. Footpath connections required. Protect existing trees on verge/fence line. Adequate space between for access. Existing blocks of trees provide containment and backdrop for new houses. Additional tree planting and hedges within the site will assist in integrating the development into the location. 25no units with continuation of village streetscape along Eden Road. Protect street trees.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: New junction onto A6105 but should not be any issues.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I have no objection to this land being zoned for housing. This is a logical extension to the settlement and would provide an opportunity for a strong street frontage onto the A6105 which would enhance the sense of arrival into the village and help reinforce the 30mph speed limit. The existing footway infrastructure will have to be extended along the frontage of the site to tie in with existing and any layout should allow for future street connectivity. A Transport Statement would be required.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Bus stop infrastructure required.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Prime Quality Agricultural Land; if units are required in Gordon, this looks to be a strong site; we would need to be very careful with the frontage to the south; a hard edge, with housing onto pavement/roadside (no front gardens) would be desirable and landscaping to the north and particularly to the east would be needed.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns to the development of this site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. Please note that there is an rising sewer within the site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Howden WTW has sufficient capacity and sufficient capacity in the network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No capacity issues.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

MIR status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Preferred	Acceptable	25

### Conclusions

This site was recently assessed as part of the Housing SG and was not taken forward for inclusion within the Housing SG, primarily as it was considered there were more appropriate sites options at that time. Only an initial stage 1 RAG assessment was undertaken as part of the Housing SG. However, the agent provided a supporting statement in response to the RAG assessment, since the Housing SG. Therefore, this has been taken into consideration and a full site assessment/consultation has been undertaken as part of the MIR process.

Following consultation with key stakeholders, there are no insurmountable constraints for the development of this site. The site itself appears to be a logical extension to the settlement boundary and relates well to Gordon. Albeit careful consideration would need to be given to the treatment of the site boundaries and the frontage to the south onto the main road. Following consultation, the following constraints/mitigation were identified;

- The proximity to the Gordon Sewage Treatment Works;
- Foul water must connect to the existing foul network;
- Assessment of ecology impacts and provision of mitigation, as appropriate;
- Protection of existing boundary features, where possible, including existing trees on the verge/fence lines;
- Extension of existing footway infrastructure along the frontage of the site;
- Landscaping to assist in integrating the development into the location;
- A Transport Statement would be required;
- Early engagement with Scottish Water, in respect of the WWTW; and
- The site is located within Prime Quality Agricultural land.

The current LDP states that the preferred area for future expansion is to the east of Gordon, north of Eden Road and that development to the north of the settlement will be resisted. The site is also well related to Gordon itself. Overall, there are no insurmountable constraints to the development of this site for housing. In conclusion, taking the above into consideration, it is considered that the site should be put forward as a preferred option for housing within the MIR, for 25 units.

# Grantshouse

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR status
AGRAN004	Land north of Mansefield	Grantshouse	Rest of Borders	Housing	8	0.4	Preferred

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any International/National designation constraint.

SEPA: Based on OS Map there is sufficient height difference between site and the Eye Water. Due to steep topography through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff.

There is the potential that development on this site could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. A Surface Water Hazard has been identified within the site. Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	On/Adjacent to site	Greenfield	Local Plan: (BGH3), this site formed part of a much larger site which was considered Local Plan: (BGH16), this site formed part of a much larger site which was considered Local Development Plan: (AGRAN001), this site formed the corner of a site to the west  Planning applications (12/01272/PPP): Erection of 12 dwellinghouses - refused planning consent. (11/01464/FUL): Construction of 15 turbines up to 100m in height. The proposed site is located within the site boundary for the approved wind farm development.

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Limited	Limited	Limited	Minor	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Minor biodiversity risk. Site is arable field with hedgerow and tree-lined boundary. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the north of Grantshouse, to the north of Mansfield. Half of the site is located within the existing settlement boundary and is infill land, whereas the area to the west and north is outwith the settlement boundary. There is a bus stop located within Grantshouse, which connects to Edinburgh and Berwick-Upon-Tweed, however this provides limited service to other settlements within Berwickshire. There are limited public services and employment opportunities within Grantshouse itself, however there are opportunities within a number of nearby settlements although they may rely on car for access. Eyemouth is located 11 miles away, while Duns is located 9 miles away.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Adjacent to site

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed

Not applicable

## Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: No known archaeological interests.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to the size and location.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: Based on desk assessment – no major constraints. Shape of allocation will dictate direct access off Mansefield street to each property as there is not enough room for an access road. Part of field at the north east corner will also be awkward to manage because of acute angle formed.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Did not raise any concerns regarding the proposed development.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the proposed development.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: Grantshouse has no notable services/amenities to justify supporting any significant new development, but a modest scale of housing would be acceptable in principle. The public road along Mansefield is a cul-de-sac with extensive on-street parking restricting traffic flow and there is a significant level difference between the public road and the site. Direct access to the public road is acceptable in principle, but will be difficult to achieve engineering wise and any development will have to address traffic flow and site access issues imposed by existing on-street parking.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the proposed development.

### Right of way

On site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No response received.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the proposed development.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with SW is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW and there is sufficient capacity in the network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Rawburn WTW has sufficient capacity and there is sufficient capacity in the network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Enhancement to Core Path 100 (Right of Way BB1) to the east would be recommended.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

### MIR status

Preferred

### Overall assessment

Acceptable

### Site capacity

8

## Conclusions

The proposal is for a housing allocation, with an indicative site capacity for 8 units. The site is located to the north of Grantshouse. Part of the site is already located within the settlement boundary for Grantshouse, the western and a small area to the north area outwith the settlement boundary. As a result, it is considered that the site relates well to the existing settlement boundary and the expansion to the west would be in a logical extension to the settlement boundary.

Following consultation, the following constraints and mitigation were identified;

- Any development must give consideration to potential surface water runoff within the site;
- The site is located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Protect the existing boundary features;
- Mitigation for protected species including breeding birds;
- The Roads Planning Officer has no objections to the proposal, however direct access to the public road is acceptable in principle, but will be difficult to achieve engineering wise and any development will have to address traffic flow and site access issues imposed by existing on-street parking; and
- Contact Scottish Water regarding WWTW capacity.

There is existing housing on the south side of Mansefield, therefore the proposal for housing would be compatible with the surrounding land uses. There are no insurmountable planning constraints which would prevent the development of this site. The part of the site which is currently included within the settlement boundary, appears to be quite small to allow any housing development with current parking/access standards. Therefore, by increasing the site to the north and west, this allows the site to be developed, whilst ensuring that there is sufficient space to accommodate a new access and parking for the development. Overall, the site is considered acceptable for a housing development. In conclusion, the site will be taken forward for inclusion within the MIR, with an indicative site capacity for 8 units.

# Greenlaw

<b>Site reference</b> BGREE005	<b>Site name</b> Land South of Edinburgh Road	<b>Settlement</b> Greenlaw	<b>RGA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Employment	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> N/A	<b>Ha</b> 1.2	<b>MIR status</b> Preferred
-----------------------------------	--	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	--------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site is not located within any international/national designation constraint.

SEPA: Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at increased risk of flooding.

There is a surface water hazard identified within the site.

Foul drainage from the site must be connected to the existing public foul sewer. Std comments for SUDS. Depending on the use of the proposed units there may be a requirement for permissions to be sought for certain activities from SEPA.

SBC COASTAL AND MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> On/Adjacent to site	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> LDP: MGREE001 - The site is allocated for mixed use development within the current LDP. The site currently has an indicative site capacity for 6 units. LPA & LDP: BGREE003 - Part of the this site was considered for business use previously, however not allocated as such.
--	------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	---

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Limited	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Limited	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> South
--	--	--------------------------------------	--	-----------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Low biodiversity risk. Site appears to be an arable field with hedgerow and garden ground on part of the boundary. No obvious connectivity to River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including badger and breeding birds.



GENERAL COMMENTS: The site lies to the south west of Greenlaw and is currently allocated for mixed use development (MGREE001) within the Local Development Plan. There are bus services within Greenlaw, providing buses to Galashiels and Berwick-Upon-Tweed, both of which have Railway connections. There are limited services located within Greenlaw itself and it would be necessary to drive or take the bus to access a wider choice and range of these services. There is some employment land in Greenlaw to the north. Duns, Eyemouth and Coldstream currently provide greater employment opportunities. Duns is located 7 miles away and Kelso is located 9 miles away. The site is within walking distance of the centre of Greenlaw and is located on the edge of the settlement, opposite an allocated housing site.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No comment on the proposed change of use.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: No response received. However, the site is an existing mixed use allocation and there are currently no site requirements proposed for archaeology mitigation at present.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: This is a change of use of an existing allocation and we have no comment to make.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: Because of its very high visibility from the A6105 Earlston and the B6364 Kelso roads and from the A697 at the western gateway to Greenlaw, I would not be particularly comfortable with a housing allocation but I am very uneasy with the proposed allocation because of its potential to create highly visible 'industrial' character in an otherwise open rural area. There is little potential for effective screening too.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: No response received.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I have no objections in principle to this land being zoned for business and industrial development. The junction arrangement with the A697 will have to allow for future upgrading to a more substantial junction if and when the land to the south of this site is developed. Similarly the development layout will need to allow for future street connectivity with the adjacent land. All of this can be covered in a Transport Statement. The existing street lighting, footway and 30 mph speed limit will have to be extended out from the village as appropriate.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No response received.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No real problems with the proposed change from mixed use to employment use. Adjoining uses are primarily residential in character and proposed use may have unacceptable adverse impacts on residential amenity. Access would appear to be achievable. There is a wider history to this proposal, principally in that this was the subject of a planning application a few years ago in relation to a housing proposal that was ultimately refused – I can supply details if necessary. The success of the appeal re the poultry farm site on Marchmont Road, has reduced the land that might otherwise have gone forward for business use, so this one is probably now in a stronger position.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. Depending on the flow demand for this development, will determine if a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Sufficient capacity at Rawburn WTW. Please note there is an existing 180mm water main running through the North edge of site. Depending on flow demand for this development, will determine if a Water Impact Assessment (WIA) is required.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the proposed development.

CONTAMINATED LAND: There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: It would be helpful to know whether there are longer term plans for additional housing to the south and south east of this site, to ensure a shared access road could be constructed and designed, to also allow further expansion of this business site in a sensible and planned way.

EDUCATION OFFICER: n/a

---

## Overall assessment

### MIR status

Preferred

### Overall assessment

Acceptable

### Site capacity

N/A

## Conclusions

The site is currently allocated for mixed use development, within the Local Development Plan. The site is located within the defined settlement boundary of Greenlaw and has an indicative site capacity for 6 units. The proposal currently under consideration is to change this to a business & industrial allocation. This would result in the removal of the indicative site capacity for 6 units. It is considered that the site is prominent from the entrance to Greenlaw from the west, however this can be mitigated through landscaping and planting. Following consultation on this site, the following constraints were identified;

- Consideration must be given to surface water runoff;
- Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Protect and enhance existing boundary features;
- Assessment of ecology impacts and provision of mitigation, as appropriate;
- Potential Drainage Impact Assessment and Water Impact Assessment required;
- Transport Statement required; and
- Landscape Officer states the site is visible and would not be comfortable with such an allocation.

As part of the employment land working group, which feeds into the MIR process, a demand for business land within Greenlaw and the surrounding towns was identified. It is acknowledged that the site has an indicative site capacity for 6 units and this would be lost. However, there is a plentiful housing land supply currently within Greenlaw and via the housing options contained within the MIR. Furthermore, due to the restricted size of the site, it was considered that the site would be better developed for business and industrial purposes. It is important to have a business and industrial allocation site within the settlement, to provide opportunities to local people within the surrounding Greenlaw. Although the Landscape Officer does not support the allocation, it should be noted that the site is already allocated for mixed use development. It is considered that appropriate planting would provide screening. Therefore, taking the above into consideration, it is considered that the site will be included within the MIR as a preferred option.

<b>Site reference</b> AGREE008	<b>Site name</b> Halliburton Road	<b>Settlement</b> Greenlaw	<b>RGA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 40	<b>Ha</b> 3.4	<b>MIR status</b> Alternative
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	----------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any International/National designation.

SEPA: Based on OS Map there is sufficient height difference between site and the Blackadder Water. Due to steep topography through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff. There is potential fluvial risk of flooding adjacent to the site. There is the potential that the development of this site could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a Surface Water Hazard within the site.

The foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. Due to the size of the development the applicant should consider surface water runoff, drainage and SUDS. Drainage Impact Assessment/SUDS.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> On/Adjacent to site	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> Local Plan: (BG10D) - smaller site under consideration Local Plan Amendment: (AGREE002) - same site as under consideration Local Plan Amendment: (SGREE003) - same site as under consideration Local Development Plan: (SGREE003) - same site as under consideration Local Development Plan: (MGREE002) - same site as under consideration Housing SG: (AGREE008) - same site as under consideration
--	------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	---

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Limited	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Limited	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> South-west
--	--	--------------------------------------	--	----------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Low biodiversity impact. Site is arable field with hedgerow young plantation on boundary. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including badger and breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the west of Greenlaw and is currently identified as a longer term housing site, within the Local Development Plan. There are bus services within Greenlaw, providing buses to Galashiels and Berwick-Upon-Tweed, both of which have Railway connections. There are limited services located within Greenlaw and it would be necessary to drive or take the bus to access a wider choice and range of these services. There is some employment land in Greenlaw but this would be limited for providing local employment. Duns, Eyemouth and Coldstream would provide greater opportunities. Duns is located 7 miles away and Kelso is located 9 miles away. The site is within walking distance of the centre of Greenlaw and is located off a quiet road leading out of the settlement.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Adjacent to site

### Garden and designed

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: There are no known implications, although the known site of a medieval and later farmstead lies immediately to the north. Some mitigation may be required.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: While the site is outwith the current settlement boundary as shown in the LDP, we note that it is included as a longer-term safeguard (SGREE003). If you are minded to support development of this site during the current plan period, further detailed assessment, particularly for the open space along the ridgeline, will be required.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No response received to date. However, the Landscape Officer was consulted on this site (AGREE008) as part of the Housing SG and offered the following comments. Due to the lack of fit with the existing settlement pattern of Greenlaw and the high visibility of this site in the view from several roads on approach, coupled with potential privacy issues to adjoining properties, it is recommended that this site is not taken forward.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Would need to extend existing 30mph limit.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding development of the site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: Direct vehicular access from the A697 (Edinburgh Road) is possible via the allocated housing site AGREE004. This will entail extending the footway out from the town on the north side of the A697 along with a slight extension of the 30 mph speed limit. This environmental change may have a positive influence on driver speeds on the main road. A right turn lane type junction may be required and visibility splays of 4.5m by 90m should be achievable. This can all be addressed in a supporting Transport Assessment.

The use of Halliburton Road as an additional means of vehicular access to the site, to help achieve good connectivity, should be explored. The junction of Halliburton Road with the A697 would ideally have to shift slightly to the west so that stacking traffic behind right turn traffic for Halliburton Road does not impact unduly on right turn traffic for Wester Row (A6105) and vice versa. The southerly boundary of the property known as '2 Edinburgh Road' would be directly affected by this, and by junction visibility requirements (4.5m by 90m). The carriageway of Halliburton Road would have to be widened and a footway provided as well as the extension of the 30 mph speed limit. Irrespective of vehicular connectivity with Halliburton Road, pedestrian/cycle linkage is essential.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

**Right of way**

Adjacent to site

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

Not applicable

**Water supply**

Yes

**Sewerage**

Yes

**Gas Supply**

No

**Education provision**

Good

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. Further investigation such as Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Howden WTW has sufficient capacity and sufficient capacity in the network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Potential opportunity to improve pedestrian/cycle access into the village. Enhancement to existing path network would also be recommended. (2016 HSG Consultation).

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

**Overall assessment****MIR status**

Alternative

**Overall assessment**

Acceptable

**Site capacity**

40

**Conclusions**

The site is currently identified as a longer term housing site within the LDP, therefore acceptable for housing. The site is close to the centre of Greenlaw and if sensitively designed would integrate well into the settlement. The site has limited access to public services and employment within Greenlaw, however there are employment and services available in nearby settlements, which can be accessed by car or bus. It is acknowledged that the site is quite prominent, however it is considered that the existing tree belt to the west screens the site on the approach road and additional landscaping would further mitigate visual impacts. Overall, there are no insurmountable planning constraints which would prevent development on this site. Through the consultation process, the following constraints and mitigation would be required for any development on the site;

- Surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue and require mitigation;
- The site is located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Potential for archaeology within the site, which would require appropriate mitigation;
- Careful design to ensure that the site is integrated into the rest of the settlement;
- Drainage Impact Assessment may be required in respect of WWTW;
- Protect and enhance existing boundary features;
- Assessment of ecology impacts and mitigation where appropriate;
- In respect of landscape capacity, there is an area of young woodland to the west of the site, with further arable land to the north;
- The site has potential to be prominent from certain angles, however the tree belt provides shelter from the western approach and the existing housing and planting screens part of the site from the south;
- The site provides opportunities for improved pedestrian/cycle access into the village and enhancement to the path network; and
- Transport Assessment would be required.

Overall, it is considered that the site would be acceptable for housing development, subject to mitigation in respect of the above constraints. There is already a large amount of un-developed established housing land supply within Greenlaw, totalling 113 units in the 2017 HLA, including 3 housing allocations (AGREE004, AGREE006 and BG200), although it is questionable how well these are being

advertised and promoted. Taking into consideration that there are no insurmountable constraints on this site, the site can be considered as a further alternative option for housing within the MIR.

---

<b>Site reference</b> AGREE009	<b>Site name</b> Poultry Farm	<b>Settlement</b> Greenlaw	<b>RGA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 38	<b>Ha</b> 2.3	<b>MIR status</b> Preferred
-----------------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	--------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designations.

SEPA: Should planning application differ from what was previously agreed we would require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Blackadder Water which flows to the south of the site. In addition there is a small watercourse which flows along the eastern perimeter of the site. There are bridges/culverts along the small watercourse which could potentially exacerbate flooding. Surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue. May require mitigation measures during design stage.

This site is next door to the Greenlaw STW. This may give rise to odour issues.

There is the potential that development of this site could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. Surface Water Hazard identified within the site. Foul waste must connect to SW foul network.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The southern boundary of the site is at risk of flooding from the Blackadder Water at a 1 in 200 year flood event. The Officer would require that a Flood Risk Assessment is undertaken for this site.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> On/Adjacent to site	<b>Current use/s</b> Brownfield	<b>Planning history references</b> Planning application (16/01360/PPP) for residential development was refused planning consent in 2017. There remains an outstanding appeal with the DPEA for this application at the time of the site assessment. Housing SG: The site was considered for housing (AGREE007) and not included LDP: The site was considered for housing (AGREE007) and not included LDP2: The site is also being considered for mixed use development (MGREE004) as part of the MIR process
--	------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> South
---	--	-----------------------------------	---	-----------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: The Ecology Officer did not respond to the consultation as part of the current MIR. However, the Officer provided comments for (MGREE004) which is also under consideration as part

of the MIR process. The Officer provided the following comments; 'Moderate biodiversity impact. Site includes poultry sheds and improved grassland, tall ruderal and scrub habitat. On the southern boundary within SEPA 1 in 200 year indicative flood risk area. Potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC via drains. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats, otter (EPS), badger and breeding birds. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC/SSSI. See also Planning Application 16/01360/PPP'.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the east of Greenlaw and is located outwith the settlement boundary. The land is currently brownfield and the site is a series of former poultry units. There are bus services within Greenlaw, providing buses to Galashiels and Berwick-Upon-Tweed, both of which have Railway connections. There are limited services located within Greenlaw and it would be necessary to drive or take the bus to access a wider choice and range of these services. There is some employment land in Greenlaw but this would be limited for providing local employment. Duns, Eyemouth and Coldstream would provide greater opportunities. Duns is located 7 miles away and Kelso is located 9 miles away. The site is within walking distance of the centre of Greenlaw and is located off a quiet road leading out of the settlement.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE AND DESIGN: No specific comment.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any objections.

ARCHAEOLOGY: There is low potential within the site.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to the location.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: The Landscape Officer did not respond to this site, however provided a response for (MGREE004) also under consideration and offered the following comments: 'This site could accommodate some level of mixed business and industrial use although would be equally good site for residential development. Perhaps the western end should be developed for housing and eastern half/third developed for small scale industrial use. The existing road and residential to the west preclude large scale business or industrial use'.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: May impact on location of 30 mph limit. Also need to consider existing access onto A697.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any objections to the proposed development.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: No objections in principle to this land being zoned for housing. Numerous access points are achievable along the northern boundary of the site. The existing public road will need widened to accommodate two-way traffic flow. Footways and street lighting infrastructure will also be required as part of the improvement works to the public road. A Transport Statement will be required.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comment.



**Right of way**

Adjacent to site

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

On/adjacent to site

**Water supply**

Yes

**Sewerage**

Yes

**Gas Supply**

No

**Education provision**

Good

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT:** The site has a complex history, and I note the appeal pending a decision. The refusal was on the basis of the unacceptability of the unallocated site, which was positioned beyond the development boundary. My own view, setting aside the timing of any application or appeal, and looking solely at the merits of the site in isolation, as a possible allocation, is that the site itself could acceptably accommodate residential development at some stage in the future.

**HOUSING STRATEGY:** Did not raise any objections.

**SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW):** Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. Further investigation such as a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) may be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

**SCOTTISH WATER (WTW):** Rawburn WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment (WIA) or Flow and Pressure test will be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

**OUTDOOR ACCESS OFFICER:** Potential to improve access to disused railway.

**CONTAMINATED LAND:** The site is developed with a poultry farm. The site is brownfield and its former use may present development constraints.

**ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH:** No response received.

**NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES:** No response received.

**PROJECTS TEAM:** No objections.

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT:** This is a large allocation; it already has a business use on it and is close to the sewage works. Whilst we know little about the site history and servicing information, perhaps the eastern part of the site, which is flat, may be appropriate for employment use and consider the site is allocated for mixed use, if the appeal is approved.

**EDUCATION OFFICER:** No issues.

**NHS:** No response received.

**Overall assessment****MIR status**

Preferred

**Overall assessment**

Acceptable

**Site capacity**

38

**Conclusions**

The site was previously considered for housing as part of the Housing SG (AGREE007), however was not included within the Finalised Housing SG. The site was submitted for mixed use development, as part of the LDP2 MIR process (MGREE004). Further to this, a planning application (16/01360/PPP) was refused planning consent for housing in 2017 and subsequently granted at appeal. This site was originally coded as (RGREE001) and consulted on, however was changed to site code (AGREE009) throughout the process. Therefore, the consultation responses may refer to (RGREE001).

The site is directly adjacent to the existing settlement boundary therefore the site provides a logical extension to Greenlaw and would integrate well with the existing settlement. There are no insurmountable planning constraints regarding the development of this site. The site is brownfield land currently disused poultry units and the re-use of the site would be a benefit. However, through the consultation process, the following constraints were identified;

- Flood Risk Assessment is required for any development on this site;
- The site is located within an area of Prime Quality Agricultural land;
- Potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC/SSSI;
- Protect boundary features;
- Mitigation for protected species;
- Potential for archaeology within the site;
- Transport Statement required;
- A number of access points are achievable along the northern boundary of the site;
- Potential for contamination, given the brownfield nature of the site;
- Early engagement with Scottish Water to ascertain whether a Drainage Impact Assessment in respect of WWTW; and

- Water Impact Assessment required, in respect of WTW.

The current proposal put forward by the land owner is for a residential development, with an indicative site capacity for 38 units. As stated above there are no insurmountable planning constraints to the development of this site. Furthermore, planning consent has been granted on appeal for housing on this site. Therefore, the principle of housing on this site has been established through the planning consent and the proposal will be included within the MIR as a preferred option for housing, with an indicative site capacity for 38 units. It is noted that the planning consent is only PPP with no specified capacity.

---

# Reston

---

<b>Site reference</b>	<b>Site name</b>	<b>Settlement</b>	<b>RGA</b>	<b>Proposed Use</b>	<b>Indicative Capacity</b>	<b>Ha</b>	<b>MIR status</b>
<b>AREST005</b>	Land east of West Reston	Reston	Eastern	Housing	5	0.4	<b>Alternative</b>

---

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b>	<b>SAC</b>	<b>SPA</b>	<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any International/National designation constraints.

SEPA: Sufficient height difference between the site and the Eye Water and lade. There is potential fluvial flood risk adjacent to the site.

Foul water must be connected to the existing sewer network. SW should confirm any capacity issues.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

---

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b>	<b>Planning history references</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	Local Plan: (BR10D) - formed part of a much larger site which was considered Housing SG: (AREST002) - formed part of a much larger site which was considered

---

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b>	<b>Access to employment</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b>	<b>Site aspect</b>
Good	Limited	Good	Minor	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Site is an arable field with field margins, broad-leaved trees on eastern boundary. Possible connectivity with Eye water via surface water run-off. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds and protect waterbodies.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site has good access to the few local services provided within the settlement and the services located within Eyemouth nearby. It has good access to the public transport network and limited access to employment in Eyemouth and Berwick-Upon-Tweed.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On/adjacent to site

### Garden and designed

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: The site is within a field of high archaeological potential. Investigation will be required.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment, existing allocation.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No constraints identified but site shape bears no relation to existing site features and is simply a diagonal strip within an existing arable field. It appears to be an extension to the existing allocation at BR5 although it does not exactly match? Recommend coordination with BR5 and allocation of a 10m planting strip along the north east (i.e. Mill House) boundary to retain separation from the existing track and provide, potentially some screening and shelter from the north east.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I have no objection to the extension to the existing allocation BR5 to include this land.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: I have no objection to the extension to the existing allocation BR5 to include this land.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No response received.

HOUSING STRATEGY: I have no objection to the extension to the existing allocation BR5 to include this land.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Reston WWTW has sufficient capacity and sufficient capacity in the network. Note that there are sewers slightly within site boundary.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Rawburn WTW has sufficient capacity and sufficient capacity in the network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS OFFICER: I have no objection to the extension to the existing allocation BR5 to include this land.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.  
NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.  
PROJECTS TEAM: I have no objection to the extension to the existing allocation BR5 to include this land.  
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.  
EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.  
NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

MIR status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Alternative	Acceptable	5

### Conclusions

This proposal is for 5 housing units, which would effectively extend the existing housing allocation (BR5) to the west. The proposal would allow an additional 25 metres to the existing housing allocation (BR5) which would allow an improved layout for development. There are 3 existing housing allocations within Reston, contained within the LDP, these are (BR5 for 20 units; BR6 for 16 units and AREST004 for 38 units). The latter was most recently taken forward as part of the Housing SG in November 2017. There is an additional area for longer term housing identified within the LDP (SREST001). Furthermore there is an allocated mixed use allocation (MREST001) within the LDP, with an indicative capacity for 100 units. It is considered that there is sufficient un-developed land available within Reston including the recent allocation for 38 units (AREST004) as part of the Housing SG. However, notwithstanding that, the proposal intends to allow the expansion of an existing housing allocation, to better the proposed layout.

Further to the site assessment, the site does not have any insurmountable constraints to development. It should be noted that the following constraints were highlighted throughout the site assessment and would require suitable mitigation measures;

- Potential fluvial flooding risk adjacent to the site;
- Protect existing boundary features;
- Protect existing species including breeding birds and protected waterbodies; and
- There is potential archaeology within the site.

The development of this site would respect the existing settlement pattern, landscape setting and would not be highly visible from any of the approach roads. Therefore, taking the above into consideration, it is considered acceptable in this instance to recommend the inclusion of the site within the MIR for an additional 5 units. This would aid the delivery of the adjacent housing allocation (BR5), in line with the comments from the land owner.

---

# Westruther

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR status
BWESR001	Land south west of Mansefield House	Westruther	Rest of Borders	Employment	N/A	0.8	Preferred

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

The site is not located within any International/National designation constraint.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourse adjacent to the site. Site is relatively flat and hydrology would appear complicated at site. Consideration should be given to bridge and culvert structures which may exacerbate flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. There is the potential that the development of this site could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a Surface Water Hazard identified within the site.

Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. There appears to be a drain partially culverted running along the northern boundary of the site. This should be protected and de-culverted if possible.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Brownfield	No planning application history.  Local Plan: (BWE1) - this site formed part of a much larger site considered Local Plan: (BWE6) - this site formed a corner of a site previously considered LDP: (MWESR001) - this site formed part of a much larger site considered

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Limited	Limited	Limited	Minor	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Low biodiversity risk. Site appears to be rank improved with two metal roofed barns and broad-leaved trees on boundary. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected

species including breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the west of Westruther. There is limited public transport available within Westruther, however there is a local regular bus service to Duns. Therefore, car usage would likely be higher within Westruther. In terms of access to services and employment, these are currently limited within Westruther itself. Duns is located 11 miles away, where a greater selection of services and employment opportunities are available. Lauder is located 8 miles away and Coldstream 17 miles away.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Appears in part to be brown field land, appears to have some potential for redevelopment.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding development on this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: There is some archaeological potential within undisturbed areas of the site, but as it has been built on this potential is low. Some form of mitigation may be required.

---

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable			Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to the size and location.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: It is not clear that an adequate access road can be provided to this site without significant impacts on narrow village roads and roadside trees and hedges and potential loss of amenity to associated housing, both existing and proposed. Business use also implies potential need for screening some of which is currently provided by trees in AWESR011 which may be removed?

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

**Near a trunk road?**

NETWORK MANAGER: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I would observe on the 5 Westruther sites served by the road past the school collectively. These are Sites: AWESR002; AWESR010; AWESR011; AWESR012; and BWESR001. The standard of the road leading to these sites from the B6456 past the school is certainly not of a standard suitable for serving all of this development. I am happy to support some development, but the scale should be respectful of the village setting and the limitations of the road. Residential development should primarily front onto and focus on the main service road leading to the sites from the village centre and to a lesser extent Edgar Road. Employment land can be behind and to the west of any residential development and I would not expect any uses which would be HGV intensive. There is a real opportunity for creating a village street feel on the existing public road adjacent to Sites 002, 010 & 011. A strong street frontage will be required as will carriageway widening and footway provision. Existing drainage and street lighting infrastructure will likely need to be adjusted to suit. Development should also front onto Edgar Road and a footway will be required on the north side of Edgar Road as will proper vehicle turning provision for Edgar Road traffic. Provision for vehicles passing needs to be improved on the existing public road on the stretch adjacent to and west of the school. Consideration should be given to defining a pedestrian strip in the road between the school and the village pub. A Transport Assessment, or at least a Transport Statement, would be required to address accessibility and sustainable transport.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Did not raise any concerns regarding development on this site.

**Right of way**

Not applicable

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

On/adjacent to site

**Water supply**

Limited

**Sewerage**

Limited

**Gas Supply**

No

**Education provision****Planning & infrastructure summary**

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Questioned whether there is demand for such an allocation, who was proposing the allocation, is there an intended occupier.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with SW is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. There is a sewer within the site. There is sufficient capacity in the network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. A flow and pressure test is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have formed part of a site developed with structures understood to be associated with commercial poultry rearing. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: We believe small settlements, such as Westruther, can benefit from a small allocation of employment/business land for a mix of uses. The site appears to be currently, or previously, used for poultry production so has an existing business use. Any redevelopment may have a need to investigate improvements to the road network, which is not ideal for a more intense use, but this perhaps could be tied to any housing land approval on, say, the adjacent AWESR010, 011 or 002 housing allocations.

**Overall assessment****MIR status**

Preferred

**Overall assessment**

Acceptable

**Site capacity**

N/A

**Conclusions**

The site was submitted for consideration, as part of the 'Call for Sites' process, for a business and industrial allocation. The land is brownfield and was previously used for game rearing/sheds. Westruther has limited access to public transport, employment and services. However, there is a local regular bus service to Duns. Duns is located 11 miles away, where a greater selection of services and employment opportunities are available. There are currently no business and industrial allocations within Westruther. Further to the site assessment, the following constraints were highlighted, however are acceptable subject to appropriate mitigation measures;

- Flood Risk Assessment is required, to ascertain the flood risk from the small watercourse adjacent to the site;
- There is potential for breeding birds and protected species within the site;
- Existing boundary features should be protected, where possible;
- The site is brownfield land, therefore potential contamination may be present;
- Early engagement with Scottish Water regarding the WWTW and WTW network capacities; and
- Potential archaeology within this site.

Further to the above, the Roads Planning Officer advised that a Transport Statement would be required for any development and raised no objections regarding the proposal.

There are currently no business and industrial allocations within Westruther. Economic Development stated in their response that small settlements, such as Westruther, can benefit from a small allocation of employment/business land for mix of uses. There are no insurmountable constraints to the development of this site for business and industrial land. Furthermore, the allocation of such a use on brownfield land is considered to be a more sustainable approach, in comparison to allocating a greenfield site. In conclusion, the site will be taken forward for inclusion within the MIR as a preferred option for business and industrial land, subject to site requirements.



<b>Site reference</b> AWESR002	<b>Site name</b> Edgar Road	<b>Settlement</b> Westruther	<b>RGA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 10	<b>Ha</b> 0.4	<b>MIR status</b> Preferred
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	--------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site is not located within any International/National designation constraints.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourse adjacent to the site. Site is relatively flat and hydrology would appear complicated at site. Consideration should be given to bridge and culvert structures which may exacerbate flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Potential development of allocation could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a Surface Water Hazard identified within the site.

Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> 07/01957/OUT: Erection of 6 affordable houses (refused consent) 14/01324/PPP: Demolition of derelict building and erection of dwellinghouse (approved) extant planning consent until June 2018. No detailed planning consent submitted to date. 15/00576/AGN: Formation of agricultural access track (No objection)  Local Plan: (BEW2), part of a much larger site which was considered Local Plan: (BEW9), a smaller corner of the current site under consideration LDP: (AWESR007), smaller part of the site currently under consideration LPA: (AWESR002), exact same site as currently under consideration
--	------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Limited	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Limited	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
--	--	--------------------------------------	---	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Site appears to be improved grassland with tree and hedgerow on the boundary. Existing stone-built, slate-roofed built structure has some potential to support bats (EPS) and

breeding birds. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including potentially bats (EPS) and breeding birds

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the north of Westruther. There is limited public transport available within Westruther, however there is a local regular bus to Duns. Therefore, car usage would likely be higher within Westruther. In terms of access to services and employment, these are currently limited within Westruther itself. Duns is located 11 miles away, where a greater selection of services and employment opportunities are available. Lauder is only 8 miles away and Coldstream 17 miles away.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Some potential for redevelopment.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: While there are no known archaeological sites within the proposed LDP area, there are a number of records for prehistoric features in the surrounding area. Additionally, the site is within an area where evidence of medieval settlement is a possibility. A requirement for evaluation is likely.

---

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable			Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to the size and location.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: No major constraints identified but mature beech tree on southern, boundary beside Edgar Road looks worthy of retention (either by identifying in site brief or by TPO?). Also mature hedge along west boundary should be retained to give some separation between housing and the road.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

<b>Physical access/road capacity</b>	<b>Near a trunk road?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	--

NETWORK MANAGER: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of the site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I would observe on the 5 Westruther sites served by the road past the school collectively. These are Sites: AWESR002; AWESR010; AWESR011; AWESR012; and BWESR001. The standard of the road leading to these sites from the B6456 past the school is certainly not of a standard suitable for serving all of this development. I am happy to support some development, but the scale should be respectful of the village setting and the limitations of the road. Residential development should primarily front onto and focus on the main service road leading to the sites from the village centre and to a lesser extent Edgar Road. Employment land can be behind and to the west of any residential development and I would not expect any uses which would be HGV intensive. There is a real opportunity for creating a village street feel on the existing public road adjacent to Sites 002, 010 & 011. A strong street frontage will be required as will carriageway widening and footway provision. Existing drainage and street lighting infrastructure will likely need to be adjusted to suit. Development should also front onto Edgar Road and a footway will be required on the north side of Edgar Road as will proper vehicle turning provision for Edgar Road traffic. Provision for vehicles passing needs to be improved on the existing public road on the stretch adjacent to and west of the school. Consideration should be given to defining a pedestrian strip in the road between the school and the village pub. A Transport Assessment, or at least a Transport Statement, would be required to address accessibility and sustainable transport.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

<b>Right of way</b>	<b>TPOs</b>	<b>Contaminated land</b>	<b>Water supply</b>	<b>Sewerage</b>	<b>Gas Supply</b>	<b>Education provision</b>
Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	Yes	Yes	No	Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Could work well; mature trees to the south of the site should be accommodated and clarification on the access point.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with SW is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. It should be noted that there is a sewer within the site. Sufficient capacity in the network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. A flow and pressure test is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Potential to improve local path network.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped with the exception of apparent residential dwellings to the south of the subject site. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

EDUCATION OFFICER: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

<b>MIR status</b>	<b>Overall assessment</b>	<b>Site capacity</b>
Preferred	Acceptable	10

### Conclusions

The site was submitted for consideration, as part of the 'Call for Sites' process, for a housing allocation of 10 units. Westruther has limited access to public transport, employment and services. However, there is a local regular bus service to Duns. Therefore, car usage would likely be higher within Westruther. Duns is located 11 miles away, where a greater selection of services and employment opportunities are available. Further to the site assessment, the following constraints were highlighted, however are acceptable subject to appropriate mitigation measures;

- Flood Risk Assessment is required, to ascertain the flood risk from the small watercourse adjacent to the site;
- There is potential for breeding birds and protected species within the site;
- Existing boundary features should be protected;
- Early engagement with Scottish Water regarding the WWTW and WTW network capacities;
- Potential archaeology within this site; and
- Mature beech tree on southern boundary and mature hedge along west boundary should be retained.

Further to the above, the Roads Planning Officer advised that a Transport Statement would be required for any development. Potential access would be from Edgar Road and/or from the minor road to the west. There is an opportunity to enhance turning, parking and pedestrian connectivity along Edgar Road.

There is currently 1 allocation for housing within Westruther for 5 units. Taking the above into consideration and the fact there are no insurmountable constraints to the development of housing on this site, it is considered that the proposal would provide an opportunity for an additional housing site. This would provide a range of housing opportunities within smaller settlements, such as Westruther. Therefore, the site will be included within the MIR as a preferred option for housing. It should be noted that there are a number of other housing allocations proposed by the landowner. However, it is considered that (AWESR002) would be sufficient for the LDP2 period, along with the proposed business & industrial site, also put forward by the landowner (BWESR001). Together they provide housing and employment opportunities within a smaller settlement within the Berwickshire area.

# Central HMA

## Ancrum

<b>Site reference</b> AANCR002	<b>Site name</b> Dick's Croft II	<b>Settlement</b> Ancrum	<b>RGA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 60	<b>Ha</b> 3.2	<b>MIR status</b> Alternative
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	----------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

There are no initial constraints on the site which would preclude it from being developed.

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is outwith both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. I would, however, ask that due to the size of the development that surface water flooding is considered and it is ensured that any water would be routed around the housing.

SEPA: Due to steep topography adjacent/ through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and the proposed development is not affected by surface runoff. There is a surface water hazard identified within the site.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> On site	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no relevant planning history on the site.  It should be noted that this site was considered as an 'alternative' option as part of the Draft Housing Supplementary Guidance and further to public consultation, the site was included within the Finalised SG on Housing. The site was later excluded from the adopted Housing SG 2017.
--	------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	---

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> South-west
---	--	-----------------------------------	--	----------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Low impact biodiversity risk. Site is improved pasture with hedgerow, trees and garden ground on boundary. No obvious connectivity to River Tweed SAC (Ale Water). Protect trees and boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: There are local village services in Ancrum. These include a primary school, bar, shop and post office, and local facilities including village hall, church, and bowling club. Other services and employment opportunities are located four miles away in Jedburgh. Four bus routes serve the village: 20 - Hawick - Jedburgh; 51 - Jedburgh - Edinburgh; 68 - Jedburgh - Galashiels.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed</b>
Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY: In an area of archaeological potential. May require evaluation.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Lies just outwith the conservation area, development of the site should take account of the potential impact on the conservation area.

HES: No comments.

NHS: No comments received.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is currently a pasture field surrounded by hedgerows, with some deciduous trees to the north-west. C class roads envelop the site on its northern, eastern, and southern boundaries and would provide access, although widening would be required. It is located just south of the village primary school and just west of a very recent housing development which has taken quite some time to develop and has provided a relatively substantial increase in the size of the village. Given Ancrum's size and character, another allocation - particularly of 60 units - would have a substantial cumulative impact.

---

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
Not applicable	On site			Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: Relatively straight forward site for development without any major issues to be addressed. The character of existing detached houses at Dick's Croft might be best served by continuing this style of development along the northern end of the site (see plan) accessed separately from the lane at the Loaning with denser housing on the flatter lower ground on the main part of the site. Retention of existing hedgerows on boundaries supplemented by some new planting is desirable to relate development to its rural setting.

SNH: From our response of 03 August 2016: This site lies outwith the current settlement boundary as shown in the LDP and is within a Special Landscape Area. If you are minded to support development of this site during the current plan period, further detailed assessment will be required. Given the site's location within a Special Landscape Area we recommend that this assessment includes landscape capacity for development and careful consideration of the site boundary, the landscape and visual impact mitigation and the site design. Subject to the conclusions of any detailed capacity assessment we would advise that any proposed allocation in this location should be supported by a site development brief.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is affected by significant sloping and the northern half of the site would have a significant visual impact, in terms of views from the south and west, given its prominent position. Development would most likely required the widening of the C road running north-south on the western approach to Ancrum, this would also require the removal of hedgerows which currently provide a landscape buffer to the west of the village. This development would add to the very recent western expansion of Ancrum, and in landscape terms would have a detrimental cumulative impact.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Will impact on existing 30 mph limit.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: This site has been looked at previously and I have no objections in principle to this land being allocated for housing. The majority of traffic would access the site via South Myrescroft but the pinch point in the road at the north corner would require to be looked at in more detail in terms of localised widening to accommodate the increase in pedestrian footfall and vehicular movements. The existing roads bounding the site will need to be widened to cater for two way traffic flow and to provide footways as appropriate and street lighting and speed limits will have to extend accordingly. Pedestrian linkage to the footpath along the north western edge of the adjacent Myrescroft development should also be incorporated into any proposal. Vehicular access is acceptable from all existing roads adjacent to the site and a strong street frontage onto these roads is recommended. A Transport Assessment will be required for the site.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No concerns regarding the development of this site.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Connectivity footways are required to the school, village centres and path to Ale Water to the south of the site. Pedestrian linkage to the footpath along the north western edge of the new Myrescroft development should also be incorporated.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Eildon Housing Association 'potential pipeline' site for 12 houses

EDUCATION: No issues.

SCOTTISH WATER: Waste: Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. Sufficient capacity in the network. Water: Robertson WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment will be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SEPA: Foul must connect to the existing SW foul network. It is likely that for a development of this size and upgrade may be required to the existing STW. SW should confirm.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Road widening would likely require the loss of hedgrows which at present provide quite a solid western boundary to the village. Would have an appreciable impact on the setting of the village.

---

## Overall assessment

### MIR status

Alternative

### Overall assessment

Acceptable

### Site capacity

60

### Conclusions

Overall the site is assessed as acceptable however it should be noted the site is within a Special Landscape Area and careful consideration must be given to boundary treatments, the landscape and visual impact mitigation as well as the site design. Due to recent development within Ancrum consideration should be given to the scale of the proposal and its effect on the size of the settlement and the character

of the village and its Conservation Area. Allocation of this site would increase pressure on services since the previous housing allocation has only recently been completed and further discussions would need to be held with Scottish Water in relation to wastewater treatment as the development is required to connect to the existing Scottish Water foul network.

Structure planting to the south and west would be required to reduce visual impact from the countryside and create an edge to the settlement. Existing hedgerows would need to be retained or improved where possible. Mitigation measures are required to prevent any impact on the River Tweed SAC. Mitigation measures are also required in relation to the impact of surface water runoff from nearby hills and this should be considered during the design stage.

Vehicular access is acceptable from all existing roads adjacent to the site and a strong street frontage onto these roads is recommended. A pedestrian linkage to the footpath along the north western edge of the new Myrescroft development should also be incorporated into any proposal. It is also important that there is connectivity from the site to the village centre for both pedestrians and cyclists.

The development at Myrescroft to the north east of this site confirmed that there was a healthy market for house purchasers within Ancrum. Consequently this proposal could be considered to be effective and there is an interested developer associated with the site. However care must be taken to ensure any new development does not saturate the village within a relatively short period of time.

Scottish Water has confirmed that there is sufficient capacity. SG assessment raises the possibility that land will be required to safeguard for education provision, implying an education capacity problem.

While there are no absolute constraints, given the issue of cumulative impact on the character of the village, the site should only be included in the MIR as an 'alternative' site. At this point in time the village should be given time to adapt to the relatively recent large scale development of Myrescroft although the site may be included in a future Local Development Plan. For these reasons, the site has been identified only as an alternative if required.

---

# Crailing

<b>Site reference</b> ACRAI004	<b>Site name</b> Crailing Toll (Larger Site)	<b>Settlement</b> Crailing	<b>RGA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 5	<b>Ha</b> 0.7	<b>MIR status</b> Alternative
-----------------------------------	---	-------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	----------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

There are no major issues at this initial assessment stage. Part of this site is allocated within the Consolidated Local Plan.

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site lies out with the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extent. I would have no objections to this development on the grounds of flood risk.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourse which would appear to be culverted either through or immediately adjacent to the site. We do not support development over culverts that are to remain active.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> On site	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> 99/00897/OUT - Erection of a dwellinghouse (Refused)  The site was considered through the process of the Housing SG 2017 but was rejected (ACRAI004).
--	------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	---

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Limited	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Limited	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> South-west
--	--	--------------------------------------	---	----------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Moderate biodiversity risk. Site is improved pasture with some mature broad-leaved trees and garden ground on boundary. Potential connectivity with the River Tweed SAC (Oxnam water) via drain. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC (Oxnam water). Protect boundary trees and features and mitigation for protected species including bats and breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Crailing is a hamlet with a limited bus service. It relies on nearby Jedburgh for services. Mitigation measures would be required to prevent any impact on the River Tweed SAC.



## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY: The site formerly contained a farm steading and is at the edge of the medieval village. Archaeological evaluation is required.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific comment

HES: No comments.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Site is relatively large in relation to the existing settlement and there remains an undeveloped allocated site in the existing LDP.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: The site would benefit from some landscape structure planting along the south eastern boundary to help screen road and reduce road noise from site. Care will be needed to ensure structure planting does not shade development in the longer term.

SNH: No comment due to size and location of the site.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Additional properties will add to traffic using existing less-than-ideal junction with A698. Visibility out is okay but fast section of road and potential for nose to tail shunts for right-turning traffic as no dedicated right turn lane.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: I have no objections to this site being developed for housing although access would have to be via the adjacent approved site (ACRAI001) and not directly off the A698.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

No

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND: An area of the site appears to have been previously developed with agricultural buildings. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Connecting pathways/pavements between the East and West of the site requested for options for pedestrian access around the village.

EDUCATION: No issues.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER - Waste: No waste infrastructure in the area. Water: Robertson WTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the network

SEPA: There is no SW foul sewer network in this location. Consideration should be given to first time sewerage for this village to include the existing and proposed development site. Failing that private drainage would need to be provided with discharge to the Oxnam water (as opposed to the small burn). There may be a culvert running through or close to the site boundary - opportunities should be taken to de-culvert.

---

## Overall assessment

MIR status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Alternative	Acceptable	5

### Conclusions

There are no specific issues which would rule out development. There is a reliance on septic tanks in Crailing. SEPA have stated that consideration should be given to first time sewerage for this village to include the existing and proposed development site. If a WWT connection was not provided, SEPA have stated that overflow would have to be diverted to Oxnam Water not the small burn nearby. SEPA have not objected, either have Scottish Water, but there would be a need to ensure no impact on the River Tweed SAC (the Oxnam Water is covered by the SAC).

Crailling has the existing undeveloped allocated housing site for 5 units which forms part of this site. The landowner has stated that the additional allocation would make the existing site more marketable. However, no specific information has been provided to support this. Moreover, the scale of any allocation needs to be carefully considered with attention to the size of the existing settlement. It is considered that this site should have an indicative capacity of 5 units.

(The site was originally plotted as ACRAI003. Part of ACRAI003 is already allocated as ACRAI001 for 5 units. The site boundaries were therefore reduced and a new code was created - ACRAI004).

---

# Darnick

<b>Site reference</b>	<b>Site name</b>	<b>Settlement</b>	<b>RGA</b>	<b>Proposed Use</b>	<b>Indicative Capacity</b>	<b>Ha</b>	<b>MIR status</b>
ADARN005	Land south of Darnlee	Darnick	Central	Housing	10	0.8	Preferred

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b>	<b>SAC</b>	<b>SPA</b>	<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is outwith both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. Would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

SEPA: No comments in respect of flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b>	<b>Planning history references</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	No planning application history.

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b>	<b>Access to employment</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b>	<b>Site aspect</b>
Good	Good	Good	Moderate	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site is improved pasture with mature broad-leaved trees on boundary/within site. Potential for EPS (bats). No obvious connectivity with the River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Protect boundary trees and features and mitigation for protected species including bats and breeding birds.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed</b>
On site	On site	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	On site	Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: The site is within the Inventory Battlefield of Darnick. Mitigation is likely. Consideration of impacts to the setting of the battlefield is needed.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: The site is to the south of Darnlee, a category B listed building and lies within the Darnick conservation area. Whilst there may be some scope for a very small scale, well designed development on the southern boundary, it is considered that development of all of the proposed site would have an adverse impact on the setting of Darnlee and adversely impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: No comments.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

On site

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: 10-12 units given constraint of existing trees on site.

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: Wish to ensure that if this site is to be allocated within and adjacent to the NSA that a site brief is produced to identify the key natural heritage assets of the site to be protected and the key opportunities for the integration of green infrastructure within future development. The majority of the site lies within the Eildon & Leaderfoot Hills NSA. The site also forms an important context for, and a gateway to, Darnick. Its location within the NSA means that high standard design will be required. Key issues for a site brief are likely to include:

- Retention of key boundary features, including the existing wall and fence, woodland along the western boundary and mature trees along southern and eastern boundaries;
- Integration of the site with Broomilees Road, maintaining landscape character and sense of scale and place of this area with dwellings relating to both the parkland and the street.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: New junction required off existing Broomlees Road.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING: Not opposed in principle to this land being allocated for residential development. The site stacks up well in terms of sustainable transport with good opportunities for pedestrian and cycle connectivity with Melrose and Galashiels. The site is well served by public transport with a bus service close at hand and railway station nearby. Vehicular access is possible off the main road into Darnick on the east side of the site, but there is an issue to be addressed here as part of any development. The stretch of road here is used extensively for on-street parking for the village. Any road junction in this location would not work safely with this on-street parking remaining as junction visibility splay standards would not be met. Displacement parking would have to be provided in the site. Alternatively, it may be possible to upgrade the existing access serving Darnlee as a means of serving the site and introducing some lay-by parking in the main road. A supplementary vehicular access is also possible off Broomilees and this would help with street connectivity. This would entail widening Broomilees Road between the mature trees and may offer scope for a one-way traffic system over the initial narrow length of Broomilees Road. Strong street frontages are recommended and allowance for future street connectivity would be required. A Transport Statement can address the issues raised.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No comments.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Safe route for non-vehicular access would be strongly advised from this site to existing pavements and, therefore, the core path network.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Attractive area of parkland within the village associated with the Listed Building, within the Conservation Area; Archaeological/battlefield implications; Potential impact on trees; Need structure planting/buffer between site and Listed Building; Some limited development of a high quality may be appropriate.

EDUCATION: No objections.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. A Flow and Pressure test is likely to be required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. A Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing Scottish Water foul network.

---

## Overall assessment

MIR status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Preferred	Acceptable	10

### Conclusions

The site is considered to represent a suitable infill development within the settlement of Darnick.

The existing woodland belt along the western boundary of the site as well as specimen trees along the southern boundary would require to be retained where possible. The developable area of the site would be established by the route protection areas of existing trees. Consideration would require to be given to how best to create separation along the northern boundary of the site to ensure the integrity of the setting of Darnlee is maintained.

Existing boundary features (including the existing stone wall and fencing) would require to be retained as much as possible.

On-street parking is currently an issue on Abbotsford Road. Main access would be from Abbotsford Road with a potential link into Broomilees Road which in turn may result in localised improvements. This would require to be addressed through any development of this site.

Any development would require to be of a high quality in order to safeguard the character and setting of the conservation area, the B listed Darnlee and the Inventory Battlefield. The relationship of development with the parkland and the street would require to be well considered. Due to the sensitivity of the site, it is considered that a Planning Brief would be required.

There is undeveloped land to the west of the site which may, in the future, offer an opportunity for future development. Access from the site in question would therefore require to be considered along with improvements to Broomilees Road as suggested by the Roads Officer.

# Denholm

<b>Site reference</b>	<b>Site name</b>	<b>Settlement</b>	<b>RGA</b>	<b>Proposed Use</b>	<b>Indicative Capacity</b>	<b>Ha</b>	<b>MIR status</b>
ADENH006	Land south east of Thorncroft	Denholm	Central	Housing	12	0.7	Preferred

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b>	<b>SAC</b>	<b>SPA</b>	<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is outwith both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. However, there is a ditch running through the grounds that has come close to flooding property in the past. This has, to our knowledge, not spilled onto this field but would still require a Flood Risk Assessment to show the risk to this development. At present, SBC Flood Team are considering work such as culverting this ditch.

SEPA: Require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourses which flow along the boundary of the site. These watercourses then enter a FPS which will require careful consideration to ensure there is no increase in flood risk due to site development. The study undertaken by JBA indicates that part of the site is at risk of flooding but it does not appear to fully modelled the adjacent watercourse. Consideration will need to be given to any culverts/ bridges which may exacerbate flood risk. Site may be constrained due to flood risk. Due to steep topography through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b>	<b>Planning history references</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Combination	No relevant planning application history.

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b>	<b>Access to employment</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b>	<b>Site aspect</b>
Good	Good	Good	Moderate	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site is improved pasture with hedgerow and trees on boundary. Potential for EPS (bats) and breeding birds to use built structures within the site. No obvious connectivity with the River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Protect boundary trees and features and mitigation for protected species including bats and breeding birds.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There are no known archaeological issues.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: No comments.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: No comments.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Adjacent to site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: 10 – 12no taking account narrowness of site and RPAs of adjacent field boundary trees.

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to size and location.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGEMENT: Creation of a new junction onto the A698.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Consider relocation of bus stop, provision of shelter.

ROADS PLANNING: Not opposed to development on this site. Access via the A698 will require the demolition of some existing outbuildings, but satisfactory access can be achieved. An acceptable revised parking arrangement would be required for the existing dwellinghouse (Thorncroft). The linear nature of the site limits potential internal street connectivity; however there may be the possibility of a link to Ruberslaw Road via the vacant plot within that development. This would require 3rd party discussions. If this site is allocated, any site layout would have to allow for future links to the land along the eastern boundary. The existing infrastructure along the A698 would have to be extended into the development site.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No comments.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

On site

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: An area of the site appears to have been previously developed with buildings, possibly of commercial/ industrial use. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: If possible a pedestrian link to Ruberslaw Road would allow pedestrian access to Core path 01 avoiding the A698.

EDUCATION: No objections.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Roberton WTW has sufficient capacity. There is a 6" water main running across the South side of the site. There is also a 4" water main north of site. Sufficient capacity in the network. Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. There is a foul and surface water sewer running through the middle of the site. Sufficient capacity in the network for foul only connection.

---

## Overall assessment

<b>MIR status</b>	<b>Overall assessment</b>	<b>Site capacity</b>
Preferred	Acceptable	12

### Conclusions

The site is considered to offer an appropriate opportunity for infill development within the settlement boundary of Denholm. Consideration will require to be given to the residential amenity of existing properties within the immediate vicinity. The Roads Officer has confirmed that an acceptable access is achievable from the A698, this would require removal of some existing outbuildings. These would require investigation for potential contamination.

The Council's Flood and Coastal Management Team and the Scottish Environment Protection Agency have requested that a Flood Risk Assessment be undertaken in relation to a ditch running through the grounds that has come close to flooding property in the past. Consideration is currently being given to culverting this ditch. The site would require careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and the proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff.



# Eckford

<b>Site reference</b>	<b>Site name</b>	<b>Settlement</b>	<b>RGA</b>	<b>Proposed Use</b>	<b>Indicative Capacity</b>	<b>Ha</b>	<b>MIR status</b>
<b>AECKF002</b>	Land at the Black Barn	Eckford	Central	Housing	10	1.1	<b>Alternative</b>

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b>	<b>SAC</b>	<b>SPA</b>	<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

There are no initial constraints on the site which would preclude it from being developed.

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

SEPA: Review of OS Map indicates a potentially culverted watercourse along the eastern boundary of the site. We would recommend that this is investigated as part of an FRA. We do not support development over culverts that are to remain active.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b>	<b>Planning history references</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	On site	Buildings	97/00580/OUT - Residential development 97/00617/COU - Change of use of land from agriculture to garden ground

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b>	<b>Access to employment</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b>	<b>Site aspect</b>
Poor	Poor	Poor	Moderate	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site appears to be arable field and improved pasture with hedgerow on boundary and trees and scrub within site. Possible potential for EPS (bats) and breeding birds to use built structures within the site. No obvious connectivity with the River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Protect boundary features and trees, mitigation for protected species including bats and breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located on the south-eastern edge of the small village of Eckford. In terms of accessibility it scores poorly. There are no key services in Eckford.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY: There are no known archaeological issues. However, the site is in close proximity to the known location of medieval Eckford and some evidence for this may exist in the site. Also, the existing building is on the site of an early 19th century farmstead evidence of which may also exist. Mitigation may be required.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific comment.

HES: No comments.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: Given the existing density and pattern of development in Eckford, capacity is likely to be 6-8 units. To alleviate the restricted nature of the existing access track, an additional strip of the field alongside the established woodland strip next to the access track could be included in the site and planted up with trees. This would allow the removal of the existing tree belt. Any removal of hedges on either side of the track should be replaced outwith the visibility splays.

SNH: No comment due to size and location.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: No comments.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: I am not opposed in principle to this land being allocated for housing. The main road through the village already benefits from street lighting provision, but lacks provision for pedestrians. If this site is to be allocated for housing then footway provision between the site access and the crossroads in the village at 'Tower Cottage' should be a consideration. A length of road side hedging is likely to have to be removed in order to achieve suitable junction visibility.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

No

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND: An area of the site appears to have been previously developed with a building, possibly of commercial/ industrial use. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Connecting path suitable for walkers cyclists from road through site and on to North East corner of site to allow future link for footpath network to link site to Loaning local path network. Section of wide verge required at entrance of site into the public road for pedestrian use.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: History of refusal and appeal, 97/00580/OUT. Suggest a development brief is required. Again private waste water systems are currently being used in development boundary, 17/00032/FUL.

EDUCATION: No comments.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER - Waste: No sewers within the area. Water: Roberton WTW has sufficient capacity. A Flow and Pressure test is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. This may require to be upgraded to accommodate this development.

---

## Overall assessment

<b>MIR status</b>	<b>Overall assessment</b>	<b>Site capacity</b>
<b>Alternative</b>	Acceptable	10

### Conclusions

The proposal involves the demolition of an agricultural barn/shed currently situated outside the settlement and its replacement with housing. In addition to this, housing would be allocated on fields that currently surround the shed and the village. The landowner's proposal suggests a new settlement boundary enveloping the site with 5+ houses to be developed. Technically the site could accommodate up to 10 units. The site is partly enveloped by existing buildings to the north, west, and south. There are no absolute constraints ruling out development. However, Eckford is a village without basic services. There is no WWT available, so private sewerage would be required. It is a very small village and development of the whole site, although small, would still be relatively significant.

This site should not be preferred for development but could be included only as an alternative site should a higher level of housing land be required as per SESPlan.

---

# Ednam

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR status
AEDNA011	Cliftonhill (v)	Ednam	Rest of Borders	Housing	15	1.3	Alternative

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
1:200	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

There are no initial constraints on the site which would preclude it from being developed.

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourse which flows adjacent to the site and enters the Eden Water. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map and steep topography indicates that there may be flooding issues at this site or immediately adjacent. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff.

Note: Surface water flood map is offset from burn suggesting an error within the flood map.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	On site	Greenfield	99/00957/OUT - Residential Development Refused, Appeal Dismissed. 01/00782/OUT - Residential Development Refused. 04/02140/OUT - Residential Development Refused.
				Site has been considered as part of previous LDP processes (site NE of War Memorial). The Reporter concluded that once the allocated site (AEDNA002) is fully developed "the preferred area for future period of this Local Plan (2011), if required, will be to the east side of the village".

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Limited	Limited	Limited	Moderate	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Moderate biodiversity risk. Site an arable field with lowland mixed deciduous woodland and hedgerow on boundary. Potential connectivity with the River Tweed SAC via drainage to the Eden water. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC. Mitigation for protected species including bats, badger and breeding birds.

SNH: No comments received.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located in the centre of Ednam, close to the crossroads and the bus shelter. Ednam has a bus service to Kelso and Berwick and is only 2.5 miles from Kelso. The site slopes towards the crossroads but sits higher than the centre of the village. The village has a post office, village hall and a primary school. Mitigation would be required to prevent any impacts on Eden water.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Adjacent to site

### Scheduled Monument

On/adjacent to site

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On/adjacent to site

### Garden and designed

Not applicable

## Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY: Historic mapping (General Roy 1750s, Stobie 1770) shows this area as containing the earlier village core to the east of the burn. Mitigation is likely.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No comments received.

HES: No comments.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located close to the centre of the small village. Boundary is provided to the south by heavy hedgrows which run along the road towards Milburn. There is heavy vegetation on the western border which separates the site from the village on this side. The northern section of the site would take development up the Duns road in quite a prominent position and in quite a linear form. The Old Smiddy is a C listed building, but any impact would be low. Archaeological interests in the southern half of the site which would required mitigation.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: No fundamental concerns but eastern boundary looks very arbitrary and does not relate to any features on the ground. One consequence of that is that the northern end is so narrow that it is probably undevelopable. It would be desirable to retain all the existing woodland that is outside the site on the west side and this implies a buffer zone of at least 10m along that side. This will affect the developable area. Presumably access would have to come off the SW corner which would affect the amenity of the Ednam to Cliftonhill road and would need to avoid impacting on the War Memorial and the Old Smithy opposite which is all quite tight and awkward.

SNH: No comment due to size and location.

General comments: This is quite a large site but the landscape impact is relatively limited. The site is partly screened by heavy hedgrows and vegetation on the west and south sides. The south-western part of the site slopes steadily towards the crossroads and this reduces landscape impact on a large portion of the site. However, roads requirements for widening of the C-class road on the south of the site might significantly reduce the hedgerow/vegetation on the south side of the site.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

NETWORK MANAGER: Access off single track road and then junction with limited visibility onto B Class Road.

ROADS PLANNING SERVICE: I am able to support this site for residential development on the basis of provision of suitable pedestrian and street lighting connectivity with the rest of the village and the carriageway of the minor public road to the south being widened to 5.5m. Frontage development along the minor public road is highly desirable; however this will require significant engineering works given the difference in level. It should be noted that the shape of the site under consideration does not bode well in terms of a potential layout; however a link through to Eden Park should be considered which would benefit the site. A strip of housing adjacent to the existing public road may be more in-keeping with the form of the village and the lie of the land.

**Right of way**

Not applicable

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

Not applicable

**Water supply**

Yes

**Sewerage**

Yes

**Gas Supply**

Yes

**Education provision**

Good

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: No comment.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Potential coalescence of Cliftonhill and Ednam.

EDUCATION: No issues.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Waste: Kelso WwTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the network. Water: Robertson WTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the network.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. The pump station at Ednam may require to be upgraded to account for the proposed developments. SW should confirm.

OVERALL SUMMARY: No major planning and infrastructure constraints. However, there are roads issues on this site. The road to the south is a single track road, which will require widening, and there are visibility issues on the B-road (Duns Road). Each of these could be resolved.

---

## Overall assessment

**MIR status**

Alternative

**Overall assessment**

Acceptable

**Site capacity**

15

**Conclusions**

If this site was to be allocated, it would be important to incorporate landscaping to resist further development to the north east and coalescence with Milburn and Cliftonhill Farm. The minor road to the south of the site requires widening for access. This will mean a reduction in the hedgerow screening. Level differences from the site to the minor road means major engineering required in order to achieve desirable development frontage along the southern section of the site, avoiding a layout that turns its back on the village. That said, as much of the hedgerow as possible would need to be retained on the southern boundary. On balance appears a more complex site to bring up to appropriate roads access standards than others.

There are no significant constraints affecting the site although there is already an allocated site in this small village and it is considered there are better options available. The site could be considered as an 'alternative' in the MIR.

<b>Site reference</b> AEDNA013	<b>Site name</b> Land north of Primary School	<b>Settlement</b> Ednam	<b>RGA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 20	<b>Ha</b> 1.4	<b>MIR status</b> Alternative
-----------------------------------	--	----------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	----------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

There are no initial constraints on the site which would preclude it from being developed.

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is outwith both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. Due to the size of the development I would recommend surface water runoff be considered.

SEPA: No detailed comments on flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> On site	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> 01/00782/OUT - Residential development (refused) 04/02140/OUT - Residential development (refused) 99/00957/OUT - Residential development (refused)
--	------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Limited	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Limited	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
--	--	--------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Low impact. Site is an arable field with hedgerow, garden ground and amenity ground on boundary. No obvious connectivity with the River Tweed SAC. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Ednam has a bus service to Kelso and Berwick and is only 2.5 miles from Kelso. The village does have a post office, village hall and a primary school. The site has low impact in terms of biodiversity risk. There is already an existing allocation in Ednam.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Not applicable	<b>Open space</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Listed buildings</b> Not applicable	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> Not applicable	<b>Garden and designed</b> Not applicable
--	---------------------------------------	---	---	---	--------------------------------------	--

## Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY: There are no known archaeological issues.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Site lies on the approach to the village form Ednam; boundary treatments and connections (both physical and visual) to the settlement will be important issues.

HES: No comments.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: 20-25no houses, if density of adjacent Eden Park was reflected in any proposed development.(and if additional land was included to ensure required structure planting was achievable. A belt of structure planting to the north boundary would create shelter from northerly winds and act as visual containment.

SNH: We recommend that if this site is to be allocated that a site brief is produced to identify the key natural heritage assets of the site to be protected and the key opportunities for the integration of green infrastructure within future development. Our advice on this site is based on prior knowledge and desktop assessment using GIS and streetview. We may provide further advice based on a site visit if the potential allocation is carried forward. The current settlement statement in LDP1 states that further expansion of Ednam would be to the north and east. This potential allocation conforms to those placemaking considerations. However, a site brief is still required if potential adverse effects on setting and character of the existing settlement are to be avoided through the promotion of a design led planning approach.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Impact on existing 30 mph limit if new access onto B Road. Access off Stichill Road less of an impact but will increase volume through more restricted section of village.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Possible bus stop infrastructure.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I am able to recommend in favour of this land being allocated for development. The street lighting and footway infrastructure in the village will have to be extended along the main road as appropriate and a modest extension of the 30 mph speed limit is likely to be required. Access should be taken from both the B6461 and the minor public road to the south west to allow a connected street network to develop. A strong street frontage onto the B6461 will create a sense of arrival from the north and will help justify a shifting of the 30 mph speed limit. Depending on the scale of development a Transport Statement may be required.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: No comment.

EDUCATION: No issues.



NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Waste: Kelso WwTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the network. Water: Robertson WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. The pump station at Ednam may require to be upgraded to account for the proposed developments. SW should confirm.

---

## Overall assessment

MIR status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Alternative	Acceptable	20

### Conclusions

The proposed site is capable of being developed. There are no restrictions that rule out development. This site is in quite a prominent position to the north of the settlement, on slightly raised ground, overlooking Ednam. It could be integrated with the settlement with appropriate layout and design, connectivity, and boundary treatment. Could be considered as an 'alternative site in the MIR' as it is considered there are more preferable site options.

---

# Galashiels

<b>Site reference</b>	<b>Site name</b>	<b>Settlement</b>	<b>RGA</b>	<b>Proposed Use</b>	<b>Indicative Capacity</b>	<b>Ha</b>	<b>MIR status</b>
<b>BGALA006</b>	Land at Winston Road I	Galashiels	Central	Employment	N/A	2.5	<b>Preferred</b>

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b>	<b>SAC</b>	<b>SPA</b>	<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The site is not shown to be at flood risk within the SEPA 1 in 200 year flood map. Small areas of the site are anticipated to be affected by surface water runoff and this site is relatively steep so it would be expected that the applicant shows how this would be mitigated.

SEPA: SEPA have post flood survey levels for nearby area after the 2005 flood event. A flood level of 92.86mAOD recorded 30m downstream of bridge on right bank. SEPA require a FRA which assesses the risk from the River Tweed. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b>	<b>Planning history references</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Brownfield	There are no planning applications of interest. The site was considered through the process of the Housing SG 2017 (RGALA003 & RGALA005) but was excluded.

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b>	<b>Access to employment</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b>	<b>Site aspect</b>
Good	Good	Good	Moderate	South

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGICAL OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site consists of sheds/ abattoir and areas of scrub and tall ruderal vegetation. Potential for EPS (bats) and breeding birds to use built structures within the site. Potential connectivity with the adjacent River Tweed SAC/SSSI via drainage. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC. Mitigation for protected species including bats, badger and breeding birds.

SNH: SNH responded and advised the following: From previous response of 03 August 2016, for allocation references RGALA003 and RGALA005: This site is for re-development of an abattoir and a former refuse tip. The proximity of the former refuse tip site (RGALA003) to the River Tweed SAC means that assessment and mitigation of impacts on the SAC will be required. It is not clear what the site requirement "there is moderate biodiversity risk associated with the site which must be given due consideration" refers to. As related site requirements refer to potential for protected species to be present, the supplementary guidance should make clear the need for survey. Further advice on survey is available on our website: <http://www.snh.gov.uk/protecting-scotlands-nature/protected-species/your-responsibilities/developers-and-builders/>.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Adjacent to site

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There are no known archaeological issues.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: Brownfield land in part, appears to have some potential for redevelopment.

HES: No comments.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: No comments received although the following comments were received during the process of the Housing SG which remain relevant:

Fairly level site in elevated location above River Tweed with gently rising ground to N and steep bank down to river on SE side. Site elevation is around 105-110m AOD. Following the closure of the abattoir the site has lain empty and become overgrown. It is 'brownfield' land. To the north of site is Scottish Power Substation and storage yard, with field extending from site boundary up the side of Winston Road and along Melrose Road as far as garage. Line of conifers separating ex-abattoir site from field and storage yard to north. Railway running along base of bank at southern side. Steep partially tree clad bank along east side. Site separated from Winston Rd by line of conifers. 2 attractive deciduous trees in verge to outside of western site boundary. 3/4 mature oak near top of slope down to railway track near SW corner of site and a mature sycamore further to east on same banking. 2 mature sycamores on or just outside SE corner at top of Steeply sloping bank down to Tweed. Trees outside and inside northern boundary adjacent to substation. Overhead HV powerlines on various sizes of pylons overrunning site in SE and SW directions. Attractive views out over Tweed with Eildon Hills beyond. Existing trees have value for birds and invertebrates. Potential for woodland restoration on steep slopes to River Tweed and on slope overlooking railway. (The abattoir has now been demolished from the site).

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Need to consider impact on existing road network, particularly junction of Winston Road and Melrose Road.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comment.

ROADS PLANNING: No objections in principle to the regeneration of this site. There needs to be two public road access points from Winston Road into the site and a strong frontage onto Winston Road is recommended. A footway on the east side of Winston Road from Melrose Road to the road bridge over the railway line will be required and pedestrian crossing points will be needed in Winston Road, the locations of which can be determined through a Transport Assessment for the site.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No comment.

---

**Right of way**

Not applicable

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

On site

**Water supply**

Yes

**Sewerage**

Yes

**Gas Supply**

Yes

**Education provision**

Good

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site was quarried and subsequently used as a refuse tip. Part of the site was developed as an Abattoir. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Non-vehicular access to existing pavements required.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: To some extent, it is a more comfortable fit to have this site designated for industrial use, given its closest neighbours to north and south and past abattoir use. The same flooding/ecological constraints would apply. Impacts on residents opposite would need accounted for, however, if both land uses are to avoid conflict.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Whilst this is generally an existing employment land site, its redevelopment to modern standards may be economically challenging due to the apparent problems with the site - o/h power lines, potential contamination, demolition costs, remediation of tip, etc. However, if no other employment land can be identified in the town, this may well be an important allocation.

HEALTH AND SAFETY EXECUTIVE: Require to be consulted.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. "Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the Wtw. Note there is a surface water sewer running through the site.

SEPA: Foul must connect to SW foul network. The site is close to the River Tweed however is elevated above river level. Care should be taken not to damage the river banking as part of any development. This site is located immediately adjacent to the Gala STW (CAR and WML licence). Odour is likely to be problematic from the STW. A suitable buffer should be provided in line with SPP requirements between the licensed sites and the proposed development. This is likely to impact the developable area available.

**Overall assessment****MIR status**

Preferred

**Overall assessment**

Acceptable

**Site capacity**

N/A

**Conclusions**

Given the former uses which occupied the site, namely an abattoir and refuse site it is considered that the principle of the use of this site for business and industrial development is acceptable in principle. The residential amenity of the neighbouring residential properties must be considered, however, it is noted that alternative uses to those that existed previously can only offer an improvement. There are limited business and industrial sites in Galashiels and it is considered that this site, albeit with constraints, brings an opportunity forward. It might be possible on the potentially contaminated parts of the site that a use could be implemented that would require minimal groundworks required. Given the nature of this proposed allocation and the identified constraints, including O/H powerlines, odour from sewage works, potential contamination, it is not considered that this site is suitable to accommodate an element of housing.

A Flood Risk Assessment would be required and there is moderate biodiversity risk. Assessment and mitigation of impact on SAC required. Capacity of the site would depend upon the wayleaves required for OH powerlines and this may take out parts of the site. Environmentally there are few limits although existing trees within the site on the south and near eastern side should be retained to provide setting and minimise impacts on River Tweed adjoining. A Transport Assessment would be required. Contamination would require to be investigated and mitigated.

<b>Site reference</b> AGALA029	<b>Site name</b> Netherbarns	<b>Settlement</b> Galashiels	<b>RGA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 45	<b>Ha</b> 7.3	<b>MIR status</b> Alternative
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	----------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Adjacent to site	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The site is not shown to be at flood risk within the SEPA 1 in 200 year flood map. Small areas of the site are anticipated to be affected by surface water runoff and this site is relatively steep so would expect the applicant to consider this as well as drainage and SUDS.

SEPA: Require an FRA which assesses the risk from the River Tweed. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map and steep topography nearby indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> 04/00706/FUL - Erection of seventy nine dwellinghouse (refused by the Scottish Ministers after they had called it in).  This site was considered during the Local Plan Inquiry 2006 (EGL2B) and at the recent Local Development Plan Examination 2016. The Reporter's recommendation at both was for the site to be removed from the Local Plan/LDP.
--	------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> South-west
---	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	---	----------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Moderate risk – Potential connectivity with River Tweed SAC/SSSI through drainage. Site separated from River Tweed by minor road and disused railway/broad-leaved woodland strip. Mitigation required to ensure no significant adverse effects on integrity of River Tweed SAC. Within site- improved field boundary features of tree line and within site old hedgerow. Protect boundary features, mitigation required e.g. badger and breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site has good access to local services and facilities and employment in the settlement. The settlement is on the A7(T) and A6091(T) and the strategic public transport network.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Adjacent to site

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed

Adjacent to site

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There are no known archaeological issues.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: Previously commented on the potential of this site back in 2016. This site lies opposite category A listed Abbotsford House but is screened in part by existing trees along the riverside and the former railway line and is set down below the level of the A7 and more recent housing development. The key issue is to avoid having an adverse impact on the setting of Abbotsford House. There is potentially some scope for limited development on this site, which may require the reinforcement of the planting to the east. Careful attention would be needed to the external colours of any development to minimise its impact.

HES: Setting of LB15104 Abbotsford House and GDL00001 Abbotsford House. Content with the principle of development for 45 units here, on the basis that site development will be brought forward via a masterplan which will ensure that the detail of scale and detailed views analysis, amongst other things, can be considered. HES would wish to be consulted on these details and others as the masterplanning process develops. The Abbotsford Trust have recently commissioned a landscape management plan for the Abbotsford estate. The plan's proposals may involve reopening of historic views from house and estate, which may take in this site. This will also need to be taken into account in the development of the masterplan. HES note that further information has been provided in relation to landscape and visuals since the Housing SG, and recommend that if this site is considered to be a reasonable alternative, these should be made available to inform the Main Issues Report consultation and assessment.

GENERAL COMMENTS: This site was considered in the Local Plan Inquiry and at the recent Local Development Plan Examination. The Garden and Designed Landscape lies to the south east of the site. The Reporters' assessment was that the site should not be developed because of the adverse impact on the setting of the A Listed Abbotsford House and its Garden and Designed Landscape. However, Historic Scotland have now removed their objection to some form of development on the site. The setting of the listed footbridge to the NE of the site and Netherbarns farmhouse, steading and stables to the west of the site should also be taken into consideration.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Adjacent to site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: This site has previously been discounted as suitable for development given its proximity to and potential impact on Abbotsford Designed Landscape which is regarded as of national importance. Potential adverse impacts on views from the DL are a major constraint. However, retention of existing (TPO) tree cover will provide a reasonable degree of mitigation (although not entirely in winter). The Landscape Architect previously stated that 'the most sensitive development scenario would be to restrict new development to the lower SE parts of the site avoiding the higher areas which cannot be effectively screened from the DL, at least until further planting has been established.' The recently submitted Landscape and Visual Appraisal in support of the site being allocated suggests with photomontages that the upper field and part of the lower field of the site are suitable for development, given the screening from the intervening trees. Before allocating the site we should require further visual assessment carried out in the winter months to test the conclusions of the recent appraisal. The supporting information lacks any assessment of the tree resource - a Tree Survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment should be part of the information provided to support the allocation and to establish a realistic 'developable area'. It is clear if this site is allocated the protected trees along the south eastern boundary will be critical in protecting the core area of Abbotsford Designed Landscape from visual intrusion and a long term retention and management programme will have to be an intrinsic part of any such allocation. Any development at this location on the edge of site would have to take into consideration SPG 'Placemaking and Design' to establish the correct built form and density.

On receipt of further photo montages from the Agent, the Landscape Architect made the following comments: The Year 15 photomontages show less visibility of existing and proposed housing than the year 1 photomontages, as additional evergreen tree planting is proposed on site. Any gaps that develop in the existing mature tree screen will open up views to the existing and proposed housing opposite. It will be crucial that:

1. The existing mature tree belt is retained and regenerated.
2. Additional screen tree planting along the SW boundary of the site is additional to the existing tree belt.

SNH: This site lies outwith the current settlement boundary as shown in the LDP. SNH understand that the site was included as an allocation in the Proposed Plan but, in their report of examination, the Reporter recommended its deletion. This recommendation was based partly on landscape impacts. SNH is not aware of a potential solution that should change that decision.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is also visible from the stretches of the A7(T) and the Southern Upland Way immediately adjacent to the site. There is a semi mature/ mature tree belt south of the site and young tree belts in the middle of the site and along the A7 (T). There are also mature trees along the fringe of the site. There is a small hillock in the north west of the site. There are small areas of steep slopes in the SW of the site and along its SE fringe. The impact on the Garden and Designed Landscape is also a constraint on landscape capacity.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: No comments.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: The A7 immediately adjacent to the site has the benefit of: street lighting and a 40mph speed limit; a footway for pedestrians, including a crossing island in the main road; and public transport provision by way of bus lay-bys and shelters. The existing road junction serving Kingsknowe Drive, which would also serve this site, has the benefit of a right turn lane on the A7 to assist with traffic flow on the main road. As such, much of the transport infrastructure required to serve this site is already in place. A Transport Assessment would be required to address any adjustments/upgrades required to accommodate the increase in traffic associated with the site, particularly at the junction with the A7/Kingsknowe Drive. With the A7 being a Trunk Road, Transport Scotland would observe on the impact on the A7, adjacent to and in the proximity of the site, including any speed reducing measures to be addressed. The design of any development would have to take significant cognisance of pedestrians and cyclists including external links with the surrounding infrastructure. All matters considered, supportive of the principle of development on this site from a transport perspective.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: AGALA029/38/39 or 06 – The potential cumulative impact of these 3 housing sites, which total 559 units, or 2 housing sites and a business and industry development, would be required to be determined with appropriate and deliverable mitigation measures identified for the trunk road network.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Adjacent to site

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained largely undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed with the exception of railway running lines along the eastern boundary. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS: Connecting paths to core path 189 (Southern Upland Way) and existing pavements required.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: There are positive elements in the landscape framework/design concept. Sections through the site would be helpful to better understand topographical relationships, particularly the lower area of housing which may appear somewhat detached from the higher section. I would query the value/purpose of the open space that would remain (it appears more left over than an integral space within the residential development, and perhaps may benefit from more substantial woodland creation). I would also query the capacity to develop what remains and still provide the level of tree protection and new tree cover. There is also potentially a general lack of connectivity within the development that the linear form of layout would lead to. I would also voice concern that PD rights be removed from the development, which would be akin to applying a Conservation Area level of regulation which I would suggest would be unnecessary. If the layout has the right landscape containment; is of appropriate scale, form, palette; and based on public fronts/private backs and designing streets concepts, then this additional tier of control should not be necessary, or at least should be minimised. Overall, a well-designed development, with good levels of landscaping at its heart, can be devised, but I think the current proposals here will require more detailed scrutiny and further thought.

EDUCATION: Extension or new school may need to be considered.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network.

---

## Overall assessment

MIR status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Alternative	Acceptable	45

### Conclusions

This site has a detailed planning history and has previously been removed from the LDP following Examination by Reporters. This has primarily been in relation to perceived detrimental impacts on the setting and views from Abbotsford House. When considering sites which have been submitted via the call for sites process, which have a detailed planning history, consideration must be given as to any proposed new mitigation matters which have been submitted as part of the proposal. In this instance the plans confirm further screening of the site would be carried out. These proposals confirm the site will not be visible from Abbotsford House during the Summer months and in the Winter months (when Abbotsford House is closed to the public) photomontages have shown that only fleeting views of very small parts of the site could be seen, but proposed housing (i.e. this would be a low density development of 45 units) would not be located within these visible locations. The site is well screened from the A7 and does not interfere at all with any views towards Abbotsford House. The Blueprint for the Railway requires the Council to maximise economic benefits along the railway corridor and finding housing land in Galashiels is a major element of that requirement. Finding housing land in Galashiels is a major challenge given a number of constraints within the town in terms of for example access, flood risk and topography. Officers continue to feel this site remains the best option for new development in the town. It is fully acknowledged that Abbotsford House will continue to have a key role in attracting tourists to the central Scottish Borders and any proposal which is considered to prejudice this position must be thoroughly investigated. However, it is considered any impacts from Abbotsford House will be negligible and the proposal can be incorporated within the MIR for public opinion.

---



# Hawick

<b>Site reference</b> BHAWI003	<b>Site name</b> Gala Law II	<b>Settlement</b> Hawick	<b>RGA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Employment	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> N/A	<b>Ha</b> 0.7	<b>MIR status</b> Preferred
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	--------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is outwith both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. No objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

SEPA: Due to steep topography through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no history of planning applications. The site is currently allocated within the LDP 2016 as part of a mixed use site (MHAWI001).
--	------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	---

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
---	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	---	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site appears to be dense scrub, poor semi-improved grassland and mature broadleaf trees/ garden ground. No obvious connectivity to River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats, badger and breeding birds (0.64ha)

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Not applicable	<b>Open space</b> Not applicable	<b>Listed buildings</b> Not applicable	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Garden and designed</b> Not applicable
--	-------------------------------------	---	---	---	--	--

## Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: Advised verbally that there is potential for archaeology within the site. Archaeology evaluation/mitigation required.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: No comments.

HES: No comments.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

Over 200 metres?

Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: Site is visually well contained and access is good so no issues in principle. The mature trees at the south western end of the site have an important screening function and might be better protected by removing that area from the allocation (unless separately covered in a site development brief)? There could be issues in relation to tree protection / developable area where the site adjoins mature woodland on the south east boundary also.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

ROADS OFFICER: No objections to the allocation of this land for business and industrial use. It is noted that the land is currently zoned for mixed use development. This site will essentially be an extension to the existing business and industrial units at Gala Law. As such the existing infrastructure will need to be extended to incorporate this site. Any development of this land must not preclude access to the remainder of the mixed use site (MHAWI001). A Transport Statement will be required.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No objections.

### Right of way

On/adjacent to site

### TPOs

Adjacent to site

### Contaminated land

On/adjacent to site

### Water supply

Limited

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have been utilised as land associated with Galalaw Farm and includes a sheepwash. The site is brownfield land and its use may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Track HAWI/GL003/1 forms part of the path network in this area and therefore a pavement or other access route providing non-vehicular access along the North edge of the site is required.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Excepting the need for attention to trees, this would be a logical extension to the existing business/industrial land provision within the area.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: The northern site boundary of this allocation needs to be amended and reduced by around 2-3m. The plot was reduced and a new fence erected to allow a vehicular and pedestrian right of access through to additional land to the west. In addition, the SW corner of the site should also be included as it is defined by the boundary ownership with the private house.

EDUCATION: No comments.

HOUSING STRATEGY: No objections.

SEPA: Foul drainage from the development must be connected to the existing SW foul sewer network. Standard comments for SUDS. Depending on the use of the proposed units there may be a requirement for permissions to be sought for certain activities from SEPA.

SCOTTISH WATER: Robertson WTW has sufficient capacity. Please note there is an existing 180mm water main running through the middle of the site. Depending on flow demand for this development, will determine if a Water Impact assessment is required. Hawick WwTW has sufficient capacity. Please note there is existing foul and surface water sewers running along the North of site. Depending on the flow demand for this development, will determine if a Drainage Impact assessment is required.

---

## Overall assessment

MIR status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Preferred	Acceptable	N/A

### Conclusions

The Council's Economic Development Section has highlighted a need for sufficient employment land in Hawick. This is particularly pertinent at this time as funding is available in the forthcoming years from the South of Scotland Economic Partnership as a forerunner to a regional enterprise agency being launched in 2020. Economic Development identified this site as a possibility. The land is currently allocated for mixed use purposes (part of MHAWI001), however, the site represents a logical extension of the existing business and industrial land to the west.

The following issues would require to be addressed during the process of an planning application:

- Consideration is required to be given to surface water
- Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats, badger and breeding birds
- Existing trees to be protected and retained
- A Transport Statement is required. Development must not preclude access to site MHAWI001.
- Potential contamination to be investigated and mitigated
- Footpath link along the northern edge of site is required
- Water and Drainage Impact Assessments may be required
- A water main runs through the middle of the site
- Archaeology evaluation/mitigation required

Overall, it is considered that given the location of this site immediately adjacent to the existing business and industrial site that this site is appropriate for consideration through the Main Issues Report.

---

<b>Site reference</b> BHAWI004	<b>Site name</b> Land to South of Burnhead	<b>Settlement</b> Hawick	<b>RGA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Employment	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> N/A	<b>Ha</b> 5.1	<b>MIR status</b> Preferred
-----------------------------------	---	-----------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------	--------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is outwith both the fluvial (river) 1 in 200 year flood extents but there is a very small pocket of potential surface water impacts on the North Western side of the site at a 1 in 200 year flood event. No objections on the grounds of flood risk. However, would ask that due to surface water risk and the size of the development that surface water flooding is considered and it is ensured that any water would be routed around the housing.

SEPA: There does appear to be a surface water/ combined drains through the site but no evidence of a culverted watercourse can be found. Due to steep topography through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no planning application history for this site. The site was assessed as part of the Local Plan Amendment for housing (AHAWI004).
--	------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	---

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
---	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	---	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site appears to be an arable field with hedgerow, garden ground and mature broadleaf trees on part of boundary. No obvious connectivity to River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats, badger and breeding birds. SEPA CAR construction site licence required (site >4ha) (5.08ha).

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> Not applicable	<b>Open space</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Listed buildings</b> Adjacent to site	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> Not applicable	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> On/adjacent to site	<b>Garden and designed</b> Not applicable
--	---------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	--

## Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: Advised verbally that there is potential for archaeology within the site. Archaeology evaluation/mitigation required.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: As previously flagged, the site lies close to Burnhead Tower, a category B listed tower house. The proposed development may have an impact on its setting, especially if larger buildings are proposed but this can probably be addressed through mitigation.

HES: No comments.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

On/adjacent to site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: Site is included within the Teviot Valleys SLA. It is also highly visible from the A7 Galalaw roundabout close to the direction of view towards Rubers Law. This makes it very sensitive to visual intrusion and does not suggest industrial use. Well-designed housing with ample structure planting would be a more acceptable option.

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: We note that a planning brief in the form of Supplementary Guidance is proposed for nearby allocations at BHAWI001 and BHAWI002. The principles established in this planning brief, such as integrating site planning with other allocations and infrastructure should also apply to this site, ensuring green network connections between allocations and existing areas. This is a prominent site for large scale buildings of the type likely for business/industrial use. The rolling topography perhaps does not easily lend itself to the proposed use. Therefore, development of it could have significant landscape and visual impacts, experienced particularly on the important approach to Hawick from the north. The challenging nature of the site suggests it would benefit from a strategic approach to development layout and landscape mitigation. Design approaches which could reduce impacts include guidance on scale and massing of buildings in prominent positions on the site, the colour and detailing of external appearance and measures needed to provide a landscape framework / green network connections.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: Vehicular access to this site is easily achievable from the B6359 (Lilliesleaf road). The Roads Officer is therefore able to support the proposal for a Business and Industrial allocation for the land. The B6359, beyond the Henderson Road junction, will have to be upgraded in terms of width, footway provision and street lighting and a 30mph speed limit is likely to be required. The site can fully integrate with the existing residential streets to the south by way of possible links to Boonraw Road, Galalaw Road and Burnhead Road. A Transport Statement will be required.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No objections.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Track HAWI/GL003/1 forms part of the path network in this area and therefore a pavement or other access route providing non-vehicular access along the North edge of the site is required. Opportunity to create better pedestrian/cycling access along the B6359 and also to provide connectivity to the A7 and the rest of Burnfoot and the wider path network.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: This site would be suitable for housing or business and industrial land. It is perhaps unfortunate that the identified housing allocation to the west would essentially end up

sandwiched between two industrial areas. This site – BHAWI004 – also appears to be a relatively contained site.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: No objections.

EDUCATION: No comments.

HOUSING STRATEGY: No objections.

SEPA: Foul drainage from the development must be connected to the existing SW foul sewer network. Std comments for SUDS. Depending on the use of the proposed units there may be a requirement for permissions to be sought for certain activities from SEPA.

SCOTTISH WATER: Roberton WTW has sufficient capacity. Please note there is an existing 180mm water main running through the middle of the site. Depending on flow demand for this development, will determine if a Water Impact assessment is required. Hawick WwTW has sufficient capacity. Please note there is existing foul and surface water sewers running along the North of site. Depending on the flow demand for this development, will determine if a Drainage Impact assessment is required.

---

## Overall assessment

MIR status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Preferred	Acceptable	N/A

### Conclusions

The Council's Economic Development Section has highlighted a need for sufficient employment land in Hawick. This is particularly pertinent at this time as funding is available in the forthcoming years from the South of Scotland Economic Partnership as a forerunner to a regional enterprise agency being launched in 2020. Economic Development identified this site as a possibility. Whilst there are concerns relating to the location of the site within the Teviot Valleys SLA, the site is only just within the boundary and it is not considered that the development of the site, with mitigation and high quality design, would have a detrimental impact upon the SLA. The following issues would require to be addressed during the process of an planning application:

- A Planning Brief has been suggested by SNH.
- Issues relating to surface water would require to be addressed.
- Ecological impacts require to be considered with appropriate mitigation where appropriate.
- Burnhead Tower, a category B listed building to the north of the site, must be safeguarded. Mitigation to safeguard the setting is required.
- A Transport Statement is required.
- Improved connectivity is required.
- A Drainage Impact Assessment may be required.

<b>Site reference</b> AHAWI027	<b>Site name</b> Burnfoot (Phase 1)	<b>Settlement</b> Hawick	<b>RGA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 60	<b>Ha</b> 5.0	<b>MIR status</b> Preferred
-----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	--------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:100	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is outwith the fluvial (river) 1 in 200 year flood extents but there are small pockets of potential surface water impacts on the South Eastern side of the site at a 1 in 200 year flood event. No objections on the grounds of flood risk. However, would require that due to surface water risk and the capacity of the development that surface water flooding is considered and it is ensured that any water would be routed around the housing.

SEPA: Historic maps shows a watercourse flowing through the middle of the site which may now be culverted. SEPA require an FRA which assesses the risk from this culverted watercourse. Buildings must not be constructed over an existing drain (including a field drain) that is to remain active. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues at this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes SEPA would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at increased risk of flooding.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> No planning application history. The site was previously considered for a housing allocation within the process of the Housing SG 2017 and is currently shown as a longer term housing site within the LDP 2016.
--	------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> South-west
---	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--	----------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Low impact. Site appears to be an arable field with rank semi-improved grassland / marshy grassland in south-west part of site, scrub and hedgerow and trees on part of the boundary. No obvious connectivity to River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats (EPS), badger and breeding birds. SEPA CAR construction site licence required (site >4ha) (4.95ha)

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located adjacent to Hawick's settlement boundary, at Burnfoot. The site is less than 2 km from Hawick High Street. A wide range of facilities and services are available within Hawick, including a number of key services within Burnfoot. Hawick has regular bus service to several places in the Borders, as well as Edinburgh and Carlisle.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Adjacent to site

### Listed buildings

Adjacent to site

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: Advised verbally that there is potential for archaeology within the site. Archaeology evaluation/mitigation required.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: No listed building or conservation area issues. Appears to be a sensible opportunity filling in the low ground between the Retail Park and the existing residential area. The roofscape will be important as it will be viewed from the higher level of the A7.

HES: No comments.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Adjacent to site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: The site indicated is not all developable. Protection of views to and from surrounding roads, avoidance of steeper ground along NW side and avoidance of wetland area to W of site all limit developable area.

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: SNH's previous advice on this site (in response to the Housing SG): This prominent site lies outwith the current settlement boundary as shown in the LDP but is included as a longer-term safeguard (SHAWI003). Justification for the eastern boundary of the site is unclear – there are no obvious physical features and it appears likely that the site would extend to the field boundary opposite Burnhead. When considered alongside adjacent allocations in the LDP it appears that a design framework for the north of Hawick is required to co-ordinate issues between sites in this area of significant change. If taken forward individually, SNH would strongly advocate a site brief for this site. SNH maintain this position. In addition, SNH highlight the potential for adverse landscape and visual impacts relating to possible intrusion of development on the wider views currently gained towards the hills on this key approach into Hawick. If this site was to be allocated we would advise that close attention should be paid to the settlement edge and to maintaining key views. Providing green infrastructure connections and suitable densities of development on less sensitive parts of the site should be also be considered.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: Access is achievable off the B6359, with pedestrian linkage required to the bus laybys on A7 by the roundabout. A footway will also be required on the north west side of the B6359 to tie-in with A7 footways. Any layout will have to facilitate projections into the adjoining land to the north east (BHAWI001). Whilst there may some benefits in direct vehicular access to the roundabout on the A7 this is unlikely to be supported by Transport Scotland as trunk road authority and it is not an absolute requirement for the development of this site. Any development will have to incorporate the principles of 'Designing Streets' in terms of layout and design and there is an opportunity to create a street-feel onto the B6359. A Transport Assessment will be required for this level of development.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Would like to discuss the access strategy for this site as it appears to be located adjacent to the A7 trunk road.

STRATEGIC TRANSPORT OFFICER: Opportunity to create better pedestrian/cycling access along the B6359 and also to provide connectivity to the A7 and the rest of Burnfoot.



**Right of way**

Not applicable

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

On site

**Water supply**

Yes

**Sewerage**

Yes

**Gas Supply**

Yes

**Education provision**

Good

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed with the exception of a water course intersecting the site. This appears to have subsequently been infilled. The site is brownfield land and its use may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Track HAWI/GL003/1 forms part of the path network in this area and therefore a pavement or other access route providing non-vehicular access along the North edge of the site is required. Opportunity to create better pedestrian/cycling access along the B6359 and also to provide connectivity to the A7 and the rest of Burnfoot and the wider path network

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: The landscaping of the boundary of this site would be highly significant given its presence within a 'gateway' approach to Hawick on the A7. The development of this land would appear liable to set off a drift towards the NE in the land between the two roads.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Some landscape separation may be required as a development condition between this site and allocation BHAWI001.

EDUCATION: No comments.

HOUSING STRATEGY: No objections.

NHS: No comments received.

SEPA: Foul drainage from the development must be connected to the existing SW foul sewer network. Standard comments for SUDS.

**Overall assessment****MIR status**

Preferred

**Overall assessment**

Acceptable

**Site capacity**

60

**Conclusions**

This site is currently identified as having longer term housing potential in the LDP. Although the site sits outwith the Hawick LDP boundary it is effectively encircled by the town on all sides, including to the north-east of the site, which is allocated for employment use.

The site's relationship with Hawick is acceptable, but careful consideration of that NE boundary and connectivity and boundary treatment between the sites is required. Accessibility within the town, and to neighbouring towns is good.

In landscape terms, the site is acceptable but not all will be developable. Protection of views and attention to the site's boundary to the NE will be required. Up to half the site could need to be given over to landscaping or SUDS, or lost due to being steeply sloping ground on the periphery of the site. Although the LDP longer term site has a capacity of 100 units this does not account for these constraints. In practice the site capacity is around 60 units.

A Flood Risk Assessment is required in order to assess the risk from a watercourse which is understood to run through the site and may be culverted. Consideration should be given to the potential for surface water runoff in the south of the site, as per SEPA's 1 in 200 year surface water flood risk mapping.

There are no significant biodiversity issues, but mitigation for protected species would be required and may be necessary. There is potential for on-site play provision. Archaeology evaluation/mitigation required.

In summary, there are no constraints to development and the site should be included within the MIR.

Overall, the site was considered as a alternative site within the Draft Housing SG and further to public consultation, the site will not be included within the Finalised Housing SG.

---

# Jedburgh

<b>Site reference</b> AJEDB018	<b>Site name</b> Land east of Howdenburn Court II	<b>Settlement</b> Jedburgh	<b>RGA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 20	<b>Ha</b> 1.2	<b>MIR status</b> Preferred
-----------------------------------	--	-------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	--------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

There are no initial constraints on the site which would preclude it from being developed.

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is outwith both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. Due to the size of the development I'd recommend surface water runoff be considered.

SEPA: Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues in this area. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no relevant planning history on the site.
--	------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> South
---	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Low impact. Site appears to be rank neutral grassland with areas of scrub and remnant hedgerow and garden ground on the boundary. No obvious connectivity with River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the east of Howdenburn Court. It is approximately 500m east of Jedburgh town centre (direct measurement) where a range of local services, bus connections to the wider region, and employment opportunities exist. It is located within walking distance of the Hartrigge Park industrial area. Biodiversity impact is low.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

On site/adjacent to

### Listed buildings

Adjacent to site

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Adjacent to site

### Garden and designed

Not applicable

## Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There are no known archaeological issues.

HERITAGE & DESIGN OFFICER: From a built heritage perspective, there are designations either within or close to this site.

HES: Robust application of national and appropriate local policies should be able to mitigate any potential adverse impacts on heritage assets, and do not have any specific comments to offer. For those sites which are considered to be preferred or reasonable alternatives for allocation in LDP2, the environmental assessment should consider the likely effects and identify site specific mitigation where negative effects are identified.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Allocating this site could improve the integration and deliverability of existing LDP allocations. For this reason it would be a good idea to add this section to the overall development area at the east of Jedburgh. However, any allocation would have to integrate with, rather than necessarily be prioritised over, the existing allocations.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: The extended northern part of the site has a width and depth that would allow development. Reflecting the density of adjacent housing to south and west this part of the site might accommodate up to 20 houses/ apartments.

SNH: Site appears to be infill between existing housing at Howdenburn Court and allocation RJ2B. The adopted Planning Brief for Lochend identifies pedestrian links between RJ2B and Howdenburn Court. These links should be designed into any allocation at AJEDB018. Design and landscape principles set out in the Planning Brief should be applied to this site.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: No comments.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments received.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: As always, the capacity of Oxnam Road to take additional traffic, without alternative access means, is a matter of concern. That said, this area of land is relatively small and effectively represents a missing link between the existing housing and the housing allocations RJ30B and RJ2B. I am therefore able to support this proposal however given the geometry of the site; it would be better served as part of/in conjunction with the adjoining sites rather than a stand-alone site. Pedestrian and cycle linkage would be required with Howden Park and Howdenburn Court.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Average

### Near a trunk road?

## Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: An area of the site appears to extend into a former refuse tip, the site also houses a former quarry which appears to have been infilled. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Path link to housing development for non-vehicular access. To paths and roads in current application 16/01587/FUL to south to allow continued use of right of way BR259. Also non-vehicular path link to recreational ground to North of area.

EDUCATION: No comments.

HOUSING STRATEGY: No comment - SHIP 2018 shows that there is development, by Eildon Housing Association at Howdenburn Dr programmed for 2019-2020.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Roberton WTW has sufficient capacity as does the water network. Jedburgh WwTW has sufficient capacity as does the waste network for foul only flows.

SEPA: Foul must connect to SW foul sewer network.

---

## Overall assessment

MIR status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Preferred	Acceptable	20

## Conclusions

There are no constraints that rule out development. The site is currently disused agricultural land/scrubland with desire lines/ unadopted paths crossing it. The site would have to be considered within the wider supplementary planning guidance for the development of adjoining allocated housing sites ref RJ30B and RJ2B. Vehicular access to the site would be required from one or both of these sites. The developer states that access/permeability will be greatly enhanced by the allocation, but this is debatable as the site is already used informally for movement around the area and for recreation.

The following issues will require to be considered:

- Surface water run-off would require to be considered
  - Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds
  - Contamination requires to be investigated
  - Path link to housing development for non-vehicular access. To paths and roads in current application 16/01587/FUL to south to allow continued use of right of way BR259. Also non-vehicular path link to recreational ground to North of area.
  - The site would be better served as part of/in conjunction with the adjoining sites rather than a stand-alone site. Pedestrian and cycle linkage would be required with Howden Park and Howdenburn Court.
-

# Melrose

<b>Site reference</b> AMELR013	<b>Site name</b> Harmony Hall Gardens	<b>Settlement</b> Melrose	<b>RGA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 20	<b>Ha</b> 0.8	<b>MIR status</b> Alternative
-----------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	----------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT: A portion of this site is within SEPA's 1 in 200 year flood map of the River Tweed. A Flood Risk Assessment would require to be undertaken.

SEPA: Require an FRA which assesses the risk from the River Tweed. There was previously a mill lade which flowed along the northern boundary which will also require consideration.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> 10/00158/LBC - Alterations to wall to widen access and erection of gates - Withdrawn 10/00159/FUL - Alterations to wall to widen access and erection of gates - Approved subject to conditions and informative
--	------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	---

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
---	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	---	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site appears to be improved grassland, (old orchard?) and garden ground, mature broad-leaved trees and stone wall on the boundary. Stone built, slate-roofed building within site potential for bats (EPS) and breeding birds. Some potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC/SSSI via run off to burn/lade to east. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including bats (EPS) and breeding birds.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b> On site	<b>Open space</b> Not applicable	<b>Listed buildings</b> On/adjacent to site	<b>Scheduled Monument</b> On/adjacent to site	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b> Not applicable	<b>Archaeology</b> On/adjacent to site	<b>Garden and designed</b> Not applicable
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--	--	---	---	--

## Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: The eastern 1/3 of the site is within the Melrose Abbey Scheduled Monument Area. Any development proposals would need to satisfy HES requirements and Policy EP8. The western 2/3 are within an area of high archaeological potential because of the proximity to the SM, and discoveries previously made nearby. Proposals outside the SM would require archaeological evaluation. All proposals would need to respect the setting of the SM.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: Lies within Melrose conservation area and close to the category B listed Harmony House and the category C listed former stables and St Marys School. There may be some scope for small scale redevelopment within the site, but any development will need to be kept low in height and respect the character of the conservation area.

HES: Development of this site, which is partially within SM90124 Melrose Abbey would raise issues of national significance. The eastern and northern edges of the proposed development site overlap into, and directly adjoin parts of the scheduled monument. No development directly affecting (i.e. within the boundary of) the scheduled monument would be permitted. Consequently, any development of this site would need to avoid the monument entirely and retain it in an appropriate setting. HES consider that the proposed level of development would be likely to affect the setting of the monument. Additionally, there are significant known unscheduled archaeological remains in the area and development of this site would be likely to encounter unscheduled archaeological remains. The Council's archaeological adviser should be consulted for further advice on this.

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: The site lies within the Eildon & Leaderfoot Hills NSA. While well contained, the site makes an important contribution to the character of St Mary's Road. The boundary wall, mature trees and orchard combine to give a strong sense of place. SNH have concerns regarding the allocation of the site as shown in the shapefiles provided with this consultation. Our advice is that the western, slightly elevated, area of orchard should be retained and enhanced through the creation of a new orchard around the remaining trees. Other existing assets such as the boundary wall on the south edge and the mature beeches on the north edge should also be retained for their contribution to sense of place. Promoting higher density of development within the remainder of the site could create a development that is in keeping with the wider area, establishing a place that could be adaptable for all stages of life and which is well connected to the town centre. SNH would wish to ensure that if this site is to be allocated within the NSA that a site brief is produced to identify the key natural heritage assets of the site to be protected and the key opportunities for the integration of green infrastructure within future development. Modification to the proposed extent of the allocation would avoid or reduce likely natural heritage impacts.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

On/adjacent to site

### SLA

Not applicable

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

## Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: A mix of house types, from detached / semi-detached to terraced/ courtyard developments but limited to 1½ storeys to reflect the style and scale of surrounding residential properties and buildings. It is important that the 'genius loci' is retained and enhanced by a high quality development with attention to building pattern and detail.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is constrained within the Development and Landscape Capacity Study (March 2007) which states that the site is within the 'Level Fields' character area which is limited by the contribution it makes to the historic setting of the Abbey and other nearby buildings, and to the setting of the River Tweed, which is characterised by its lack of immediate development.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: Existing roads infrastructure not ideal in this area.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: No objections to the principle of housing on this site, however, there are some issues to resolve: The carriageway in St Mary's Road is only around 4.5m wide, with a roadside wall on the north side, so that two-way traffic flow is very difficult. Furthermore, the wall is of a height that it would not afford safe junction visibility for any new junctions unless it was lowered or set back. A solution could be to lower the wall in height and to form at least two new junctions which would double up as passing opportunities. Some concerns regarding the pedestrian network surrounding the site. The existing route to the town centre via Abbey Street is particularly narrow in parts and arrangements for pedestrians at the junction of St Mary's Road with Abbey Street are poor. The site serves as a

pedestrian way between the private school and the sports fields as well as a pedestrian way between Melrose and Gattonside any development on the site would need to respect this and incorporate such movement. A Transport Statement can address all of the issues raised.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No comments.

#### Right of way

Not applicable

#### TPOs

On/adjacent to sit

#### Contaminated land

Not applicable

#### Water supply

Yes

#### Sewerage

Yes

#### Gas Supply

Yes

#### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have been developed as a residential property with associated garden ground. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: No comments.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Appears to be a logical addition within the development boundary but is an attractive area of parkland. A high quality, low density development would be required as the site is within the Conservation Area. Archaeological/Scheduled Ancient Monument implications. Potential impact on the setting of the Listed Building. Access along St Mary's Road may be a problem.

EDUCATION: No objections.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. A Flow and Pressure test is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. Surface water sewer just within site boundary.

SEPA: Foul water must connect to the existing SW foul network. It appears that the mill lade may be culverted through this development site. Opportunities should be taken to de-culvert this as part of any development.

---

## Overall assessment

#### MIR status

Alternative

#### Overall assessment

Acceptable

#### Site capacity

20

### Conclusions

There are clearly sensitive issues which require to be addressed such as the location of the site within the Conservation Area and its proximity to listed buildings. The eastern third of the site is within the Melrose Abbey Scheduled Monument Area and would be excluded from development. Furthermore, archaeological remains are likely within the remainder of the site which would require investigation. It is likely an acceptable access on the western part of the site could be formed with minimal disturbance to the existing walls. It is considered that the development of this sensitive site would be acceptable in principle subject to the following:

- A Flood Risk Assessment is required which should take cognisance of a mill lade which previously flowed along the northern boundary and the River Tweed.
- Retain and protect the existing boundary features and trees, where possible
- Assessment of ecology impacts and provision of mitigation, as appropriate
- Mitigation required to ensure no significant adverse effects upon integrity of River Tweed Special Area of Conservation
- Archaeological assessment (including archaeological evaluation) is required, with any associated mitigation as identified
- Development must respect the setting of the Scheduled Monument. No development within the Melrose Abbey Scheduled Monument (SM90124) would be permitted
- The design and layout of the site should take account of the Conservation Area, the setting of the Scheduled Monuments and trees on/adjacent to the site



- Access to the site should be in a location which results in the least disruption to the existing stone wall along the southern boundary of the site. A Transport Statement would be required
  - Existing trees/hedging within and on the boundaries of the site must be retained and protected
  - In order to safeguard the character of the Conservation Area and adjacent listed buildings, dwellinghouses should be restricted to single storey.
-

# Selkirk

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR status
<b>ASELK040</b>	Philiphaugh Mill	Selkirk	Central	Housing	19	1.7	<b>Alternative</b>

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
1:200	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: Dependent on SEPA's building behind defences stance.

SEPA: Due to the site being in a sparsely developed area and a proposed increase in sensitivity from commercial to residential we do not consider that it meets with the requirements of Scottish Planning Policy and our position is unlikely to change. We have a shared duty with Scottish Ministers and other responsible authorities under the Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009 to reduce overall flood risk and promote sustainable flood risk management. The cornerstone of sustainable flood risk management is the avoidance of flood risk in the first instance. Therefore, we require that this site is removed from the Local Development Plan.

SEPA previously required the removal of this site during the LDP consultation process in February 2014 and July 2016. Prior to the 2008 Local Plan, SEPA had indicated that the site was unsuitable for residential development. Therefore, SEPA has always had a consistent view regarding this site. SEPA attended a meeting with Scottish Borders Council representatives in November 2015 to discuss the Scottish Government Reporter findings. The Reporter had agreed with SEPA and recommended removal of this allocation. The 2013 Proposed Plan which was adopted in May 2016, included the Philiphaugh Mill redevelopment site, which was contrary to SEPA's and the Scottish Governments Reporter's recommendations. The previous Proposed Plan made no mention of flood risk within the Site Requirements. The Site Requirements did state that "The Redevelopment opportunity at Philiphaugh Mill is for housing use". As part of the November 2015 meeting, SBC pointed out that for the site at Philiphaugh Mill (then Zro200) SEPA could have objected to the housing part of the proposal rather than ask for the removal of the site. The allocation is consistently being promoted as housing and as such the council have not altered the land use.

Review of the SEPA Flood Map shows that the entire site boundary of ASELK040 lies entirely within the estimated 1 in 200 year functional floodplain of the Ettrick Water. In addition, there is a mill lade which flows through the site which poses an additional flood risk to the site.

The Ettrick Water has a well documented history of flooding. It is also well documented that the site flooded on the 31st of October 1977 in the book "Troubled Waters – Recalling the Floods of '77". "At the top of Ettrickhaugh Road, Kendal Fish Farm was flooded out and subsequently many thousands of rainbow trout were released into the river. The following day was a boom time for the local anglers". "Many houses in Ettrickhaugh Road, opposite Selkirk RFC, had to be abandoned and the only escape route for one unfortunate man trapped upstairs in the rugby club premises was via a rowing boat! A short distance away, the swollen waters meant the loss of 70,000 rainbow trout from Kendal Fish Farm, valued at £20,000." Philip Edgar, the former manager at Kendal Fish Farm is quoted as saying "A couple of thousand fish were lost from the farm. It was mainly the big fish that got washed away into people's gardens and the rugby pitch – they were everywhere". The site is also within the flood envelope of the 1977 flood as produced by Crouch & Hogg on behalf of Borders Regional Council.

SEPA acknowledge that the Selkirk Flood Prevention Scheme will reduce the risk of flooding to Selkirk, including to site ASELK040 Philiphaugh Mill. However, the primary purpose of a flood protection scheme is to protect existing development from flooding rather than facilitate new development.

The latest development planning/ management guidance published by SEPA (<https://www.sepa.org.uk/media/162837/lups-bp-gu2a-land-use-planning-background-paper-on-flood-risk.pdf>) on development behind defences clearly states that a precautionary approach should be taken to proposed allocations in areas protected by a flood protection scheme. Defences can be breached or overtopped leading to a scenario that can be significantly worse than if there are no defences present as flooding can be sudden, unexpected and floodwater trapped behind defences can extend the period of inundation which can lead to greater damage. FPS have a finite design life, which may be less than that of the proposed and future development.

Scottish Planning Policy (paragraph 263) states that in medium to high risk areas (greater than 0.5% annual probability of coastal or watercourse flooding); “May be suitable for residential, institutional, commercial and industrial development within built-up areas provided flood protection measures to the appropriate standard already exist and are maintained, are under construction, or are a planned measure in a current flood risk management plan.” We consider this site to be within a sparsely developed area and based on the risk framework, these areas are generally not suitable for additional development unless a location is essential for operational reasons.

In summary, the housing allocation for 19 units is in a sparsely developed area and as the proposed development would be an increase in sensitivity from commercial to residential. In line with our SEPA position on development behind formal FPSs, development in this area would add to the overall area at risk and would therefore be contrary to the policy principles of Scottish Planning Policy and the aspirations of the Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act. However, SEPA would be supportive of redevelopment of the site for a similar commercial use.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b>	<b>Planning history references</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Brownfield	There is no planning application history relating to the site. The site has previously been allocated within the Consolidated Local Plan 2011 as a redevelopment opportunity (zRO200).

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b>	<b>Access to employment</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b>	<b>Site aspect</b>
Good	Good	Good	Moderate	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGICAL OFFICER: Moderate risk - existing built structures (textile mill) have potential to support protected species such as bats (EPS) and breeding birds. Site contains trees and scrub and derelict buildings adjacent to mill lade, potential connectivity to Ettrick water (River Tweed SAC/SSSI) (protected species interest may include bats, badger and breeding birds). Mitigation required to ensure no significant adverse effects on integrity of River Tweed SAC.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	On/adjacent to site	Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: The site is partly within the Inventory Battlefield of Philiphaugh. Mitigation will be required. Development must respect the setting of the battlefield.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN OFFICER: Although not listed, the remains of the former mill, including structures, former wheel pit and lade, are of historic significance, any development should take account of these features.

HES: No comments.

## Landscape assessment

**NSA**  
Not applicable

**SLA**  
Adjacent to site

**Over 200 metres?**

**Over 12 degree slope**

**Wild Land**  
Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: Trees along mill lades, especially along north and east boundaries should be protected from development as they have a screening and amenity value. Building survey should be undertaken to assess cultural and historic value of remaining buildings. Need to explore potential to make direct pedestrian link onto footpath that runs along south and west boundary site. Perimeter trees and scrub have ecological value and should be retained and supplemented. Capacity is dependent on ability to convert some of the better quality mill buildings and infill development. A capacity of approximately 15-20 does not seem inappropriate for an ex-industrial site where density could be higher than surrounding area. The site has potential to be an interesting combination of building conversion, retaining the more attractive buildings, supplemented by infill development in keeping with the character of the site.

SNH: No comment, redevelopment of existing sites.

Scottish Natural Heritage: No comments.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

**Near a trunk road?**

NETWORK MANAGER: No comments.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING TEAM: No objections to the site being zoned for housing. Some minor widening of Ettrickhaugh Road will be required to mitigate the increase in traffic movements. Access to the site will require a new bridge over the Ettrickhaugh Burn. Given that the site only has one realistic point of access, any proposal will need to provide a well-connected layout internally with a potential link to the adjacent site to the north east if that site is also to be allocated for housing. Pedestrian/cycle links will also be required to take advantage of the new riverside path which has been constructed as part of the Selkirk Flood Prevention Scheme.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No comments.

**Right of way**  
On/adjacent to site

**TPOs**  
Not applicable

**Contaminated land**  
On site

**Water supply**  
Yes

**Sewerage**  
Yes

**Gas Supply**  
Yes

**Education provision**  
Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have been developed as a woollen mill. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development constraints.

COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM: Non-vehicular access required to existing pavements and links to existing path network.

EDUCATION: No objections.

NHS: No comments received.

SCOTTISH WATER: Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. A Flow and Pressure test is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. Selkirk WwTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the network.

SEPA: Mill lade which went through old fish farm runs through the site. This would need to be protected to maintain flow and protect water quality. There should be no culverting for land gain. Foul water should be connected to the SW foul sewer network. SEPA is aware that there is made ground on the site (filling in of old fish tanks) which could contain unsuitable materials (ie be considered contaminated land).

---

## Overall assessment

MIR status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Alternative	Acceptable	19

### Conclusions

SEPA object to the allocation of the site on flooding grounds on the grounds that the site is in a sparsely developed area and there would be and an increase in sensitivity from commercial to residential. SEPA do not consider that the site meets the requirements of SPP and they advise that their position is unlikely to change. SEPA require that the site is removed from the LDP. These matters have been discussed with the Council's Flood and Coastal Management Team and the Senior Project Manager of the Selkirk Flood Protection Scheme. As part of the Selkirk Flood Protection Scheme, a final 'as built' model run will be undertaken of the scheme to determine actual risk. This will confirm the actual standard of protection. It is expected that this will be undertaken by the end of August 2018 and thereafter analysed. This information will then be conveyed to SEPA for their information and further comments. This site is therefore suggested as an 'alternative' site at this point in time, due to the outstanding objection raised by SEPA. This is, however, subject to ongoing discussion and will be reported further in the Proposed Plan. It should be noted that the Council considers that this site is part of the built up area which satisfies the terms of SEPA's 'Planning Information Note 4: SEPA Position on development protected by a Flood Protection Scheme' and does not consider that this is an argument SEPA should be contending.

Moderate risk to biodiversity. Mitigation required relating to River Tweed SAC. It is considered that the site relates well to the existing settlement at this location. Setting of historic battlefield to be considered. Accessibility to local services is acceptable. The site has the potential to be an interesting combination of building conversion with infill development in keeping with the character of the site. An acceptable access arrangement is achievable. Pedestrian/cycle links required. Potential contamination issues. WTW local network issues possible.

---

# Smailholm

<b>Site reference</b> ASMAI002	<b>Site name</b> Land at West Third	<b>Settlement</b> Smailholm	<b>RGA</b> Central	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 5	<b>Ha</b> 1.2	<b>MIR status</b> Preferred
-----------------------------------	--	--------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	--------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

There are no initial constraints on the site which would preclude it from being developed.

FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is outwith both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk. However, dependent on the amount of properties, we may want to see surface water runoff managed on site.

SEPA: Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map shows that there may be flooding issues in this area. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> On site	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no relevant planning history on the site.
--	------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Limited	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Limited	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
--	--	--------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Low impact. Site appears to be rank improved pasture with areas of scrub in site and garden ground on the boundary. No obvious connectivity with River Tweed SAC/SSSI. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species including breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Kelso and Melrose are both around 6 miles (10 mins drive) Galashield is 11 miles (20 mins drive). Aside from a village hall and church, there are very few facilities in Smailholm and residents rely on nearby towns for all daily services. As an attractive conservation village, there has been demand for small scale growth in Smailholm. The village does fall within the Central Borders Rural Growth Area but would not represent a suitable location for development other than that which allows for a steady, organic, growth of the village. With this in mind, it might be appropriate to alter the settlement boundary in order to allow for this in future, in a way which does not compromise the setting and Conservation Area status of the village and at a scale that is appropriate for a small isolated village with few facilities. There are only minor ecological risks associated with a redrawing of the settlement boundary at the West Third of Smailholm.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On/adjacent to site

### Garden and designed

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY: The medieval village of Smailholm was formerly much more more extensive. 18th century historic mapping shows it to have extended along the main road at least as far west as West Third. By the middle of the 19th century the village had shrunk to its current size. It is likely that archaeological deposits linked to medieval and post-medieval occupation of this site will exist. Mitigation will be necessary.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Smailholm currently comprises two separate small settlements; the East Third with the church being larger and this is designated as a conservation area. The West Third is quite separate. I am not opposed to the potential expansion of West Third provided that there is no coalescence with East Third.

HES: No comments.

GENERAL COMMENTS: An allocation, via a redrawing of the development boundary at West Third, allowing for 5 units, could be accommodated in terms of impacting on the existing settlement. Smailholm East Third is a Conservation Area. There is a requirement to avoid the coalescence of the two separate parts of the village, and this proposal would not threaten that.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

On site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: There is adverse landscape or visual impact associated with amending the development boundary of the western part of Smailholm. The development of an informal footpath from the west part to the main Smailholm settlement should be considered as a measure to improve the amenities of the village.

SNH: No comment due to nature of the proposal. However, it should be noted that this consultation was based on an original proposal without an indicative site capacity and only to alter the settlement boundary.

The relevant Tweed Lowlands Local Landscape Area management recommendation is for 'careful management of development at settlement edges.' The West Third of Smailholm sits in low lying flat arable farmland landscape. Existing houses are spread out along the main road in an unplanned fashion. There is scope for self build plots of varying sizes, with appropriate boundary treatment, to respond to the existing settlement pattern and its place within the local landscape.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

NETWORK MANAGER: The site may impact on the existing 30 mph limit position.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No comments.

ROADS PLANNING MANAGER: I have no objections to this development boundary amendment. If this part of Smailholm is to eventually join up with the main part of Smailholm then consideration should be given to this being properly planned to allow proper infrastructure to be provided i.e. street lighting, footway provision and an extension of the 30 mph speed limit.

### Near a trunk road?

**Right of way**

Not applicable

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

Not applicable

**Water supply**

Yes

**Sewerage**

Limited

**Gas Supply**

No

**Education provision**

Average

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

**CONTAMINATED LAND:** The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

**COUNTRYSIDE ACCESS TEAM:** Opportunity to provide pedestrian path.

**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT:** Investigate waste water capacity. Boundary requirement? Need for pavements and public roads.

**EDUCATION:** No comments.

**NHS:** No comments received.

**SCOTTISH WATER:** Waste: Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WwTW. Water: Robertson WTW has sufficient capacity. Please note there are Water mains within site. Depending on how many units this site includes will determine if further investigation required.

**SEPA:** Consideration should be given to extending the sewer network into this part of the village to incorporate this and the existing houses in the west end as there is no nearby watercourse to receive a sewage discharge. There are a number of existing private sewage discharges to soakaway and hence any proposed new discharges to soakaway may impact groundwater.

**GENERAL COMMENTS:** There are no constraints which should rule out development of five units on the West Third of Smailholm. There is a need to confirm waste water treatment capacity when the final number of units and program for delivery is confirmed. The allocation would be for a maximum of five units to be provided through self build plots and so it is expected that these will be built out privately, demand-led, rather than developer-delivered. Roads planning service have raised the potential need for linking the East and West Third in future. This would not be an objective present because of the need to consider coalescence and viability of development for five units. However, the specific roads planning service requirement should be clarified before a decision is made.

**Overall assessment****MIR status**

Preferred

**Overall assessment**

Acceptable

**Site capacity**

5

**Conclusions**

Smailholm is in the Central Borders Rural Growth Area. It is a settlement with none of the services that are required on a daily basis and so residents rely on neighbouring Kelso, Melrose, St Boswells. It is a distinctive settlement and this is reflected in its Conservation Area status. An allocation of five units would be appropriate in a settlement of this size and function.

The site, and settlement, could only accommodate 5 units. Given the size of Smailholm a 5 unit allocation would be appropriate. The proposal suggests that self-build plots would be likely, rather than developer-led build out. There is a question around marketability in this location, however, a small scale allocation such as this in terms of balancing plan deliverability and allowing for small scale rural settlement growth appears appropriate to consider in the MIR.

There is a need for further investigation around WWTW. There is a need for archaeological investigation as records show that the village's West Third and East Third were once conjoined. In design terms, the existing settlement pattern and architectural heritage in the West Third of Smailholm is varied with individual non-uniform plots and buildings, but new development should recognise the pattern of stone dyke frontages and the traditional building styles that exist. Roads have called for "consideration of proper infrastructure to be provided i.e. street lighting, footway provision and an extension of the 30 mph speed limit.

The site should go forward for consideration in the MIR as an preferred site.



# Northern HMA

## Cardrona

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR status
<b>SCARD002</b>	Land at Nether Horsburgh	Cardrona	Western	Long Term Mixed Use	N/A	23.8	<b>Preferred</b>

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

The site is not located within any international/national designation. However, the River Tweed SAC and SSSI lies to the south of the site, on the opposite side of the road.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourses which flow through and adjacent to the site as well as the River Tweed. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site which may exacerbate flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Site may be constrained due to flood risk.

There are multiple watercourses throughout the site. There is the potential that the development of this allocation could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard at this site. SEPA advise that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

Foul drainage should be connected to the SW foul network at Cardrona stw (the site is outwith the currently sewered area). Options for private drainage on site do not appear to be feasible. Std comments for SUDS. The small watercourses running through/alongside the development should be safeguarded and enhanced as part of any development. Depending on the use of any proposed units there may be a requirement for permissions to be sought for certain activities from SEPA.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with the fluvial 1 in 200 year flood extents. This site is shown to be affected by surface water flooding in some small areas in the North of the site. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk but would ask that surface water runoff be considered.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	There is no planning application history within the site. Housing SG: As part of the SG, a smaller site overlapping this one was considered for mixed use development (MCARD008). LDP: As part of the LDP, a much larger site was considered for mixed use development (MPPEEB005).

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

### Access to public transport

Good

### Access to employment

Good

### Access to services

Good

### Wider biodiversity impacts

Moderate

### Site aspect

South

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Moderate biodiversity impact. Site appears to be improved pasture with areas of scrub on parts of the boundary and a small coniferous plantation within part of the site. Pond located outside western boundary. Oystercatcher and curlew are recorded in Tetrad NT33E and NT23Z. Potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC/ SSSI via drains. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially badger and breeding birds. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC/SSSI. SEPA CAR construction site licence required (site >4ha 23.78ha)

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located adjacent to the A72 and is a short walking distance from Cardrona. The site is a potential longer term mixed use allocation. Cardrona has good access to public transport, services and employment. Furthermore, good bus connections to Edinburgh and Galashiels. Consideration will need to be given to how active travel between the site and the village of Cardrona will be achieved.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Adjacent to site

### Scheduled Monument

Adjacent to site

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Adjacent to site

### Garden and designed

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Remote site in a very prominent position would have a significant impact on the Tweed Valley.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Potential to impact on setting of SM 3118: Nether Horsburgh, Castle. There may be potential for development within this area, but without suitable evaluation it is not possible to determine impact and mitigate in line with policy.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Spoke to the Officer and they advised that there is potential for archaeology within the site.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

On/adjacent to site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: Our previous advice on this site (in response to the Housing SG) - This site lies outwith the current settlement boundary as shown in the LDP and is within a Special Landscape Area. Due to its physical separation there is little relationship of this site to Cardrona or to Peebles and it appears likely that development here would essentially involve the creation of another new village. Due to the prominence and location of this site here is a high potential for adverse landscape and visual impacts within the SLA, even with mitigation. The overall assessment in Appendix 10 of the Housing SG was that the site is unacceptable due to high potential for adverse landscape and visual impacts and the need for a solution to access issues. We are not aware that mitigation has been identified that would address either of these issues and maintain our previous advice regarding the physical separation of this allocation and its potential landscape and visual impacts.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: If a Masterplanning exercise can demonstrate that this site on the north side of the A72 can successfully be connected to the Cardrona settlement to the south of the A72 and the Tweed, and that a scheme of mitigation planting would avoid diminishing the quality of this part of the Tweed valley SLA, this site has potential as a mixed use development. The re-alignment of A72 might help to create a development more unified with the existing settlement to the south.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: No response received.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: This site has previously been considered for mixed use development. The difficulty of developing this site is the fact that the A72 runs along the southern boundary of this site with Cardrona being located on the opposite side of the main arterial route linking the Central Borders with the west and beyond. Any allocation of this site would have to include fundamental changes to drastically change the characteristics of the A72 through this area. The idea would be to make the A72 more of a high street rather than bypassing or dividing Cardrona. By creating a high street with dual frontage, this would allow a reduction in the traffic speed limit and help integrate both sides of the A72 into one settlement. A Transport Assessment will be required for this level of development. Master planning of the site would also be required to ensure phasing of the development is carried out in a satisfactory manner. For a development of this scale, consideration should be given to the appropriate infrastructure and amenities required to serve this site and the existing settlement profile of Cardrona, such as retail opportunities and possibly a new school. In summary, developing this site is possible but will require careful planning and a significant investment in infrastructure to create a cohesive and safe residential environment which can sustain this level of development.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No response received.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Limited

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No response received.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. Depending on the flow demand for this development, will determine if a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. Please note there is an existing 100mm water main running along side of site. Depending on flow demand for this development, will determine if a Water Impact Assessment (WIA) is required.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Requires non-vehicular links to path network and Peebles town and amenities.

CONTAMINATED LAND: There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: It is desirable for business premises to generally be on flat land as the building footprint is generally larger than residential, so this site affords an opportunity to accommodate future business premises so close to an existing small settlement. The location provides the opportunity for integration of developments with a properly thought out layout and modern design.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

### MIR status

Preferred

### Overall assessment

Acceptable

### Site capacity

N/A

### Conclusions

The site comprises a large, flat area to the north of the A72, at Cardrona. The site was identified as part of the 'Western Rural Growth Area: Development Options Study' which was undertaken by LUC, to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Central Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP and for the future, within the Tweeddale area, in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders. The site currently being considered is proposed for a longer term mixed use development site.

Cardrona has good access to services, employment and public transport. Further to a site assessment, the following constraints/issues were identified, which may require mitigation;

- Flood Risk Assessment required, in respect of potential flood risk and surface water runoff on the site;
- Multiple watercourses within the site, therefore a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6m wide must be provided between the watercourse and any built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures;
- Foul sewerage constraints, as the site is located outwith the current sewered catchment;
- Potential connectivity to the River Tweed SAC/SSSI, mitigation required to ensure no likely significant effects;
- Protect and enhance the existing boundary features;
- Potential protected species, including breeding birds within the site, would require mitigation;
- Scheduled Monument 'Nether Horsburgh Castle' is located to the north east of this site, this would require appropriate mitigation measures;
- Potential for archaeology within the site;
- The site is located within a prominent location and would be visible from the A72;
- Located within the 'Tweed Valley' Special Landscape Area;
- SNH advise that there is the potential for adverse landscape and visual impacts within the SLA, as a result of any development. However, the Council's Landscape Officers advise that development on this site could be acceptable subject to a scheme of mitigation and masterplanning, which would avoid diminishing the quality of this part of the Tweed Valley SLA;
- The Roads Planning Officer does not raise any objections to the development of this site. However, advises that any proposal would include fundamental changes to drastically change the characteristic of the A72 through this area;
- Transport Assessment would be required;
- Non vehicular link would be required, linking to the path network and Peebles town & amenities;
- Potential for Drainage Impact Assessment, in respect of the WWTW; and
- Potential for Water Impact Assessment, in respect of the WTW.

It is acknowledged that this site, albeit smaller, was assessed as part of the Housing SG for a mixed use development. The site was ultimately not included within the Housing SG as it was considered there were more preferable sites and the site assessment concluded that there were a number of constraints and there was the potential for adverse landscape and visual impacts within the SLA, even with mitigation. Since this assessment, a more extensive and detailed study of the Tweeddale area has been undertaken by LUC, in order to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Tweeddale. This site was one option put forward for consideration, in respect of a longer term mixed use site. A re-assessment has therefore been undertaken, in light of the additional information contained within the LUC Study. It should also be noted that there are a lack of suitable development opportunities within the Tweeddale area going forward. Many sites need to be re-visited in order to find further development land.

Overall, taking the above into consideration, there are a number of constraints identified within and adjacent to the site. However, it is not considered that any of these constraints are insurmountable and could be mitigated, subject to appropriate site requirements. There are aspects which would require further investigation, such as the road infrastructure and layout. However, given the longer term nature of this allocation, it is considered that this allows time to look further into the constraints and mitigation measures in more detail, including potential masterplanning of the site.

In conclusion, the longer term mixed use site will be taken forward as a preferred option within the MIR. It should be noted that longer term sites will not be formal allocations within the LDP2, rather areas identified for potential development in the future. It is considered that a masterplan would be required for such a development and the site must accommodate an element of business land.

# Dolphinton

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR status
ADOLP004	Land to north of Dolphinton	Dolphinton	Rest of Borders	Housing	10	1.3	Preferred

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
1:200	Not applicable	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

SEPA: Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map and steep topography indicates that there may be flooding issues within/adjacent to site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff. There is the potential that the development of this site could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard identified at this site.

This development site does not appear to be served by the SW foul sewer network. However the foul network is not far from the proposed site and hence this is the preferred option. It is likely that the SW foul network/STW would require to be upgraded to accommodate the development site. Opportunity should also be taken to pick up the existing properties to the south and west of the development area.

Co-location issues: A PPC part B cement batcher is currently located south west of the development at 'Heywood'. Likely issues: dust.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial 1 in 200 year flood extents but small parts of the site are within the 1 in 200 year surface water flood extents. I would require that surface water runoff is considered before development.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Brownfield	Planning application 04/01122/FUL Erection of 12 houses - refused; 07/01379/FUL - Erection of 14 houses - refused. Housing SG: ADOLP004 - Exact same site was assessed as part of the Housing SG (Stage 1 RAG only)

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Limited	Limited	Limited	Moderate	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Moderate biodiversity impact. The site is poor, semi improved grassland. Hedgerow on part of the boundary and garden ground. No obvious connectivity with Dolphinton-West Linton Fens and Grassland SSSI. Protect boundary trees and mitigation for protected species including bats and breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located within Dolphinton. There are no services or facilities within the settlement. The nearest settlement is West Linton 4 miles away, which has a primary school, co-op and other facilities. There is a bus service to Edinburgh, however limited bus services to other towns. This means that there will be a reliance on car travel. Natural regeneration, adjacent trees and woodland should harbour young wildlife habitats. Retention of this where possible and extension to create woodland strip to south. Divisional garden hedges could create further opportunities for wildlife. Retain trees on eastern and northern boundaries if possible. The site appears unused and over grown. Bunds and embankments from railway workings, possibly minor huts/structures amongst vegetation.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There is a high concentration of archaeological sites and features in the surrounding landscape which increases the potential for unknown features to exist in the site. There is nothing known for this site, but archaeological mitigation is likely base on the potential.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific comment.

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
Not applicable	On/adjacent to site			Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: We recommend that if this site is to be allocated that a site brief is produced to identify the key natural heritage assets of the site to be protected and the key opportunities for the integration of green infrastructure within future development. Our advice on this site is based on prior knowledge and desktop assessment using GIS and streetview. We may provide further advice based on a site visit if the potential allocation is carried forward. This section of the A702 is characterised by small groups of houses, often screened wholly or partly by well-established woodland and boundary planting. If allocated, we recommend that a site brief is prepared, this should include:

- Retention of woodland along the A702 boundary of the site; and
- Maintain and enhance pedestrian and cycle access established by LDP1 allocation ADOLP003.

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT: Opportunity to allow natural regeneration to develop and be managed as swathe of woodland; thinned and augmented as required. This young tree cover will in due course provide excellent screen planting from the road and a buffer between the existing and any proposed housing. The majority of it is in the most unsuitable part of the site where there appear to considerable railway workings. The area is low lying and likely to be shady. Houses built on upper part of site to maximise solar gain and views. Position new properties at suitable distance from existing mature trees on boundary to protect trees from development, ensure sufficient light levels and maintain open views across landscape from new development. Recommend low density to safeguard existing tree cover, retain views out of the site to distant hills and prevent adverse effect on the setting of the Pentland hills SLA.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

<b>Physical access/road capacity</b>	<b>Near a trunk road?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	--

NETWORK MANAGER: Would be concerned if a new access was proposed directly off the A702, which is a fast unrestricted road at this location.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Access is not recommended to be taken from the A702 trunk road.

ROADS PLANNING: I have no objections in principle to the allocation of this site. Access is achievable from the allocated site (ADOLP003) to the south. There is a current live outline application for 5 units on the existing allocated site and any detailed design for that site would have to allow for a public road extension through to the site in question here. A pedestrian link will be required from any proposed development to the existing public transport provision on the A702. Any new access onto the A702 to serve this site would be for Transport Scotland (TS) to comment on. Likewise TS will comment on the

impact of any further development should it take access via the existing allocated site and onto the A702 via the existing junction.  
 PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Improved pedestrian crossing facilities across the A702 to and from bus stop layby.

<b>Right of way</b>	<b>TPOs</b>	<b>Contaminated land</b>	<b>Water supply</b>	<b>Sewerage</b>	<b>Gas Supply</b>	<b>Education provision</b>
Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	Yes	Yes	No	Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Appears logical link between the two settlement envelopes either side of the A702. Good landscaping along A702 but would need robust landscaping on northern boundary.  
 HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.  
 SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. Sewer within site boundary. Sufficient capacity in the network.  
 SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Roseberry WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.  
 OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Connecting paths to core path 169 (RoW BT28) and existing pavements required.  
 CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.  
 NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.  
 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.  
 PROJECTS TEAM: Did not raise any concerns regarding the proposed development.  
 EDUCATION OFFICER: No Issues.  
 NHS: No response received.

## Overall assessment

<b>MIR status</b>	<b>Overall assessment</b>	<b>Site capacity</b>
Preferred	Acceptable	10

### Conclusions

The site is located within Dolphinton and was submitted as part of the 'Call for Sites' process. It should be noted that the site was also submitted and considered as part of the Housing SG and ultimately not included. An initial Stage 1 RAG assessment was undertaken as part of the Housing SG. At that stage, it was concluded that, a recent allocation was made within the LDP for Dolphinton, therefore that was considered to be sufficient for the LDP period.

The site itself includes derelict ground including the remains of the former railway platform and sections of old railroad in parts. The site is considered to be acceptable for housing and there are no insurmountable planning issues, which cannot be resolved through mitigation. Dolphinton has limited access to services, public transport and employment opportunities. The nearby settlement of West Linton has a school and shops. Further to the site assessment, the following constraints/mitigation were identified/proposed;

- The site is adjacent to the SSSI and within the SLA 'Pentland Hills';
- Potential flood risk and surface water hazard;
- Protection of boundary trees and retention of woodland along the A702 site boundary, where possible;
- Mitigation for protected species, including breeding birds;
- Potential archaeology within the site, evaluation/mitigation would be required;
- Maintain and enhance the pedestrian and cycle access established by LDP1 allocation (ADOLP003);
- New planting to the north and enhancement of the woodland along the eastern boundary will be required. Landscape buffers will be required and the long term maintenance of the landscaped areas must be addressed;
- A pedestrian link will be required to the existing public transport provision on the A702, either via this site or the adjacent allocation (ADOLP003);
- Co-location issues, as 'A PPC part B cement batcher' is currently located south west of the development at 'Heywood'. The likely issues are dust;
- The Roads Planning Officer has advised no objections and that access is acceptable via the existing housing allocation (ADOLP003) to the south; and

- Early discussions with Scottish Water, to ascertain whether a Water Impact Assessment will be required.

In conclusion, it is not considered that there are any insurmountable planning issues, which cannot be overcome through mitigation. The site is recommended for inclusion within the MIR as a preferred option for housing, with an indicative site capacity for 10 units.

---



# Eddleston

<b>Site reference</b> AEDDL008	<b>Site name</b> Land West of Elibank Park	<b>Settlement</b> Eddleston	<b>RGA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 40	<b>Ha</b> 5.5	<b>MIR status</b> Alternative
-----------------------------------	---	--------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	----------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designations.

SEPA: Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at an increased risk of flooding. There is the potential that development of this allocation would increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard identified at the site.

Foul sewage from this development should be connected into the SW public foul network (although the site is outwith the current sewered catchment). Failing that private sewage provision would be required although this could be challenging given the site location. The only possible discharge point would appear to be the Eddleston water for this scale of development. Further discussion would be required to determine whether such a discharge would be feasible in terms of the effluent standards required. Std comments re: SUDS.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

I would, however, ask that potential surface water is considered during development due to the large capacity of the site.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no planning application history on this site.  The site has not previously been assessed as part of any Local Plan process.
--	------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
---	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	---	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Moderate biodiversity risk. Site appears to be an improved pasture but with Ancient Woodland (Ancient of semi-natural origin) (Cemetery wood) along northern boundary with

record of red squirrel (10 +years) and beech hedgerow along roadside boundary. Potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC via the Dean burn. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats, badger and breeding birds. Planted buffer required to protect ancient woodland. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC (Eddleston water). SEPA CAR construction site licence required (site >4ha)(5.50ha)

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the south west of Eddleston. Good bus route to Edinburgh and Peebles with connecting linkages. The village has a restaurant, hotel, village hall and a primary school. Eddleston is located 5 miles north from Peebles, on the A701 to Edinburgh.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed</b>
Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	On/adjacent to site	Adjacent to site	On/adjacent to site

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: There may be some minor issues about possible impact on the setting of the Black Barony, although the current woodland provides a buffer. The site is remote from the village.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Spoke to the Officer and he advised that there is potential for archaeology within the site.

---

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable			Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: This is a large and partially open site on undulating ground. The proposed density of development over the site is very low and it is unclear how the proposal would seek to integrate or respond to the settlement character and siting principles established within the existing village. If allocated, we advise that a design brief should inform what would be intended for the development layout. Existing features such as the hedgerow should be retained and appropriate improvements made to allow safe access to the rest of the settlement established. For example the provision of pavements along the main road and access connections from the site to and through Elibank Park to Station Lye should be established.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: The site is an east facing gently sloping field to the west of the minor road that connects A703 at Eddleston through the Meldons to Lyne and A72 west of Peebles. The gradients are relatively gentle and the site sits contiguous with the ancient woodland associated with Dean Burn that runs through Barony Castle (local Designed Landscape) immediately to the north. A buffer of woodland planting along the north boundary should wrap around the west and south boundaries to ensure an appropriate 'landscape fit'. As far as is practicable boundary hedges should be retained and enhanced.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

<b>Physical access/road capacity</b>	<b>Near a trunk road?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	--

NETWORK MANAGER: No response received.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: While the site lies adjacent to the settlement boundary of Eddleston, the road leading out to it from the village is restrictive in width and there is no provision for pedestrians. Any development of this site will require carriageway widening, (at key locations on the section of road between the junction with Station Lye and the site entrance) and a pedestrian link with the village including street lighting provision. Such provision will require significant engineering work and will impact on land outwith the road boundary. That said, I understand the land on the south east side of the road (Elibank Park) is Council owned so that a pedestrian route, divorced from the carriageway, could be provided through the park towards the site, but it should be noted this will impact on the tree belt

and roadside hedge and will require a footbridge over Dean Burn. From Dean Burn a new footway would be required to connect with the village footway which terminates near the bridge over Eddleston Water. The village street lighting and 30 mph speed limit would need to extend out to the site. In terms of the site itself, satisfactory access can be achieved, although a section of the roadside hedgerow would have to be removed in order to create appropriate visibility splays. In summary, I can on balance support this site being allocated for housing development, but there is a fair bit of work required for it to properly connect with the village. A Transport Statement would be required.  
 PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No response received.

<b>Right of way</b>	<b>TPOs</b>	<b>Contaminated land</b>	<b>Water supply</b>	<b>Sewerage</b>	<b>Gas Supply</b>	<b>Education provision</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Limited	Limited	No	Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No response received.  
 HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.  
 SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. A Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network .  
 SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. A Water Impact Assessment (WIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.  
 OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: This site would need to have good non-vehicular links to the existing path network and recreation ground.  
 CONTAMINATED LAND: There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.  
 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.  
 NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.  
 PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.  
 EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.  
 NHS: No response received.

## Overall assessment

<b>MIR status</b>	<b>Overall assessment</b>	<b>Site capacity</b>
Alternative	Acceptable	40

### Conclusions

The site lies to the south west of Eddleston. The site was identified as part of the 'Western Rural Growth Area: Development Options Study' which was undertaken by LUC, to identify and assess options for housing within Central Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP for the Tweeddale area, in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders.

Eddleston has good access to public transport, services and employment, given it's proximity to Peebles. Further to a site assessment, the following constraints/issues were identified, which may require mitigation;

- Foul sewerage constraints, as the site is located outwith the current sewered catchment;
- Potential surface water runoff issues;
- Ancient Woodland Inventory lies along the northern boundary of the site;
- Potential connectivity to the River Tweed SAC/SSSI;
- Protect and enhance the existing boundary features, including the beech hedgerow along the roadside;
- Potential protected species, including breeding birds within the site;
- Site lies within the 'Barony Castle' Designed Landscape (SBC);
- 2 HER records adjacent to the site;
- Pedestrian link to the village would be required;

- Planting/lanscaping along the western and southern boundary of the site, to contain the development and form a settlement edge;
- Some form of separation buffer between the development and ancient woodland to the north;
- Transport Statement required; and
- Drainage Impact Assessment and Water Impact Assessment required, in respect of WWTW and WTW.

Overall, taking the above into consideration, it is considered that there are no insurmountable planning issues and the site is proposed as an alternative housing option within the MIR, with an indicative site capacity of 40 units.

---

<b>Site reference</b> AEDDL009	<b>Site name</b> Land South of Cemetery	<b>Settlement</b> Eddleston	<b>RGA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 35	<b>Ha</b> 3.7	<b>MIR status</b> Alternative
-----------------------------------	--	--------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	----------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designation constraints. However, it does fall within the 1 in 200 floodrisk maps.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Eddleston Water. Any nearby small watercourses should be investigated as there was a mill dam upslope of the site in the past to ensure there are no culverted watercourses through the site. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within the site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at increased risk of flooding.

There is the potential that development at this allocation could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard at this site.

Foul sewage from this development should be connected into the SW public foul network (although the site is outwith the currently sewerred catchment). Failing that private sewage provision would be required. The only possible discharge point would appear to be the Eddleston water for this scale of development. Further discussion would be required to determine whether such a discharge would be feasible in terms of the effluent standards required. Std comments re: SUDS.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site may be at risk of flooding from the Eddleston Water during a 1 in 200 year flood. The South part of this site is expected to flood so dependent on the outline drawings, I may require a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). However, if properties were located out with the Southern side, there would be scope for approval.

I would ask that potential surface water is considered during development due to the large capacity of the site.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no planning application history on the site. The site has not been previously considered as part of a Local Plan.
--	------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	---

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
---	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	---	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Moderate biodiversity risk. Site appears to be an improved pasture with beech hedgerow and treeline on boundary. Small part of site within SEPA 1 in 200 year indicative flood

risk area, potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including, badger and breeding birds. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC (Eddleston water) (3.7ha)

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the south west of Eddleston. Good bus route to Edinburgh and Peebles with connecting linkages. The village has a restaurant, hotel, village hall and a primary school. Eddleston is located 5 miles north from Peebles, on the A701 to Edinburgh.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed</b>
Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	On/adjacent to site	Adjacent to site

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: The site is remote from the village.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Spoke to the Officer who advised that there is potential for archaeology within the site.

---

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable			Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: The site presents similar issues to AEDDL008. We highlight the potential for a planted linear path or green network along the dismantled railway to the east of the site and connecting to and through Elibank Park. We recommend that if both are to be allocated in the next LDP a planning brief for both sites should be prepared.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: Site is very gently sloping, almost valley bottom of Eddleston Water. It would effectively extend Eddleston southward by .270km. Both this site and AEDDL008 are highly visible from the A703 but the visual impact could be mitigated by carefully planned structural planting along the eastern and southern boundaries, ideally overrunning into the flood plain to create a more natural edge to the development and avoid using manmade features such as the railway line as rigid boundary.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

<b>Physical access/road capacity</b>	<b>Near a trunk road?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	--

NETWORK MANAGER: No response received.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: While the site lies adjacent to the settlement boundary of Eddleston, the road leading out to it from the village is restrictive in width and there is no provision for pedestrians. Any development of this site will require carriageway widening, (at key locations on the section of road between the junction with Station Lye and the site entrance) and a pedestrian link with the village including street lighting provision. Such provision will require significant engineering work and will impact on land outwith the road boundary. That said, I understand the land on the south east side of the road (Elibank Park) is Council owned so that a pedestrian route, divorced from the carriageway, could be provided through the park towards the site, but it should be noted this will impact on the tree belt and roadside hedge and will require a footbridge over Dean Burn. From Dean Burn a new footway would be required to connect with the village footway which terminates near the bridge over Eddleston Water. The village street lighting and 30 mph speed limit would need to extend out to the site. A pedestrian/cycle link from the lower part of the site to the village via the old railway line and/or Elibank Park needs to be explored too. In terms of the site itself, satisfactory access can be achieved at a number of locations provided visibility splays and acceptable gradients are met. In summary, I can on balance support this site being allocated for housing development, but there is a fair bit of work required for it to properly connect with the village. A Transport Statement would be required.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No response received.

**Right of way**

Not applicable

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

Not applicable

**Water supply**

Limited

**Sewerage**

Limited

**Gas Supply**

No

**Education provision**

Good

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No response received.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. Site is 145 meters away from the existing Scottish Water WwTw, odour and noise assessments will need to be carried out to consider the impact of the proximity. A Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network .

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. Please note there is an existing Scottish Water existing raw water main running along East and within the south edge of site. Additionally there is a 100mm water main running along East edge of site. A Water Impact Assessment (WIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Housing on this site and AEDDL008 would benefit greatly from a pavement down to the village as well as non-vehicular links to the existing path network and recreation ground.

CONTAMINATED LAND: There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

---

**Overall assessment**

**MIR status**

Alternative

**Overall assessment**

Acceptable

**Site capacity**

35

**Conclusions**

The site lies to the south west of Eddleston. The site was identified as part of the 'Western Rural Growth Area: Development Options Study' which was undertaken by LUC, to identify and assess options for housing within Central Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP for the Tweeddale area, in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders.

Eddleston has good access to public transport, services and employment, given it's proximity to Peebles. Further to a site assessment, the following constraints/issues were identified, which may require mitigation;

- Foul sewerage constraints, as the site is located outwith the current sewered catchment;
- Flood Risk Assessment required, in respect of potential flood risk and potential surface water runoff on the site;
- Potential connectivity to the River Tweed SAC/SSSI, mitigation required to ensure no likely significant effects;
- Protect and enhance the existing boundary features, including the beech hedgerow and treeline along the roadside;
- Potential protected species, including breeding birds within the site, would require mitigation;
- The site is adjacent to 'Elibank Park' key greenspace and Eddleston Cemetery;
- 2 HER records adjacent to the site, 1 overlaps the eastern boundary of the site, potential mitigation required;
- Site located adjacent to the 'Barony Castle' Designed Landscape SBC;
- Pedestrian link with the village and explore the potential to connect with the old railway line and/or Elibank Park;
- Structure planting along the eastern and southern boundaries, to mitigate any visual impacts from the A703;
- Transport Statement required;

- Drainage Impact Assessment required, in respect of WWTW; and
- Water Impact Assessment required, in respect of WTW.

Overall, taking the above into consideration, it is considered that there are no insurmountable planning issues and the site is proposed as an alternative housing option within the MIR, with an indicative site capacity of 35 units.

---



<b>Site reference</b> SEDDL001	<b>Site name</b> North of Bellfield II	<b>Settlement</b> Eddleston	<b>RGA</b> Rest of Borders	<b>Proposed Use</b> Long Term Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> N/A	<b>Ha</b> 4.4	<b>MIR status</b> Preferred
-----------------------------------	---	--------------------------------	-------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	------------------	--------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> Not applicable	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designation constraints. There are Surface Water Hazards to the west of the site, however not within the site itself.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Eddleston Water. Due to the gradients on site, the majority of the site will likely be developable. Consideration should be given to the lower parts of the site adjacent to the A703. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at an increased risk of flooding.

There is the potential that development at this allocation could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard identified at the site.

Foul sewage from this development should be connected into the SW public foul network (although the site is outwith the current sewered catchment). Failing that private sewage provision would be required although this could be challenging given the site location. The only possible discharge point would appear to be the Eddleston water for this scale of development. Further discussion would be required to determine whether such a discharge would be feasible in terms of the effluent standards required. Std comments re: SUDS.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

I would, however, ask that potential surface water is considered during development due to the large capacity of the site.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b>	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no planning history on the site. The site has not been previously considered as part of a Local Plan.
--	------------------------------	--	----------------------	---

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Good	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Minor	<b>Site aspect</b> Not applicable
---	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Low biodiversity risk. Site appears to be an improved pasture sloping down to old A703 with stone dyke on the boundary. Site may require cut and fill. No obvious drainage connectivity to River Tweed SAC but is just outside of 1 in 200 year flood risk area. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including badger and breeding birds. SEPA CAR construction site licence required (site >4ha) (4.36ha)

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the north of Eddleston, directly to the north of the existing housing allocation (AEDDL002). The settlement currently runs along the A703. Good bus route to Edinburgh and Peebles with connecting linkages. The village has a restaurant, hotel, village hall and a primary school. Eddleston is located 5 miles north from Peebles, on the A701 to Edinburgh.

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Adjacent to site

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Whilst not specific Listed Building or Conservation Area issues, at first sight, this land is remote from the village. However if the site to the south were to be developed (and I think this is an allocated site) then this proposal may be worthy of further consideration, especially as it is set back from the road behind a line of mature trees lining the old road.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Spoke to the Officer who advised that there is potential for archaeology on the site.

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable			Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: We note that existing allocation AEDDL002 is to have a planning brief produced and adopted. If AEDDL007 is to be allocated in the second LDP, we recommend that the proposed planning brief is extended in scope to include both AEDDL002 and AEDDL007. Allocation of this site should lead to update of site requirements for AEDDL002, particularly "New structure planting/landscaping, including woodland, to improve the setting of the areas, screen and shelter development". This requirement will need review if AEDDL007 is to be delivered as part of Eddleston rather than as a perceptually isolated extension. Consideration of the potential impact of development on the River Tweed SAC has been established through the prior assessment of AEDDL002 during preparation of the current LDP. We recommend a similar approach is adopted for this site.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: This site would effectively extend Eddleston northwards by .275km beyond the allocated but as yet undeveloped AEDDL002. The site is a sloping west facing field on the east side of the A703, the western boundary is defined by the old A703 which along this section is lined by a single line of mature lime trees. The slopes are no steeper than the allocated site to south and access could be achieved from existing access points off the A703 to the north (at Cottage Bank) and to the south along the old A703. Structure shelterbelt planting using deciduous/ mixed woodland species will be essential along the eastern elevated boundary to achieve a 'landscape fit' with potential to wrap this around the north boundary to create a structural limit extent of Eddleston.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

<b>Physical access/road capacity</b>	<b>Near a trunk road?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	--

NETWORK MANAGER: No response received.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I am able to offer my support for housing development on this site, but the allocated site to the south (AEDDL002) would have to be developed first in order to integrate this proposed site with the settlement of Eddleston. In terms of access, I would be looking for the former section of public road, which runs along the western boundary of the site (Old Edinburgh Road), to be re-instated as a public road to provide access to the A703 to the north of Scots Pine Restaurant as well as well as to the A703 south near Bellfield Crescent. Access into the development site can be taken from a number of points on the former public road and a link from the allocated site to the south should also be a requirement.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No response received.

**Right of way**

Adjacent to site

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

Not applicable

**Water supply**

Limited

**Sewerage**

Limited

**Gas Supply**

No

**Education provision**

Good

**Planning & infrastructure summary**

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No response received.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. A Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. This proposed site is located a considerable distance from the public network. Any installation of network from site to the public sewers must be funded and carried out by the developer. These associated costs may be notable and not fully covered by Scottish Water's Reasonable Cost Contribution (RCC) scheme.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. A Water Impact Assessment (WIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network. The nearest water main is some distance away and it will be the Developers responsibility to lay their water main to existing Scottish Water network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS: Core path 146 partly runs adjacent to the west side of this proposed site. Should a road be built over this then there would need to be a footpath/pavement to maintain non-vehicular access.

CONTAMINATED LAND: There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

**Overall assessment****MIR status**

Preferred

**Overall assessment**

Acceptable

**Site capacity**

N/A

**Conclusions**

The site is located to the north of Eddleston, directly to the north of the existing housing allocation (AEDDL002). The site was identified as part of the 'Western Rural Growth Area: Development Options Study' which was undertaken by LUC, to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Central Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP and for the future, within the Central Tweeddale area, in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders. The site currently being considered is proposed for a longer term housing development site. It should be noted that the consultation was undertaken for site code (AEDDL007), however after the consultation the site code was altered to (SEDDL001) to reflect the longer term housing proposal.

Eddleston has good access to services, employment and public transport. Further to a site assessment, the following constraints/issues were identified, which may require mitigation;

- Flood Risk Assessment required, in respect of potential flood risk and surface water runoff on the site;
- Foul sewerage constraints, as the site is located outwith the current sewered catchment;
- Protect and enhance the existing boundary features, where possible;
- Potential protected species, including breeding birds within the site, would require mitigation;
- The Designed Landscape (SBC) and Garden and Designed Landscape (HES) 'Portmore' are located to the north of the site;
- Consideration of the potential impact of the development on the River Tweed SAC/SSSI;
- Structure shelterbelt planting using deciduous/mixed woodland species will be essential along eastern elevation boundary to achieve a 'landscape fit'
- The Roads Planning Officer advised that the proposal is acceptable. (AEDDL002) would need to be developed first, in order to integrate this proposed site within the settlement. Access into the site can be taken from a number of points along the former public road and a link to (AEDDL002) would be required;
- Potential for archaeology on the site;

- Potential for Drainage Impact Assessment, in respect of the WWTW; and
- Potential for Water Impact Assessment, in respect of the WTW.

There are no insurmountable constraints, which would prevent the development of this site for housing, subject to mitigation measures. It is acknowledged that the site immediately to the south is already allocated for housing within the LDP and remains undeveloped to date. The Roads Planning Officer has confirmed that access would need to come via the allocated housing site (AEDDL002) and that the site should be developed prior to this one. Therefore, given that (AEDDL002) remains undeveloped to date, it is considered more appropriate for this site to be considered for longer term housing.

In conclusion, the longer term housing site will be taken forward as a preferred option within the MIR. It should be noted that the longer term sites will not be formal allocated within the LDP2, rather identified for potential development in the future.

---

# Eshiels

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR status
MESHI001	Land at Eshiels I	Eshiels	Western	Mixed Use	200	19.4	Preferred

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not lie within any international/national designations.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Linn Burn and any small watercourses which flow through and adjacent to the site. The River Tweed may also require consideration. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site which may exacerbate flood risk. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at increased risk of flooding.

There is the potential that development on this allocation could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard on the site.

There is a water body immediately adjacent to the site. Therefore, SEPA advise that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

There is no public foul sewer in the vicinity and if this site was to be developed this would be an opportunity to provide first time sewerage provision to Eshiels, picking up existing properties also. Any private sewage provision would be likely to require to discharge to the River Tweed rather than the Linn burn. The watercourse that runs through/adjacent to the site should be protected and enhanced as part of any development. Std comments for SUDS. Depending on the use of the proposed site there may be a requirement for permissions to be sought for certain activities from SEPA.

There are co-location issues regarding this site. Peebles STW (CAR) and Eshiels community recycling centre (WML) are located across the road and to the west of the site. These sites are however unlikely to have an impact on the site from SEPA's perspective. Possible odour issues from the STW would be dealt with by SBC Env health.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with the pluvial 1 in 200 year flood extents but there is a small section at the SE side (next to the road) that is shown to flood from the River Tweed. It is unlikely that a Flood Risk Assessment would be required but this would be dependent on the layout of the development. I would ask that due to the size of the development that surface water flooding is considered. I would recommend dealing with MESHI001 and MESHI002 at the same time from a flood risk perspective.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	Planning consent for a dwellinghouse in the north eastern corner of the site. (16/00497/PPP). The site was considered, as part of a larger site, in the Local Development Plan (BPEEB005). The south west part of the site, was previously considered, in the Local Development Plan (BPEEB006).

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

### Access to public transport

Limited

### Access to employment

Good

### Access to services

Good

### Wider biodiversity impacts

Moderate

### Site aspect

Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Moderate biodiversity impact. Site appears to be an improved pasture with mature broadleaf treeline on boundary and field boundary within site These feature on 1st Ed OS map). Small area along A72 boundary within SEPA 1 in 200 year indicative flood risk area. Potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC via the Linn burn. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats (EPS), badger and breeding birds. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC/SSSI. SEPA CAR construction site licence required (site >4ha (19.38ha)

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located at Eshiels, which is not an identified settlement within the current Local Development Plan, rather consists of a small cluster of houses, farm buildings and a sawmill. Immediately to the east of Eshiels, is the recreational hub of Glentress, and there is further development on the south side of the A72. Eshiels is within close proximity to Peebles, which is 2 miles to the west. As Eshiels is not a settlement, there are no services or employment opportunities at present. However, the close proximity to Peebles, including the cycle path along the former railway line, provides access to a wider range of services, employment and public transport opportunities. Furthermore, Edinburgh is within commuting distance.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

On/adjacent to site

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On/adjacent to site

### Garden and designed

On/adjacent to site

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No additional comments from those on the original proposal – a prominent site on the approach to Peebles.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Site adjacent to SM 3667 Eshiels, Roman camps 90m SSW of No 4 Eshiels. Content with the principle of development in this area but would wish to see mitigation in the form of (a) an adequate buffer zone to protect the physical remains and setting of Eshiels Roman camps, and (b) a suitable management regime for the section of the monument within or adjacent to the development area.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Spoke to the Archaeology Officer who advised that there is Scheduled Monument in the south east corner of the site. There is also a ring ditch within the site and there is potential for prehistoric burials and cemetery within the site. Justification likely against LDP policies.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

On/adjacent to site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: This is a large and open site that is detached from the town of Peebles. There would likely be loss of openness and adverse effects on local landscape character experienced, particularly from the A72 and existing settled areas along the Linn Burn Road. If this site was to be considered (and noting the detached nature of the site) we would advise the need for a strong approach to place-making to be adopted in order ensure local identity and appropriate facilities, including green infrastructure. In this regard we advise that safe off-site active travel connections linking the site to the town should be secured in order to link the site through sustainable travel to nearby Peebles.

We also advise that a co-ordinated approach to landscape design, wider integration into setting and place design would also be needed and be set through a pre-agreed site development brief. Close consideration of landscape structure and development densities should inform this approach. Existing natural features on the site should also be safeguarded and utilised in the development of the site should it be considered appropriate for development.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: The logical development pattern for this relatively large block of land (circa 20 ha) would be industrial/business on the southernmost, more gently sloping fields with housing in the larger field to the north to take advantage of elevated views south across the valley to hills beyond. A masterplan will be necessary to establish the optimum access routes into the site, buffer planting to existing field boundary trees and the appropriate depth of shelterbelt planting along the southern boundary to mitigate the impacts of the development from sensitive receptors on A72.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: No response received.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: Whilst I am not against the allocation of this site for mixed use development, the main consideration will be providing adequate access from the A72 to serve a development of this size. The existing access is unsuitable to support a substantial increase in dwellings. Therefore a new junction onto the A72 will be required to the west of the existing, with the existing junction closed off. A further access point will be required and can be achieved to the west of No 6 Eshiels Holdings which will help disperse traffic movements and will aid connectivity. Junction design for access to the A72 will have to be in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges and a Transport Assessment can address the most appropriate form of junctions. The site will have to connect and integrate with the existing body of Eshiels and with Site MESH1002 if it is to be developed. Options for improvements to the existing public transport infrastructure will need to be explored as will the suitability of pedestrian provision in the A72.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No response received.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

On/adjacent to site

### Water supply

Limited

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No response received.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. A Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network .

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. A Water Impact Assessment (WIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Requires non-vehicular links to path network and Peebles town and amenities.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed, with the exception of development in the north eastern corner of the site. The use of the buildings is not known but appear to possibly be agricultural/commercial in use. Therefore, part of the site is brownfield and its use may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURING SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: This site has potential on the southern and western edge for accommodating a new industrial / business park development. We would prefer that a separate access to this site is made from the A72 rather than from a single access which would also service any proposed residential development. More detailed feasibility work is required to ascertain the best layout and access road locations before fully defining the boundary of the site allocation.

EDUCATION OFFICER: Kingsland Primary and Halyrude RC Primary would be at full capacity if development went ahead, an extension or new school may need to be considered.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

## MIR status

Preferred

## Overall assessment

Acceptable

## Site capacity

200

## Conclusions

The site lies at Eshiels, on the north side of the A72. It should be noted that Eshiels is not an identified settlement within the LDP, however lies 2 miles to the east of Peebles. The site was identified as part of the 'Western Rural Growth Area: Development Options Study' which was undertaken by LUC, to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Central Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP for the Central Tweeddale area, in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders. The site currently being considered, is proposed for a mixed use development with an indicative site capacity for 200 units.

Eshiels has good access to services and employment, given it's proximity to Peebles and limited access to public transport. Further to a site assessment, the following constraints/issues were identified, which may require mitigation;

- Flood Risk Assessment required, in respect of potential flood risk and surface water runoff on the site;
- Water body immediately adjacent to the site, therefore a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6m wide must be provided between the watercourse and any built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures. This is required given the watercourse(s) which run through and adjacent to the site;
- Foul sewerage constraints, as the site is located outwith the current sewered catchment;
- Possible co location issues with the Peebles and Eshiels re cycling centres, located on the south of the A72;
- Potential connectivity to the River Tweed SAC/SSSI, mitigation required to ensure no likely significant effects;
- Protect and enhance the existing boundary features;
- Potential protected species, including breeding birds within the site, would require mitigation;
- Scheduled Monument 'Roman Camp' is located in the south east corner of the site and adjacent to the proposed site, this would require appropriate mitigation measures;
- Site is located within the 'Eshiels' Designed Landscape (SBC);
- Archaeology HER's within the site, potential mitigation required;
- The site is prominent from the approach to Peebles;
- Historic Scotland have set out mitigation requirements in respect of the proximity to the Scheduled Monument, including a) an adequate buffer zone to protect the physical remains and setting of Eshiels Roman camps, and (b) a suitable management regime for the section of the monument within or adjacent to the development area
- Located within the 'Tweed Valley' Special Landscape Area;
- There will be a requirement for a co-ordinated approach to landscape design and the wider integration into the setting and place design;
- Shelterbelt planting would be required along the southern boundary of the site, to mitigate the impacts of development from sensitive receptors on the A72;
- Roads Planning Officer advised that the existing access is unsuitable. A new junction would be required onto the A72 and the existing closed off. A further access point will be required and can be achieved to the west of No6 Eshiels Holdings;
- Transport Assessment would be required;
- The site must ensure connectivity and integration with Eshiels and the adjacent proposed site (MESH1002) should it also be taken forward;
- Potential for Drainage Impact Assessment, in respect of the WWTW;
- Potential for Water Impact Assessment, in respect of the WTW;
- Northern corner is brownfield land and potential for contamination; and
- Economic Development advise that the site has potential on the southern and western edges for accomodating a new industrial/business park development.

It should be noted that the Education Officer states that Kingsland Primary and Halryude RC Primary would be at full capacity if development went ahead, an extension or new school may need to be considered. Further investigation into this matter requires to be carried out.

Overall, taking the above into consideration, it is noted that there are a number of identified constraints within the site, however it is considered that there are no insurmountable planning issues which cannot be overcome through appropriate mitigation measures and subject to further discussions regarding school capacities. It is considered that a masterplan must be prepared, in conjunction with (MESH1002) and the site must accommodate an element of business land. Overall, the site is proposed as a preferred mixed use option within the MIR, with an indicative site capacity of 200 units.



<b>Site reference</b> MESH1002	<b>Site name</b> Land at Eshiels II	<b>Settlement</b> Eshiels	<b>RGA</b> Western	<b>Proposed Use</b> Mixed Use	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> 40	<b>Ha</b> 6.7	<b>MIR status</b> Preferred
-----------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	--------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site is not located within any international/national designation.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Linn Burn, Eshiels Burn and small watercourses which flow through and adjacent to the site. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site which may exacerbate flood risk as well as any transfer of water between catchments. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at increased risk of flooding. Site may be constrained due to flood risk.

There is the potential that development on this allocation could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard on the site.

There is a water body immediately adjacent to the site. Therefore, SEPA advise that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

There is no public foul sewer in the vicinity and if this site was to be developed this would be an opportunity to provide first time sewerage provision to Eshiels, picking up existing properties also. Any private sewage provision would be likely to require to discharge to the River Tweed rather than the Linn burn. The watercourse that runs through/adjacent to the site should be protected and enhanced as part of any development. Std comments for SUDS. Depending on the use of the proposed site there may be a requirement for permissions to be sought for certain activities from SEPA.

There are co-location issues regarding this site. Peebles STW (CAR) and Eshiels community recycling centre (WML) are located across the road and to the west of the site. These sites are however unlikely to have an impact on the site from SEPA's perspective. Possible odour issues from the STW would be dealt with by SBC Env health.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with the pluvial 1 in 200 year flood extents but there is a small section at the south side that is shown to flood from the River Tweed. It is unlikely that a Flood Risk Assessment would be required but this would be dependent on the layout of the development. I would ask that due to the size of the development that surface water flooding is considered. I would recommend dealing with MESH1001 and MESH1002 at the same time from a flood risk perspective.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no planning application history. The site has not previously been considered as part of any Local Plan.
--	------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	---

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

**Access to public transport**

Limited

**Access to employment**

Good

**Access to services**

Good

**Wider biodiversity impacts**

Moderate

**Site aspect**

Not applicable

**Accessibility and sustainability summary**

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Moderate biodiversity risk. Site appears to be an improved pasture with mature broadleaf treeline on boundary and field boundary within site (these feature on 1st Ed OS map). The Southern boundary is within SEPA 1 in 200 year indicative flood risk area. Potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC via the Linn burn. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats (EPS), badger and breeding birds. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC/SSSI. SEPA CAR construction site licence required (site >4ha).

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located at Eshiels, which is not an identified settlement within the current Local Development Plan, rather consists of a small cluster of houses, farm buildings and a sawmill. Immediately to the east of Eshiels, is the recreational hub of Glentress, and there is further development on the south side of the A72. Eshiels is within close proximity to Peebles, which is 2 miles to the west. As Eshiels is not a settlement, there are no services or employment opportunities at present. However, the close proximity to Peebles, including the cycle path along the former railway line, provides access to a wider range of services, employment and public transport opportunities. Furthermore, Edinburgh is within commuting distance.

**Local impact and integration assessment****Conservation area**

Not applicable

**Open space**

Not applicable

**Listed buildings**

Not applicable

**Scheduled Monument**

Adjacent to site

**Ancient woodland inventory**

Not applicable

**Archaeology**

On/adjacent to site

**Garden and designed**

On/adjacent to site

**Local impact and integration summary**

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No LB or CA issues. If MESH001 is developed, then , with this site as well, there will be a significant coalescence of development on the N side of the Tweed.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Site adjacent to SM 3667 Eshiels, Roman camps 90m SSW of No 4 Eshiels. Content with the principle of development in this area but have concerns that such a large allocation would require significant upgrades to access and service routes (water sewerage etc) that could have a direct physical impact on the scheduled remains. We would wish to see mitigation in the form of (a) an adequate buffer zone to protect the physical remains and setting of Eshiels Roman camps, (b) a suitable management regime for the section of the monument adjacent to the development area, and (c) any upgrades to road and service infrastructure necessitated by the development should be designed to avoid the scheduled monument.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Spoke to the Archaeology Officer who advised that there is a Scheduled Monument located to the south of the site. Also evidence of Roman Camps (unscheduled) into the site.

**Landscape assessment****NSA**

Not applicable

**SLA**

On/adjacent to site

**Over 200 metres?** **Over 12 degree slope** **Wild Land**

Not applicable

**Landscape summary**

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: This is a medium sized and open site that is detached from the town of Peebles. There would likely be loss of openness and adverse effects on local landscape character experienced, particularly from the A72 and existing settled areas along the Linn Burn Road, as well as the Glentress lodges and recreational area. We note however that there is a degree of set-back on this site from the A72 and this may aid integration with local landscape character. If this site was to be considered (and noting the detached nature of the site) we would advise the need for a strong approach to place-making to be adopted in order ensure local identity and appropriate facilities, including green infrastructure. In this regard we advise that safe off-site active travel connections linking the site to the town should be secured in order to link the site through sustainable travel to nearby Peebles.

We also advise that a co-ordinated approach to landscape design, wider integration into setting and place design would also be needed and be set through a pre-agreed site development brief. Close consideration of landscape structure and development densities should inform this approach. Existing natural features on the site should also be safeguarded and utilised in the development of the site, should it be considered appropriate for development.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: This site, if constraints associated with access can be overcome, would be best suited to housing development, largely restricted to the upper ¾ of the site – the southern ¼ could be utilised for access and structure planting to mitigate effects of any development.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: No response received.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: Whilst I am not against the allocation of this site for mixed use development, the main consideration will be providing adequate access from the A72 to serve a development of this size. The existing access is unsuitable to support a substantial increase in dwellings. Therefore a new junction onto the A72 will be required to the west of the existing, with the existing junction closed off. Junction design for access to the A72 will have to be in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges and a Transport Assessment can address the most appropriate form of junction. The main access point into this site will need to be at the south westerly corner and the road between here and the new junction with the A72 will need to be upgraded to an appropriate standard. The site will have to connect and integrate with the existing body of Eshiels and with Site MESH10010 if it is to be developed. Pedestrian/cycle links with the Glentress Centre will be required and the merits of vehicular connectivity can be considered as part of the Transport Assessment. It should be noted that the southerly portion of this site is used as overspill parking for the Glentress Centre and any development on this site may need to take this into consideration. Options for improvements to the existing public transport infrastructure will need to be explored as will the suitability of pedestrian provision in the A72.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No response received.

### Right of way

On/adjacent to site

### TPOs

Adjacent to site

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Limited

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Good

## Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No response received.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. A Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. A Water Impact Assessment (WIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Requires non-vehicular links to path network and Peebles town and amenities.

CONTAMINATED LAND: There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: This mixed use site would appear to be more appropriate for commercial / tourism based mixed use development rather than for business / industrial uses. However, some class 4 or craft workshop use, tied towards serving the Glentress Tweed Valley Forest Park development tourist visitors, may be desirable.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues raised.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

### MIR status

Preferred

### Overall assessment

Acceptable

### Site capacity

40

## Conclusions

The site lies at Eshiels, on the north side of the A72. It should be noted that Eshiels is not an identified settlement within the LDP, however lies 2 miles to the east of Peebles. The site was identified as part

of the 'Western Rural Growth Area: Development Options Study' which was undertaken by LUC, to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Central Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP for the Central Tweeddale area, in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders. The site currently being considered, is proposed for a mixed use development with an indicative site capacity for 40 units.

Eshiels has good access to services and employment, given it's proximity to Peebles and limited access to public transport. Further to a site assessment, the following constraints/issues were identified, which may require mitigation;

- Flood Risk Assessment required, in respect of potential flood risk and surface water runoff on the site;
- Water body immediately adjacent to the site, therefore a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6m wide must be provided between the watercourse and any built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures. This is required given the watercourse(s) which run through and adjacent to the site;
- Foul sewerage constraints, as the site is located outwith the current sewered catchment;
- Possible co location issues with the Peebles and Eshiels re cycling centres, located on the south of the A72;
- Potential connectivity to the River Tweed SAC/SSSI, mitigation required to ensure no likely significant effects;
- Protect and enhance the existing boundary features;
- Potential protected species, including breeding birds within the site, would require mitigation;
- Scheduled Monument 'Roman Camp' is located to the south of this site, this would require appropriate mitigation measures;
- Site is located within the 'Eshiels' Designed Landscape (SBC);
- Archaeology HER's within the site, potential mitigation required;
- Historic Scotland have set out mitigation requirements in respect of the proximity to the Scheduled Monument, including (a) an adequate buffer zone to protect the physical remains and setting of Eshiels Roman camps, (b) a suitable management regime for the section of the monument adjacent to the development area, and © any upgrades to road and service infrastructure necessitated by the development should be designed to avoid the scheduled monument;
- Located within the 'Tweed Valley' Special Landscape Area;
- Tree Preservation Order to the west of the site boundary;
- There is an existing Core Path which runs through the middle of the site;
- There will be a requirement for a co-ordinated approach to landscape design and the wider integration into the setting and place design;
- The existing access is unsuitable to support a substantial increase in dwellings. Therefore a new junction onto the A72 will be required to the west of the existing, with the existing junction closed off. The main access point into this site will need to be at the south westerly corner and the road between here and the new junction with the A72 will need to be upgraded to an appropriate standard;
- Transport Assessment would be required;
- The site must ensure connectivity and integration with Eshiels and the adjacent proposed site (MESH1001) should it also be taken forward;
- Non vehicular link would be required, linking to the path network and Peebles;
- Potential for Drainage Impact Assessment, in respect of the WWTW; and
- Potential for Water Impact Assessment, in respect of the WTW.

Overall, taking the above into consideration, it is noted that there are a number of identified constraints within the site, however it is considered that there are no insurmountable planning issues which cannot be overcome through appropriate mitigation measures though archaeological issues are sensitive and will require further detailed consideration. It is considered that a masterplan must be prepared, in conjunction with (MESH1001) and the site must accommodate an element of business land. Overall, the site is proposed as a preferred mixed used option within the MIR, with an indicative site capacity of 40 units.

# Innerleithen

<b>Site reference</b>	<b>Site name</b>	<b>Settlement</b>	<b>RGA</b>	<b>Proposed Use</b>	<b>Indicative Capacity</b>	<b>Ha</b>	<b>MIR status</b>
MINNE003	Land West of Innerleithen	Innerleithen	Western	Mixed Use	50	6.8	Preferred

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b>	<b>SAC</b>	<b>SPA</b>	<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

The site is not located within any international/national designation.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the River Tweed. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within the site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. In addition, surface water runoff from the nearby hills may be an issue and may require mitigation measures during design stage.

There is the potential that development at this allocation could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard at this site.

Foul drainage from the development must be connected to the existing SW foul sewer network. Std comments for SUDS.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with the fluvial 1 in 200 year flood extents. This site is shown to be affected by surface water flooding in some small areas in the South of the site. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk but would require that surface water runoff be considered.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b>	<b>Planning history references</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	There is no planning application history on the site. Housing SG: The site was considered for housing as part of the Housing SG (AINNE008). Local Plan Amendment: The eastern part of the site was considered as part of the Housing SG (AINNE001).

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b>	<b>Access to employment</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b>	<b>Site aspect</b>
Good	Good	Good	Moderate	South-west

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Moderate biodiversity impact. Site appears to be an improved pasture with an area of scrub in the western corner and scrub and grassland along the disused railway. Provisional

Local Biodiversity Site along old railway line (Innerleithen disused railway). Redshank, oystercatcher, lapwing and curlew recorded in Tetrad NT33I in breeding season. Site adjacent to SEPA 1 in 200 year indicative flood risk area. No obvious drainage linkage but on a precautionary basis potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC/ SSSI. Protect boundary features on disused railway and mitigation for protected species potentially badger and breeding birds. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC/SSSI. SEPA CAR construction site licence required (site >4ha)

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the west of Innerleithen. Innerleithen has good access to public transport, services and employment opportunities. There is a bus stop within walking distance of this site, with good connectivity to Galashiels, Edinburgh and other settlements, including Peebles. Peebles is located 7 miles to the west, which also provides a wider range of services and employment opportunities. There is a primary school located within Innerleithen and the nearest High School is within Peebles. There are moderate biodiversity issues, which are highlighted in the consultation response from the Ecology Officer.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific LB and CA issues – Caerlee House is listed category C but is located in woodland so development unlikely to have an impact on its setting.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Spoke to the Archaeology Officer who advised that there is evidence of archaeology within the site (Roman Camp). Would require justification against LDP policies.

---

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
Not applicable	On/adjacent to site			On/adjacent to site

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: The overall assessment in Appendix 10 of the Housing SG was that the site should be excluded for the following reason: 'It is considered that the site forms part of the setting of Innerleithen, should development occur at this location it is considered that it would result in a dominant element on the western approach into the settlement and have a negative impact on the Tweed Valley SLA. There is also the potential for the site to impact on archaeology, in addition there is already substantial allocated land within the settlement.'. We agree with the assessment of potential landscape impacts and consider that the site should remain unallocated. Partial allocation could however be considered if there was a wider or over-riding need for housing in this area. In such circumstances close attention should be paid to allocations and site briefings which allow retain open views to the wider landscape as experienced from the road and existing dwellings

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: The site is a large field to the south of A72 approaching Innerleithen from the west. The ground slopes steeply down from the A72 before levelling out in the south eastern part that borders the existing settlement boundary west of Buchan Place off Traquair Road. Careful consideration will be required to achieve a scheme of structure planting that mitigates the visual impact of the development when seen from the elevated A72 coming into Innerleithen from the west, while maintaining views southward across the Tweed valley.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

<b>Physical access/road capacity</b>	<b>Near a trunk road?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	--

NETWORK MANAGER: No response received.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: I have no objections to the allocation of this site for mixed use. There is ample opportunity for the easterly portion of the site to be well integrated with and connected to the surrounding street network i.e. Tweed View, St Ronan's Health Centre and Angle Park. The close proximity of the multi-use path to the south of the site offers a great opportunity to provide a

pedestrian/cycle link to the site. I would not necessarily rule out direct access from the A72 into the site, however this would need to be carefully designed to ensure the appropriate gradients and visibility splays can be achieved. A strong street frontage would help have a positive impact on driver behaviour along this section of the A72. A Transport Assessment, or at least a Transport Statement, will be a prerequisite for development on this site to address matters of accessibility and sustainable transport.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No response received.

#### Right of way

Adjacent to site

#### TPOs

Not applicable

#### Contaminated land

Not applicable

#### Water supply

Limited

#### Sewerage

Limited

#### Gas Supply

Yes

#### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT:** The site lies to the south west of the town immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary edge and would appear to be a logical extension of the town. The land slopes from the main public road A72 south to the River Tweed SAC. The site lies within the Tweed Valley Special Landscape Area. The site will be visible from main public road A72 on approach from Peebles and would become the new edge of the settlement. Landscaping would be an important consideration in order to soften the edge of any development. Low density development of high quality may appropriate for edge of settlement area. The site lies immediately north and adjacent to an area which is considered to be at a high risk of flooding from the River Tweed (SAC) and is thus a potentially vulnerable area. Surface water drainage may be an issue/would require to be considered. Potential for access from existing development may be a consideration. West end of site is steeper and located adjacent to sharp bend in the A72.

**HOUSING STRATEGY:** Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.

**SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW):** Walkerburn WWTW has sufficient capacity. A Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

**SCOTTISH WATER (WTW):** Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. Please note there is an existing 100m water main within the site boundary. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

**OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM:** Requires non-vehicular links to path network and Peebles town and amenities.

**CONTAMINATED LAND:** There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

**NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES:** No response received.

**ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH:** No response received.

**PROJECTS TEAM:** No response received.

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT:** Whilst the site is likely to be mainly housing, an area of mixed use of commercial / business use would be desirable adjacent to the health centre and other similar business uses.

**EDUCATION OFFICER:** No issues.

**NHS:** No response received.

## Overall assessment

#### MIR status

Preferred

#### Overall assessment

Acceptable

#### Site capacity

50

### Conclusions

The site lies to the west of Innerleithen, just outwith the settlement boundary, on the south side of the A72. The site was identified as part of the 'Western Rural Growth Area: Development Options Study' which was undertaken by LUC, to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Central Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP for the Central Tweeddale area, in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders. The site currently being considered, is proposed for a mixed use development with an indicative site capacity for 50 units.

Innerleithen has good access to public transport, services and employment, given the proximity to Peebles and good links to Galashiels and Edinburgh. Further to a site assessment, the following constraints/issues were identified, which may require mitigation;

- Flood Risk Assessment required, in respect of potential flood risk and surface water runoff on the site;
- Potential connectivity to the River Tweed SAC/SSSI, mitigation required to ensure no likely significant effects;
- Protect and enhance the existing boundary features and protect boundary features on dis-used railway;

- Potential protected species, including breeding birds within the site, would require mitigation;
- Located within the 'Tweed Valley' Special Landscape Area;
- The western part of the site is constrained within the Landscape Capacity Study;
- SNH advise that the site should remain unallocated, given the potential for any development to result in a dominant element on the western approach into the settlement. However, structure planting is proposed and it is considered that this would mitigate any visual impacts of the development from the A72;
- Transport Assessment or at least Statement required;
- Evidence of archaeology within the site, therefore mitigation required. The Officer would prefer in-situ protection, full investigation would be required for the area within the Roman Camp;
- Roads Planning Officer raised no objections to the allocation;
- Potential for Drainage Impact Assessment, in respect of the WWTW;
- Potential for Water Impact Assessment, in respect of the WTW; and
- Non vehicular links to existing path network and Peebles town/amenities.

It should be noted that the site was considered as part of the Housing SG for housing development and was ultimately not included. An initial Stage 1 RAG assessment was undertaken as part of the Housing SG. It is acknowledged that concerns were raised in the conclusions at that stage, regarding the prominent location, impact upon the SLA and potential archaeology. However since that assessment, a more extensive study of the Tweeddale area has been undertaken by LUC, in order to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Tweeddale. The site was one option put forward for consideration, in respect of a mixed use site. A re-assessment has therefore been undertaken, in light of the additional information contained within the LUC Study and consultation responses. It should also be noted that there are a lack of suitable development opportunities within the Tweeddale area going forward.

Overall, taking the above into consideration, it is considered that there are no insurmountable planning issues which cannot be overcome through appropriate mitigation measures. These will be set out within the site requirements. Overall, the site is proposed as a preferred mixed use option within the MIR, with an indicative site capacity of 50 units. It should be noted that the site should accommodate an element of business land.

---



# Oxton

<b>Site reference</b>	<b>Site name</b>	<b>Settlement</b>	<b>RGA</b>	<b>Proposed Use</b>	<b>Indicative Capacity</b>	<b>Ha</b>	<b>MIR status</b>
<b>AOXTO010</b>	Nether Howden	Oxton	Rest of Borders	Housing	30	2.1	<b>Preferred</b>

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b>	<b>SAC</b>	<b>SPA</b>	<b>SSSI</b>	<b>Ramsar</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designation constraints.

SEPA: OS Map indicates a sufficient height difference between site and Leader Water. Surface Water Flood Map is picking up the low point of the dismantled railway.

Foul water must be connected to the existing SW foul network. SW should confirm any capacity/network issues.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents. I would have no objection to this proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b>	<b>NNR</b>	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b>	<b>Current use/s</b>	<b>Planning history references</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Combination	N/A

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b>	<b>Access to employment</b>	<b>Access to services</b>	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b>	<b>Site aspect</b>
Good	Good	Limited	Moderate	Not applicable

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Moderate biodiversity impact. Site consists of farm buildings and agricultural outbuildings, garden ground (mature broadleaves) and improved pasture. Potential for EPS (bats) and breeding birds to use built structures within the site. No obvious connectivity with the River Tweed SAC (Leader water). Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC. Mitigation for protected species including bats and breeding birds.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the east of Oxton, just outwith the settlement boundary. Development will help sustain local services in the settlement such as the school, shop and village hall. Settlement is near the strategic public transport network on the A68(T). The site has other local services a 10 minutes driving distance away in Lauder.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Not applicable

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Not applicable

### Garden and designed

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There are no known issues, although there is generally a low to moderate potential in the wider area. Some mitigation may be required depending on the development.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: No specific comment.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

Adjacent to site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to size and location.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: There are clearly issues with access that need to be addressed if the original Nether Howden building group is retained. A 10m wide belt of woodland planting along the east boundary would help to provide containment to the development from the east and separation from the farm buildings immediately to the east.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

### Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: Additional traffic being added to junction with A68.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: Possible bus stop infrastructure.

ROADS PLANNING: In order to achieve satisfactory access to this site the existing farm will have to be redeveloped and some of the farm buildings will have to be demolished. A footway and street lighting will be required from the site along the minor road to link in with Station Road (Main Street). Widening of the minor road carriageway will also be required. A secondary access from the extreme south westerly corner of the site which links into Justice Park and the possibility of a further pedestrian/cycle linkage between plots 26/27 Justice Park should be explored in the best interests of connectivity and integration of the existing street network. Depending on the scale of development a Transport Statement is likely to be required.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

On site

### Water supply

Yes

### Sewerage

Yes

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: Appears to be constraint free.

HOUSING STRATEGY: No issues.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Oxton WwTW has sufficient capacity. Sufficient capacity in the network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Howden WTW has sufficient capacity. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: No Comment.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: An area of the site appears to have been previously developed with agricultural buildings. The site is brownfield land and its former use may present development

constraints.  
ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.  
PROJECTS TEAM: No issues.  
EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.  
NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

MIR status	Overall assessment	Site capacity
Preferred	Acceptable	30

### Conclusions

The site is located to the north east of Oxton, adjacent to the existing settlement boundary. The site currently consists of farm land, buildings and agricultural buildings. Oxton has good access to public transport and employment, however limited access to services. However, it is considered that this site would assist in supporting the existing services within the settlement. It is considered that the site has the potential to integrate with the rest of the settlement. The consultation process highlighted the following constraints/issues, which may require mitigation measures;

- There is potential for breeding birds and bats, given the existing buildings on site;
- Potential connectivity with the River Tweed SAC/SSSI;
- Potential for archaeology within the site;
- The Lammermuir Hills SLA lies to the north east;
- Planting along the eastern boundary, would help to provide containment to development from the east and separation from the farm buildings to the east. The landscaping would help to assist in enhancing and enclosing the site;
- Footway and street lighting would be required, to link with Station Road;
- Access from the south west corner of the site and the possibility of further pedestrian/cycle linkage should be explored, in the best interests of connectivity and integration of existing street network;
- Transport Statement required;
- Water Impact Assessment required, in respect of the WTW network capacity; and
- Part of the site is brownfield land and may have contaminated land constraints.

Overall, it is considered that there are no insurmountable constraints, to prevent the development of this site, subject to appropriate mitigation measures being put in place. In conclusion, the site will be taken forward within the MIR as a preferred option for housing, with an indicative site capacity for 30 units.

---

# Peebles

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR status
<b>APEEB056</b>	Land South of Chapelhill Farm	Peebles	Western	Housing	150	7.0	<b>Preferred</b>

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not lie within any international/national designation constraints. The River Tweed SAC lies to the east of this site.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Eddleston Water and small watercourses which flow along the southern and north eastern boundary. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site which may exacerbate flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within the site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at increased risk of flooding.

There is the potential that the development of this allocation could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard at this site.

There is a water body immediately adjacent to the site. Therefore, SEPA advise that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

Foul drainage from the development should be connected to the existing SW foul sewer network (although the site is just outwith the current sewered catchment). Std comments for SUDS. The watercourse adjacent to the site should be protected and enhanced as part of any development.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial (river) 1 in 200 year flood extents but there is a very small pocket of potential surface water impacts on the South Eastern side of the site at a 1 in 200 year flood event.

I would have no objections on the grounds of flood risk. However, I would ask that due to surface water risk and the capacity of the development that surface water flooding is considered and it is ensured that any water would be routed around the housing.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	There is no planning application history on this site. The southern part of this site was previously considered as part of the Local Development Plan (APEEB036). The southern part of this site, formed part of a much larger site, which was considered as part of the Local Plan 2005/06 (TP12).

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

### Access to public transport

Good

### Access to employment

Good

### Access to services

Good

### Wider biodiversity impacts

Moderate

### Site aspect

South

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Moderate biodiversity risk. Site appears to be an improved pasture with treeline on parts of boundary and drystone dyke along road. Adjacent to areas within SEPA 1 in 200 year indicative flood risk area. Potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats (EPS), badger and breeding birds. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC (Eddleston water). SEPA CAR construction site licence required (site >4ha) (7.01ha).

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the north of Peebles, just outwith the settlement boundary. Peebles has good access to public transport, employment and services. There are moderate biodiversity issues associated with this site. Peebles is within commuting distance to Edinburgh, where a wider selection of employment opportunities are available.

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Not applicable

### Listed buildings

Adjacent to site

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

Adjacent to site

### Garden and designed

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Standalane Cottage at the SW end of the site is category C listed and the proposed development may have an impact on its setting, but this can probably be addressed through mitigation. Careful consideration will be needed about the site layout as the site straddles the road – will there be a “street frontage”?

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Spoke to the Officer who advised that there is potential for archaeology on the site.

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

Not applicable

### SLA

On/adjacent to site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: APEEB056 lies adjacent to the recent development at Standalane. The outlying and linear nature of the site is likely to result in development that is physically and perceptually detached from the rest of Peebles. The general sense of openness and the rolling nature of the topography could also accentuate these issues. In overall terms we highlight that this site, even with landscape planting and retention of stone walls, could result in a settlement extension which appears incongruous and detracts from the existing well defined and characterful landscape setting of Peebles. The western part of the site is on a slope and would appear likely to require significant cut and fill to achieve development platforms.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: This site lies on both sides of the minor road that links the A703 to Rosetta Road. The site is out with the development boundary and would extend the Peebles settlement .425km further north up the Eddleston Water valley. It would be highly visible from the A703 approaching from the north. It will be essential to achieve containment to the northern edge (by carefully designed structure planting that could extend into the flood plain along the eastern boundary) and additional planting as a backdrop (containment) along the more elevated and exposed west boundary.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: No response received.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: Any development at the north end of Peebles will be reliant upon improved vehicular linkage being provided over the Eddleston Water between Rosetta Road and the A703. This should ideally be provided between Kingsland Square and Dalatho Street, but there may be other acceptable opportunities further north. Third party land ownership will be an issue. Existing pedestrian and street lighting infrastructure would need to be extended out from the town to the development site. Fundamental to the development of this site is good pedestrian/cycle connectivity with the provision in Standalane View. There appears to be constraints engineering wise and land ownership wise in achieving this and it will need to be demonstrated that solutions are available before I can offer my support for this site being developed for housing. Some minor road improvement work may be required to Rosetta Road leading to the site from the town to facilitate the flow of traffic and the existing public road through the site will likely need to be modified to accommodate the development. A Transport Assessment would be required to identify and address transport impacts and to demonstrate sustainable travel is achievable.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No response received.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Limited

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Average

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No response received.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. A Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network .

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. A Water Impact Assessment (WIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS: requires a pavement into the town precincts and non-vehicular links to the existing path network.

CONTAMINATED LAND: There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.

EDUCATION OFFICER: Kingsland Primary and Halyrude RC Primary would be at full capacity if development went ahead, an extension or new school may need to be considered

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

### MIR status

Preferred

### Overall assessment

Acceptable

### Site capacity

150

### Conclusions

The site lies at Peebles, just outwith the settlement boundary to the north. The site was identified as part of the 'Western Rural Growth Area: Development Options Study' which was undertaken by LUC, to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Central Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP for the Central Tweeddale area, in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders. The site currently being considered, is proposed for a housing development with an indicative site capacity for 150 units.

Peebles has good access to services, employment and public transport. Further to a site assessment, the following constraints/issues were identified, which may require mitigation;

- Flood Risk Assessment required, in respect of potential flood risk and surface water runoff on the site;
- Water body immediately adjacent to the site, therefore a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6m wide must be provided between the watercourse and any built development. Additional water quality buffer

strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures. This is required given the watercourse(s) which run through and adjacent to the site;

- Foul sewerage constraints, as the site is located outwith the current sewered catchment;
- Potential connectivity to the River Tweed SAC/SSSI, mitigation required to ensure no likely significant effects;
- Protect and enhance the existing boundary features;
- Potential protected species, including breeding birds within the site, would require mitigation;
- Located within the Tweed Valley SLA;
- Constrained within the Landscape Capacity Study;
- Visible site from the A703;
- In order to provide containment, the north edge would need structure planting and additional planting as a backdrop;
- Would require improved vehicular linkage over the Eddleston Water between Rosetta Road and the A703 (preferred route is between Kingsland Road and Dalatho Street);
- Existing pedestrian and street lighting would be needed from the development to the town;
- Pedestrian infrastructure would need to be extended out from the town to the site. Option could include provision of access via Standalane View. This matter requires further investigation;
- Transport Assessment required;
- Potential for archaeology within the site;
- Potential for a Drainage Impact Assessment, in respect of WWTW; and
- Potential for a Water Impact Assessment, in respect of WTW.

It should be noted that the Education Officer states that Kingsland Primary and Halyrude RC Primary would be at full capacity if development went ahead, an extension or new school may need to be considered. Further investigation into this matter requires to be carried out.

Overall, taking the above into consideration, it is considered that there are no insurmountable planning issues which cannot be overcome through appropriate mitigation measures although further investigations need to be carried out regarding road/pedestrian infrastructure and school capacity. These will be set out within the site requirements. Overall, the site is proposed as a preferred housing option within the MIR, with an indicative site capacity of 150 units.

---

<b>Site reference</b> SPEEB009	<b>Site name</b> East of Cademuir Hill	<b>Settlement</b> Peebles	<b>RGA</b> Western	<b>Proposed Use</b> Long Term Housing	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> N/A	<b>Ha</b> 13.2	<b>MIR status</b> Preferred
-----------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------------------	--	-----------------------------------	-------------------	--------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international or national designation constraints. The comments from SEPA and the Flood and Coastal Management Team were based on the original consultation for all 3 parcels of land (SPEEB007).

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Haystoun Burn and Crookston Burn and small watercourses which flow through and adjacent to the site. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site which may exacerbate flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Due to the steepness of the adjacent hill slopes we would also recommend that consideration is given to surface water runoff to ensure the site is not at risk of flooding and nearby development and infrastructure are not at increased risk of flooding.

Development on this site, has the potential to increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard identified within the site.

Multiple watercourses throughout the site. Therefore, SEPA require a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide to be provided between the watercourse and the built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

This allocation appears to comprise 3 separate sites with no indication of number of units for each. However given the size of the sites the allocation would appear to potentially be quite large. Foul drainage from the development should be connected to the existing SW foul sewer network (although the sites are just outwith the current sewer catchment). Private foul drainage is unlikely to be feasible for this size of development as there are no major watercourses in the vicinity in which to discharge effluent. Std comments for SUDS. The watercourses adjacent/running through the site should be protected and enhanced as part of any development. The most northerly allocation appears to be close to the SW public drinking water supply works.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: The Crookston Burn runs between the three sites and has an impact on small areas of all three sites. In all three of the sites, small parts of the site are shown to be at both fluvial and pluvial flood risk. It would be dependent on the layout of the development and the proposed access and egress as to whether a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) would be required. I would, however, definitely require that potential surface water is considered during development due to the large capacity of the site.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> Local Plan Amendment: Part of the site considered (APEEB010) and (APEEB013)
--	------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	---

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

<b>Access to public transport</b> Good	<b>Access to employment</b> Limited	<b>Access to services</b> Good	<b>Wider biodiversity impacts</b> Moderate	<b>Site aspect</b> South
---	--	-----------------------------------	---	-----------------------------



## Accessibility and sustainability summary

It should be noted that the response from the Ecology Officer was for the 3 parcels of land (SPEEB007), however the comments have still be used.

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk: Moderate impact. Site appears to be an improved pasture with mature broadleaf treeline and hedgerow on boundary and tree lined field boundary within site, (these feature on 1st Ed OS map). Records of breeding barn owl, oystercatcher and lapwing within site. Red Squirrel recorded in and adjacent to site. Areas within SEPA 1 in 200 year indicative flood risk area. Potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC/SSSI via the Crookston burn to Haystoun burn. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats (EPS), badger, red squirrel, and breeding birds. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC/SSSI. SEPA CAR construction site licence required (site >4ha).

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site lies to the south of Peebles, directly to the south of the settlement boundary. Peebles has good access to public transport, employment and services.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

Conservation area	Open space	Listed buildings	Scheduled Monument	Ancient woodland inventory	Archaeology	Garden and designed
Not applicable	Adjacent to site	Adjacent to site	Not applicable	Not applicable	Adjacent to site	On/adjacent to site

## Local impact and integration summary

It should be noted that the responses are for the 3 parcels of land (SPEEB007), however the comments have still be used.

HERITAGE & DESIGN: There is a cluster of listed building at the end of the Bonnington Road, but these are screened by an existing woodland strip so the setting of these building is unlikely to be adversely affected. The sites on the W side of the Crookston Burn are likely to have less impact visually that that on the E side of the burn.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: No issues raised.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Spoke to the Officer who advised that there is potential for archaeology within the site, given the proximity to archaeology to the south of the site.

---

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
Adjacent to site	On/adjacent to site			Not applicable

## Landscape summary

It should be noted that the responses are for the 3 parcels of land (SPEEB007), however the comments have still be used.

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: (SPEEB007) is a significant potential extension to Peebles, in an area of strongly defined landscape character outwith the current settlement boundary. We are concerned that development in the three sections proposed has the potential to promote a sense of piecemeal growth to Peebles with sections physically and perceptually detached from the town. The area of Bonnington Road as it currently skirts around Cademuir Hill also acts as an important and attractive landscape approach to the nearby Upper Tweeddale National Scenic Area. Land to the west of Bonnington Road is rising and will promote a degree of landscape and visual impact both on the approach to Peebles and from wider views. We are not convinced that these three sites represent a co-ordinated or planned approach to expansion of Peebles.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: The site lies on the south side of Peebles and is made up of agricultural fields within the Haystoun Designed landscape which is characterised by tree belts separating fields in the valleys of Haystoun Burn and the neighbouring Crookstoun Burn together with blocks of planting on adjacent hills, all on a modest scale. If additional planting is developed that builds on the existing historic landscape structure, an attractive extension to Peebles could be achieved. The landscape structure must not be compromised to achieve greater number of units. A hierarchy of circulation and access should be a requirement of any layout.

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

It should be noted that the responses are for the 3 parcels of land (SPEEB007), however the comments have still be used.

NETWORK MANAGER: No response received.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No issues raised.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: Any further development on the south side of the River Tweed is reliant on a new river crossing due to issues over capacity, High Street amenity and the reliance on a single bridge for the south side of Peebles. I am opposed to the larger southerly part of this site being zoned for development in that: Bonnington Road would be the shortest route into town and it is not of a standard suitable for serving this level of development, this land is too divorced from the town, and the gap between this part of the site and the northerly part means that there would be no opportunity for properly integrating the two areas. The smaller northerly portion of land could be zoned for longer term housing, but a Transport Assessment would be required to justify the extent of housing the road network could support. As well as a new bridge over the Tweed, a road link would be required between this site and Kingsmeadows Road via Sites SPEEB004, SPEEB003 and Whitehaugh Park. A link is then required from this road into Glen Road. This will all help disperse traffic. Some road improvements are likely to be required to Bonnington Road towards Springhill Road to assist with traffic flow.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No response received.

### Right of way

Adjacent to site

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Limited

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

Yes

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

It should be noted that the responses are for the 3 parcels of land (SPEEB007), however the comments have still be used.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: No response received.

HOUSING STRATEGY: No issues raised.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. A Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. Please note there is a Raw water supply and existing water main running through the middle of site. Additionally the site is in close proximity to our existing Water treatment works. A Water Impact Assessment is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: The development of these sites would reduce further the aesthetics of the environment and require a sensitive design in order to maintain a sense of place for residents and visitors alike which includes the path network and any new links to it.

CONTAMINATED LAND: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed until the two southern land parcels were developed for mobile poultry housing units. The northern land parcel appears to have remained undeveloped greenfield land throughout. There is no evidence to indicate that this sites historic uses may present development constraints

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

### MIR status

Preferred

### Overall assessment

Acceptable

### Site capacity

N/A

## Conclusions

The site lies to the south of Peebles, adjacent to the settlement boundary and to the south of Kings Muir. The site was identified as part of the 'Western Rural Growth Area: Development Options Study' which was undertaken by LUC, to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Central Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP and for the future, within the Central Tweeddale area, in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders. The site currently being considered is proposed for a longer term housing development site. It should be noted that the site was originally consulted as 3 parcels of land (SPEEB007), however further to the consultation responses, it was decided to only take the north most parcel of land forward, therefore the site was re-coded as (SPEEB009). Therefore, the consultation responses are all based on the previous site code (SPEEB007).

Peebles has good access to services, employment and public transport. Further to a site assessment, the following constraints/issues were identified, which may require mitigation;

- Flood Risk Management to assess the flood risk and surface water runoff within the site;
- There is a waterbody within the site, therefore a maintenance buffer strip will be required;
- Foul drainage should connect to SW foul sewer network;
- Watercourses within and adjacent to the sites must be protected and enhanced as part of any development;
- Potential connectivity to the River Tweed SAC/SSSI;
- Protect and enhance existing boundary features, where possible;
- Potential protected species on site, mitigation required;
- The site is located within the 'Haystoun' Designed Landscape (SBC);
- The site lies to the south of Jubilee Park Greenspace
- There are 2 HER records to the north west of the site and 1 to the south;
- There are a group of listed buildings to the north of the site;
- The site lies within the Tweed Valley SLA;
- The site lies to the east of the Upper Tweeddale NSA;
- SNH raised concerns that the 3 parcels (SPEEB007) has the potential to promote a sense of piecemeal growth to Peebles, with sections physically and perceptually detached from the town. However, it is considered that this has been taken on board and only the 1 northmost site is being assessed and considered;
- SNH state that the area of Bonnington Road acts as an important and attractive landscape approach to the nearby Upper Tweeddale NSA;
- The Landscape Officer states that if additional planting is developed that builds on the existing historic landscape structure, an attractive extension to Peebles could be achieved;
- The Roads Planning Officer raised initial concerns with the 2 southern sites being taken forward as part of (SPEEB007), however advised that the north most site could be zoned for longer term housing, but a Transport Assessment would be required to justify the extent of housing the road network could support. Therefore, the site currently under consideration is the north most site of (SPEEB007);
- Any further development on the south side of the River Tweed is dependent on a new river crossing due to issues regarding capacity of road network and the reliance on the existing single bridge;
- Road linkage would be required between this site and Kingsmeadow Road via (SPEEB004, SPEEB003 and Whitehaugh Park), a link is then required from this road into Glen Road;
- Water Impact Assessment required in respect of WTW network; and
- Drainage Impact Assessment required in respect of WWTW network.

It is acknowledged that parts of the site have previously been assessed for development and not been taken forward. Although the sites/parts of the site have previously been assessed, since these previous assessments a more intensive study of the Central Tweeddale area has been undertaken by LUC, in order to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Central Tweeddale. This site was one option put forward for consideration, in respect of a longer term housing site. The site boundary has taken cognisance of the comments from the Roads Planning Officer to (SPEEB007) and the current site under consideration (SPEEB009) is now a reduced site.

Overall, taking the above into consideration, it is considered that there are a number of constraints identified within and adjacent to the site. However, it is not considered that any of these constraints are insurmountable and could be mitigated, subject to appropriate site requirements and infrastructure. There are aspects which would require further investigation, most notably the need for a new bridge crossing over the River Tweed. However, given the longer term nature of this allocation, it is considered that this allows time to look further into the constraints and mitigation measures in more detail.

In conclusion, the longer term housing site will be taken forward as a preferred option within the MIR. It should be noted that longer term sites will not be formal allocations within the LDP2, rather areas identified for potential development in the future.

<b>Site reference</b> SPEEB008	<b>Site name</b> Land West of Edderston Ridge	<b>Settlement</b> Peebles	<b>RGA</b> Western	<b>Proposed Use</b> Long Term Mixed Use	<b>Indicative Capacity</b> N/A	<b>Ha</b> 19.5	<b>MIR status</b> Preferred
-----------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------------------	--	-----------------------------------	-------------------	--------------------------------

## Initial assessment

<b>Floodrisk</b> 1:200	<b>SAC</b> Not applicable	<b>SPA</b> Not applicable	<b>SSSI</b> Not applicable	<b>Ramsar</b> Not applicable
---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designations.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the Edderston Burn and tributaries which flow through and adjacent to the site. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structures within and adjacent to the site. The applicant would need to be mindful of the FPS to ensure there is no increase in risk elsewhere. There have been discussions regarding additional flood prevention works here which may restrict development. Due to steep topography through the allocation site, consideration should be given to surface runoff issues to ensure adequate mitigation is implemented. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further as and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Discussions should also take place with the flood prevention officer regarding the additional flood protection works that are considered in the future to ensure a holistic approach. There is the potential that development of this allocation could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard identified within the site.

There is a watercourse going through the site. There is the potential that development on this site could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard identified within the site. SEPA advise that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

Foul drainage from the development must be connected to the existing SW foul sewer network. Std comments for SUDS. The burns running through/adjacent of the site must be protected and enhanced as part of any development.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial (river) 1 in 200 year flood extents but there is a very small pocket of potential surface water impacts on the South Eastern side of the site at a 1 in 200 year flood event.

I would have no objections on the grounds of flood risk. However, I would ask that due to surface water risk and the potential capacity of the development that surface water flooding is considered and it is ensured that any water would be routed around the housing.

## Background information

<b>Minerals and coal</b> Not applicable	<b>NNR</b> Not applicable	<b>Prime Quality Agricultural Land</b> Not applicable	<b>Current use/s</b> Greenfield	<b>Planning history references</b> There is no planning application history within the site. The site or parts of the site, have been looked at as part of a number of previous plans, these are outlined below. Housing SG: A larger site was assessed for housing (APEEB052) Housing SG: The eastern part of the site was assessed for housing (APEEB048) Housing SG: The southern triangle was part of a larger site assessed for housing (APEEB047) Local Plan Amendment: Parts of the site were assessed as part of the LPA, including (APEEB005), (BPEEB002), (APEEB016), (APEEB015), (APEEB022), (BPEEB003) and (MPEEB002). Local Development Plan: Parts of the site were assessed as part of the LDP, including (MPEEB002),
--	------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--

---

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

### Access to public transport

Good

### Access to employment

Good

### Access to services

Good

### Wider biodiversity impacts

Moderate

### Site aspect

South

### Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Biodiversity Risk - Moderate impact. Site appears to be an improved pasture with mature broadleaf treeline and woodland on parts of boundary. These feature on (1st Ed OS map). Records of oystercatcher and lapwing within site. Potential connectivity to River Tweed SAC via the Edderstone burn. Protect boundary features and mitigation for protected species potentially including bats (EPS), badger and breeding birds. Mitigation to ensure no significant effect on River Tweed SAC/SSSI. SEPA CAR construction site licence required (site >4ha).

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is located to the west of Peebles, just outwith the settlement boundary. Peebles has good access to public transport, employment and services. There are moderate biodiversity issues associated with this site. Peebles is within commuting distance to Edinburgh, where there is a wider range of employment opportunities.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

### Conservation area

Not applicable

### Open space

Adjacent to site

### Listed buildings

Adjacent to site

### Scheduled Monument

Not applicable

### Ancient woodland inventory

Not applicable

### Archaeology

On/adjacent to site

### Garden and designed

Not applicable

### Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Boundary treatments will be an important element in any development. The colour and hue of any development will also need to be carefully considered as the land rises to the south and will be visible from the N of the Tweed.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ARCHAEOLOGY: Spoke to the Officer who advised that there is potential for archaeology within the site.

---

## Landscape assessment

### NSA

On/adjacent to site

### SLA

On/adjacent to site

### Over 200 metres?

### Over 12 degree slope

### Wild Land

Not applicable

### Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: We understand that this site has been considered on a number of occasions and has been refused due to access constraints. If those constraints are now considered likely to be overcome we advise that the proximity of the site to the Upper Tweeddale National Scenic Area should be addressed in site requirements in relation to built form and landscape design to ensure appropriate wider integration of the town within its countryside context. Appropriate recreational access routes, for example to the Manor Sware viewpoint, should also be retained or re-established in appropriate form.

The northern-most boundary of the site is also in close proximity to the River Tweed SAC, which should also be considered further prior to allocating the site.

LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: This site comprises a number of large sloping fields to the south west of the Peebles settlement boundary. The land and fields slope to the north east and are of a gentle gradient

---

appropriate for development. A scheme of structure planting will be required to create a landscape fit as well as define the limit of settlement expansion in this immediate area – this may be in response to the contours rather than existing field boundaries and should seek to protect the amenity of the existing adjacent housing as well as help to reduce the scale of the site by creating tree belts, green corridors and a hierarchy of circulation built into the landscape structure.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

Near a trunk road?

NETWORK MANAGER: No response received.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development of this site.

ROADS PLANNING OFFICER: Any further development on the south side of the River Tweed is reliant on a new river crossing due to issues over capacity, High Street amenity and the reliance on a single bridge for the south side of Peebles. Previously I have expressed concern on the possibility of development in this area on the grounds of the traffic capacity of the roads leading to the site i.e. Caledonian Road and South Parks. The problem with Caledonian Road is parking in the carriageway, forcing single file traffic, and the issue with South Parks is the tortuous nature of the initial length of the road off the mini roundabout. That said, there may be scope for tackling some of the capacity issues and one benefit of this land is its relative close proximity to the town centre. This favours well from a sustainable transport point of view. If this area is to be developed for mixed use development it should be dependent on measures being taken to improve the capacity of the roads leading to the site. The extent of the site suitable for development, possibly not all of it, will be dependent on the extent of off-site improvements and the findings of a Transport Assessment. Development will have to integrate and connect with the existing housing land to the east by way of access linkage with South Parks, Edderston Ridge/Edderston Ridge Park and Edderston Road. This will help with dispersion of traffic. The Sware road which runs along the southern boundary of this proposed allocation will have to be upgraded to a suitable standard. Extension of the street lighting and footways would have to be included, as would the relocation of the existing 30mph limits.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No response received.

### Right of way

Not applicable

### TPOs

Not applicable

### Contaminated land

Not applicable

### Water supply

Limited

### Sewerage

Limited

### Gas Supply

No

### Education provision

Good

### Planning & infrastructure summary

DEVELOPMENT MANGEMENT: No response received.

HOUSING STRATEGY: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. A Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WTW. A Water Impact Assessment (WIA) is required to establish what impact, if any this development has on the existing network.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: The development of these sites would reduce farther the aesthetics of the environment an require a sensitive design in order to maintain a sense of place for residents and visitors alike which includes the path network and any new links to it.

CONTAMINATED LAND: There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No response received.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: No objections. An integrated design study is needed to ascertain the most appropriate way to integrate the various elements of the development. It would be preferable if the flattest land within this allocation could be used for any business use on the site as developing on sloping land is problematic and costly for business use

EDUCATION OFFICER: No issues.

NHS: No response received.

---

## Overall assessment

## MIR status

Preferred

## Overall assessment

Acceptable

## Site capacity

N/A

## Conclusions

The site lies to the west of Peebles and wraps around South Park Industrial Estate and Edderston Ridge/Road. The site was identified as part of the 'Western Rural Growth Area: Development Options Study' which was undertaken by LUC, to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Central Tweeddale. The reason for this study being that there are limited development allocations currently identified within the LDP and for the future, within the Central Tweeddale area, in comparison to other areas within the Scottish Borders. The site currently being considered is proposed for a longer term mixed use development site.

Peebles has good access to services, employment and public transport. Further to a site assessment, the following constraints/issues were identified, which may require mitigation;

- Flood Risk Assessment required, in respect of flood risk and surface water runoff potential;
- There is a watercourse which runs through the site, therefore a maintenance buffer strip is required;
- There is potential connectivity to the River Tweed SAC/SSSI
- Protect and enhance the existing boundary features, where possible
- Potential protected species, including bats and breeding birds;
- Potential archaeology within the site
- The site lies partially within the Tweed Valley SLA
- The small section of the north west corner of the site lies within the Upper Tweeddale NSA
- The south eastern triangle of the site is identified as constrained within the Landscape Capacity Study
- Structure planting and landscaping is required, to create a landscape fit as well as determine the limit of the settlement expansion within this area. This will help integrate the development into the landscape setting of the SLA an NSA
- Any additional development on the south side of the River Tweed is reliant on a new river crossing due to issues over capacity, High Street amenity and the reliance on a single bridge for the south side of Peebles. It is acknowledged that the extent of the site suitable for development, will be dependent on the extent of off-site improvements and the findings of the Transport Assessment;
- Transport Assessment required;
- Potential for archaeology within the site;
- Drainage Impact Assessment required in respect of the WWTW network capacity; and
- Water Impact Assessment required in respect of the WTW network capacity.

It is acknowledged that parts of this site/larger sites have been previously assessed for development in previous Local Plans and the site has not been taken forward. Although the site/parts of the site have previously been assessed, since these previous assessments a more extensive study of the Tweeddale area has been undertaken by LUC, in order to identify and assess options for housing and business & industrial land within Tweeddale. This site was one option put forward for consideration, in respect of a longer term mixed use site. The site boundary has taken cognisance of the landscape constraints surrounding the site, including the NSA, SLA and Landscape Capacity Study and mitigation proposed. A re-assessment has therefore been undertaken, in light of the additional information contained within the LUC Study. It should be noted that there are a lack of suitable development opportunities within the Tweeddale area going forward, including for future plans.

Overall, taking the above into consideration, it is considered that there are a number of constraints identified within and adjacent to the site. However, it is not considered that any of these constraints are insurmountable and could be mitigated, subject to appropriate site requirements. There are aspects which would require further investigation, most notably a new crossing over the River Tweed. However, given the longer term nature of this allocation, it is considered that this allows time to look further into the constraints and mitigation measures in more detail.

In conclusion, the longer term mixed use site will be taken forward as a preferred option within the MIR. It should be noted that longer term sites will not be formal allocations within the LDP2, rather areas identified for potential development in the future. It is considered that a masterplan would be required for the development of this site and the site must accommodate an element of business land.

# West Linton

Site reference	Site name	Settlement	RGA	Proposed Use	Indicative Capacity	Ha	MIR status
<b>BWEST003</b>	Deanfoot Road North	West Linton	Rest of Borders	Employment	N/A	1.6	<b>Preferred</b>

## Initial assessment

Floodrisk	SAC	SPA	SSSI	Ramsar
1:200	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

### Initial assessment summary

The site does not fall within any international/national designation constraints.

SEPA: We require an FRA which assesses the risk from the small watercourse (potentially called The Dean) which flows through the site. Consideration should be given to bridge and culvert structures which may exacerbate flood risk. Review of the surface water 1 in 200 year flood map and nearby steep topography indicates that there may be flooding issues within this site. This should be investigated further and it is recommended that contact is made with the flood prevention officer. Site will need careful design to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere and proposed housing is not affected by surface runoff. SEPA require a flood risk assessment (FRA) to be included as a site specific developer requirement prior to any development occurring on the site, and that the findings are used to inform the scale, layout and form of development. There is the potential that the development of this allocation could increase the probability of flooding elsewhere. There is a surface water hazard identified within the site.

Foul must be connected to SW foul network. SW should confirm any capacity issues. There is a burn running through the site which should be protected and enhanced as part of any development. There should be no culverting for land gain. There may be a requirement for enhanced SUDS for any industrial uses.

There is a water body within, on or adjacent to the site, therefore SEPA request a developer requirement attached to the site to ensure that a maintenance buffer strip of at least 6 metres wide is provided between the watercourse and built development. Additional water quality buffer strips may be recommended in addition to the maintenance buffer strip depending upon specific water quality pressures.

SBC FLOOD AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT TEAM: This site is out with both the fluvial and surface water 1 in 200 year flood extents however The Dean Burn flows through the extent of the site which I would expect the applicant to consider. We may request an FRA.

## Background information

Minerals and coal	NNR	Prime Quality Agricultural Land	Current use/s	Planning history references
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Greenfield	96/01526/FUL - Formation of new access road, car park and a single toilet - Approved subject to conditions. 96/01503/AGN - Erection of 3 polytunnels and 1 portacabin - Approved.

## Accessibility and sustainability assessment

Access to public transport	Access to employment	Access to services	Wider biodiversity impacts	Site aspect
Good	Limited	Good	Moderate	South



## Accessibility and sustainability summary

SBC ECOLOGY OFFICER: Moderate biodiversity impacts. Site appears to be improved grassland with mixed amenity woodland, field margin and garden ground on the boundary and burn along western boundary. Records of oystercatcher, lapwing and curlew during the breeding season. Potential connectivity with River Tweed SAC (Lyne water). Protect boundary features and water course and mitigation for protected species including potentially badger breeding birds and mitigation to ensure no adverse impacts on River Tweed SAC.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The site is outside the development boundary. West Linton has a range of services, facilities and has a potential employment opportunity.

---

## Local impact and integration assessment

<b>Conservation area</b>	<b>Open space</b>	<b>Listed buildings</b>	<b>Scheduled Monument</b>	<b>Ancient woodland inventory</b>	<b>Archaeology</b>	<b>Garden and designed</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	On/adjacent to site	Not applicable

## Local impact and integration summary

HERITAGE & DESIGN: Outwith the current settlement in a visible location especially from the main Edinburgh Road at a higher level.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT SCOTLAND: Did not raise any concerns regarding the development.

ARCHAEOLOGY OFFICER: There is potential for previously unrecorded archaeology, particularly prehistoric lithic artefacts and associated features. Evaluation will be required.

---

## Landscape assessment

<b>NSA</b>	<b>SLA</b>	<b>Over 200 metres?</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Over 12 degree slope</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Wild Land</b>
Not applicable	Not applicable			Not applicable

## Landscape summary

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE: No comment due to size and location.

LANDSCAPE COMMENT: Small scale units suited to rural environment. Well screened with woodland belts as per adjacent site and zEL18.

The Landscape Capacity Study considered this area to be marginal for development. It also suggested areas for landscape enhancement within the site.

---

## Planning and infrastructure assessment

### Physical access/road capacity

**Near a trunk road?**

NETWORK MANAGER: Access should be restricted to via Robinsland roundabout and A72.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT: No Comment.

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND: No issues raised.

ROADS PLANNING: Although I have previously confirmed I would be unable to support housing on this site due to road infrastructure constraints, I may be able to support some small scale low key employment use in line with the needs of the village. The road infrastructure would have to extend out to the site. A Transport Statement is likely to be required.

**Right of way**

Not applicable

**TPOs**

Not applicable

**Contaminated land**

Not applicable

**Water supply**

Yes

**Sewerage**

Limited

**Gas Supply**

No

**Education provision****Planning & infrastructure summary**

The settlement of West Linton already has an allocated Business and Industrial site allocated within the Local Development Plan. However, that site is constrained by ownership. Following a public meeting within the community, it was noted that there is a desire to identify another site in order to assist in meeting local demand until the current allocated site zEL18 can come forward.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: There is an employment allocation to the south (zEL18) which is smaller and hasn't been taken up. This is a larger site so would that be likely to be taken up?

SCOTTISH WATER (WWTW): Early engagement with Scottish Water is recommended to discuss build out rates and to establish any potential investment at the WWTW. Depending on the flow demand will determine if further investigation is required.

SCOTTISH WATER (WTW): Roseberry WTW has sufficient capacity. Depending on the flow demand will determine if further investigation is required.

OUTDOOR ACCESS TEAM: Non-vehicular links required to existing pavements to give safe non-vehicular access in to West Linton.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER: The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the map extracts reviewed. There is no evidence to indicate that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES: No response received.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: No response received.

PROJECTS TEAM: No issues raised.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: We have no objections to this allocation but would require the input from the roads authority on the acceptability of such a large allocation and its effect on the road network. It may be that access could be taken further up Robinsland Drive to reduce the impact of business traffic on the remaining residential area. The site is relatively flat and there is an unsatisfied demand for sites and premises from businesses in this locale. Additional work may be necessary to investigate the feasibility of this further.

**Overall assessment****MIR status**

Preferred

**Overall assessment**

Acceptable

**Site capacity**

N/A

**Conclusions**

The site is located to the north east of West Linton. The site is considered to be acceptable for inclusion within the MIR as a preferred option for a business and industrial allocation. There is a desire to see some additional Business and Industrial land come forward to assist in meeting local need. West Linton has good access to public transport and services and limited access to employment opportunities. Further to a site assessment, the following constraints/issues were identified, which may require mitigation:

- Flood Risk Assessment required, in respect of potential flood risk and surface water runoff;
- There is a water body within, on the boundary or adjacent to the site, therefore a maintenance buffer zone is required;
- There is potential for connectivity with the River Tweed SAC/SSSI;
- Protect and enhance the existing boundary features, where possible;
- Potential for protected species, including breeding birds within the site;
- Potential for archaeology within the site, therefore mitigation required;
- The site is within a visible location, especially from the main Edinburgh road. However, the site can integrate well, if planting was established to create a well defined setting and visual containment;
- The Roads Planning Officer can support some small scale low key employment use on the site, in line with the needs of the village;
- Transport Statement required;
- Possible investment required in respect of the WWTW; and
- Non vehicular links required to existing pavements to give safe non vehicular access to West Linton.

Overall, it is considered that there are no insurmountable planning constraints to the development of this site, subject to mitigation measures. Therefore the site will be included within the MIR as a preferred option for business & industrial use.