

## Planning Committee (including Licencing matters) Report – Thursday 7<sup>th</sup> August 2014

**Note these are recommendations to Community Council until passed at full Council Meeting or submitted under delegated powers due to time constraints**

Members: Crick Carleton (Chair), Alan Mackenzie, Martin Tolhurst, Lesley Morrison, Robin Tatler, Gary Rennie, Derek Horsburgh, Anne Snoddy, Lewis Foster, Graham Mackie

**Present** – Crick Carleton (Chair), Derek Horsburgh, Anne Snoddy, Graham Mackie

**Apologies** – Alan Mackenzie, Martin Tolhurst, Lesley Morrison, Robin Tatler, Gary Rennie, Lewis Foster

Key issues:

- Maintaining a strategic focus
- Connectivity across the town – roads, paths, cycle routes
- Housing developments
  - Rosetta Holiday Park planning application
  - Innerleithen Road – housing
  - Cardrona
  - Venlaw Hill
- Town infrastructure
- Community empowerment – in its various guises

### Strategic issues

This is the first formal report since our meeting of early June, with plenty of on-going and some new issues. These have a bearing on the overall context of issues raised and discussed within the Planning Committee and the Community Council, and it is useful to revisit some of these more general issues and their more specific local application.

**Western Borders economic development:** SESplan is one of three Scottish experiments to re-cast strategic planning around city hubs. This departs significantly from recent and traditional approaches to the (physical) planning process, but is being trialled on the premise that in our case Edinburgh is such a significant economic hub and driver for the region that its impacts stretch as far as Berwick, Glenrothes, Hawick and Peebles. By pleading the cause for a greater focus on economic development in Peebles and the western Borders within SESplan we have at least laid down a clear context for such development. Turning this to economic development on the ground is still a hurdle to be overcome – and to be fought for.

**Action:** *The Community Council will maintain this focus, and continue to press councillors, the Council, Scottish Enterprise etc. for the economic development of the town and surrounds, and policies and plans that facilitate such development. This links into the draft LDP, Community Empowerment, LEADER and other sources of development funding, and the need for local businesses to work together to achieve this result.*

**Containing future housing development:** And likewise with housing – aspiration and practice are far apart. Estimation of future housing demand follows well-rehearsed traditional estimation systems – and makes precious little allowance for differences between large urban, small urban and rural communities requiring different treatments. And there remain two different systems of housing calculation – not helpful. Peebles remains stuck with future housing numbers that are largely dictated by central government, without any real recourse to rational debate – not just on numbers, but on how these numbers fit alongside local infrastructure provision, and available funding. It is here that the theory of strategic and local planning seems of limited service, with old planning systems continuing to be run alongside new systems. Our efforts to mold an unhelpful system to our local needs is through our continuing work on the “Vision for Peebles” initiative – with a particular focus on setting boundaries for the extent and quality of housing expansion, highlighting the need for infrastructure provision to be made ahead of housing development, and increasing frustration with the piecemeal treatment of the transport needs of the community – walking, cycling and by vehicle; around town and to and from work. The topsy turvy world of the second bridge debate is a point in question – or, the second bridge is the answer; what is the question?

**Action: *The Community Council will continue to support the “Vision for Peebles” initiative and to encourage and press for the early completion of a Whole Town Master Plan. It will also press for an early resolution to settlement of the issue of a second road bridge – on the basis that if it is cited in the forthcoming LDP it rather suggests that it will go ahead i.e. there is something like a three to one chance that it will happen. This outcome is not supported by the majority of the community, and to this end the Community Council will seek to present these views to the Reporter should the draft LDP go to formal Examination. In addition, the Community Council will press for public funding of a planning charrette focused on resolving transport / connectivity issues in relation to future development and expansion of the town.***

**Empowering communities:** The Scottish government is keen for communities to take greater responsibility for the futures of their communities, and to encourage greater local democracy. Again, whilst the right moves are being made at the centre of government, the authorities are less helpful in making this happen at the coal face – where change is still largely dependent on the efforts of a volunteer workforce (Community Councillors and others) of busy people. Nonetheless, there are three consultations on this topic that require our attention.

**Community Empowerment Bill – consultation – 5th September:** Following the introduction of the Community Empowerment (Scotland) Bill to the Scottish Parliament, the Parliament’s Local Government and Regeneration (LGR) Committee has now issued a call for written evidence on the Bill. Details are on the Committee’s website: <http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/CurrentCommittees/78599.aspx>.

The timetable for the Bill will be determined by the Committee, but approximates as follows. Once written evidence has been received the Committee will invite oral evidence from stakeholders and the Minister. This is the first of three stages in the process of the Bill – which is expected to take between nine and twelve months. The Community Empowerment Bill is expected to receive Royal Assent by summer 2015. There will then be a process to prepare secondary legislation, guidance etc. for each part of the Act before they are brought into force.

**Action: *The deadline for submission of evidence is Friday 5 September 2014. Graham Mackie has agreed to review the documentation, and suggest a CC response if appropriate.***

**Our future our borderlands consultation – deadline 1st September.** This is a follow-up to the sessions that the Scottish Affairs Select Committee of the UK Parliament held in Galashiels, Peebles and Dumfries a couple of months ago. The Committee investigates a range of topics of its choice – for example it published reports on 14 topics over the year 2013/14. The focus of the current report is the economic health and development of the borders region (primarily Scottish Borders, Dumfries & Galloway), and whether or not it is getting the support it needs (a reference to the possibility of being over-shadowed by the economic might of the Central Belt, and to the supportive institutions of the Highlands and Islands). Their report on this topic was published on 14<sup>th</sup> July (<http://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/commons-select/scottish-affairs-committee/inquiries/parliament-2010/our-borderlands-our-future/>), together with a request for further information.

**Action: *The deadline for responses is 1st September. Derek Horsburgh has agreed to draft our response.***

#### **Community Right to Buy and Land Ownership policies and legislation**

The “Land of Scotland and the Common Good: Report of the Land Reform Review Group” was published in May 2014, and contains a range of proposals for change to existing (largely 2003) legislation. There has also been a related report prepared by the UK Parliament Scottish Affairs Committee. Radical changes were made by the Scottish Government in 2003, and there is renewed pressure for still more radical change. Existing legislation allows communities the opportunity to register interest in the acquisition of property (land and/or buildings), which (assuming at least 10 per cent of those affected by the acquisition vote in favour of such action) gives a community a window of opportunity to buy that asset at such time as the owner should offer it for sale. But debate continues to explore ways of countering long-held concentration of land ownership in the hands of a few. Legislation also covers the issue of Common Good, and the rules governing the exercise of Right to Buy. All of these issues have relevance to Peebles and the Community Council.

**Action: *The Planning Committee will inform itself on the content of recent reports and report back.***

#### **LEADER funding consultation – deadline 24<sup>th</sup> August**

One potential source of funding for town centre / community development within the area covered by the community council is the EU structural fund LEADER. The 2014-2020 strategy for the Scottish Borders LEADER programme is currently in draft form, and formed the basis of consultation with communities across the Borders. A consultation meeting was held in Peebles in June to discuss the programme. A revised draft strategy is now available, and work on developing supporting documentation, including a more detailed business plan, is in preparation. We have been asked to comment on the current draft. This is an important source of funding for community development – which Peebles could make more of.

**Action: *Crick Carleton has offered to review this document and draft a response.***

**The A72/A702 project:** On the paths and roads networks, a number of current issues are relevant. On the bigger issues, Dirtpot Corner is in the news again, with local concerns about the proposed new logging road put forward by the Forestry Commission at Cardrona (the concern is that the proposed intersection of this new road with the main road is too close to Dirtpot Corner for comfort). This went to planning this Tuesday – and has now been approved. But at the other end of the town we have continuing niggles with Neidpath Corner. We know that SBC is short of funds, but ensuring that our access roads remain patent is of the highest priority. As matters stand, if Dirtpot goes down it is the back route to Traquair that takes the strain. And if Neidpath Corner goes down it is a trip via Eddleston that takes the strain (now that Manor Brig is closed to traffic). Both of these routing have elements that are single-track.

**Action: *The Community Council will give further support to efforts to raise the status of this important east/west link road – ideally raising it (the A72 as well as the A702) to the status of a trunk road.***

**Tweed Valley Forestry Commission Master Plan:** The Forestry Commission made a big noise about developing a Master Plan for its assets in the Tweed Valley – including Glentress, Innerleithen and points east to Clovenfords. But nothing has yet appeared in the public domain. The idea was / is that SBC would build a Supplementary Planning Guideline (SPG) alongside the Master Plan in order to give it weight, and to outline the development logic behind matching infrastructure development with public access and tourism related development along the valley. So far there is no sign of either. Key to the thinking around the FC Master Plan was the role of the river as the backbone of the valley, but also recognising it as the key divider separating the north and south of the river – there are still precious few crossing points for walkers and cyclists that would give them access to the hills and paths to the south. Should we be thinking of trying to install half a dozen low cost pedestrian / cycle bridges along the river? In the Peebles Community Trust's bid for Kingsmeadows Estate this forms a key logic behind bringing the estate into public ownership – at least at the western end of the multi-use path.

**Action: *Request our SBC councillors to establish the state of play.***

**Connecting Innerleithen / Peebles multi-use path to Peebles:** Where great headway HAS been made is in the development of the multi-use path between Innerleithen and Peebles. This is popular and well used, and will hopefully encourage, over time, the development of further facilities and spur paths along its length (for example, we note that a spur has already been established to link to Glentress). But the connectivity element provided by this path peters out once it hits Peebles, with walkers and cyclists directed onto the main Innerleithen Road on the outskirts of Peebles. It has been suggested, by the Community Council and others, that the developer promoting the building of some 30 houses / apartments on the lower grounds of the Peebles Hydro should facilitate the extension of this path along the back of its property and then routing its exit through the development to link to a crossing to Kerfield Park. This issue has also been taken up by SBC planning officers (see Appendix 1), but so far there has been no response from the developer.

**Action: *Make further representation to the planning department on this matter, and raise the issue with our council representatives. Also take this forward, as a matter of some urgency, as an element in any formal debate on the issue of connectivity – such as a planning charrette.***

**Connecting Broughton / Peebles multi-use path to Peebles:** The draft SBC Local Development Plan incorporates policies and plans that promote development of a green network running along the Tweed Valley (between Melrose and Peebles), and provides for the future development of multi-use paths to the north and west of Peebles – from Peebles to Leadburn and beyond, and from Peebles to Broughton and beyond. The Community Council has welcomed these plans, and is encouraged by the recent submission by the Upper Tweed Railway Paths Group for planning permission for change of use of the old railway line from Peebles to Lyne to a pedestrian and cycle path. We are very supportive of this submission, but note public concern, which we share, about the specific detail where the path reaches Peebles to the east of the old railway tunnel. The particular geography of this connection is complex – not least of which is the well-known restrictions to road and path traffic along Caledonian Road. Connectivity issues associated with this whole area – and not just in the context of the proposed multi-use path – need to be addressed through a wider planning exercise. Sign-posted developments impacting on this area are the future redevelopment of Tweedbridge Court, and housing and economic development in the South Parks area. Vehicle, pedestrian and cycle connectivity across this whole area needs to be reviewed – and long-term solutions to current and projected problems identified, funded and implemented.

**Action: *We support this planning application, and welcome the amendment to the proposed routing options indicated in this submission. But we wish to see a formal planning exercise to resolve connectivity issues associated with this part of town the various impending developments proposed for this area.***

**In-town connectivity, roads, paths and cycle tracks:** And so back to wider issues of roads, transport and connectivity. At the heart of arguments concerning almost all planned, projected and unknown future developments affecting Peebles is the issue of connectivity. We have inherited a largely Victorian street layout which, to be absolutely clear, was designed for a time when travel was mainly by foot, by donkey or donkey and cart, by horse or horse and cart / carriage, and by train. The area, as built then, largely conforms to the current Conservation Area. Since then, we have entered the age of the internal combustion engine, and latterly to a time when most households own one or more cars and fewer and fewer people park their cars in private garages, but rather park at the kerbside. This leads to road-width problems, as occurs on Rosetta Road and Caledonian Road. The town has also been expanded through a regular roll-out of estate developments – most notable to the south of the river, but also along both sides of Edinburgh Road, and both sides of upper Rosetta Road. Further, our two railway stations (Dean's Park and Caledonian Road) have been dismantled. But as the periphery of Peebles is built outwards, traffic continues to be directed back through the Victorian layout of the Town Centre and Conservation Area – which continues to struggle with the type and volume of traffic. In this context, the capacity of road traffic that the Tweed Bridge can handle is the least of our worries; more critical is the handling capacity of our minor roads, particularly as more and more houses are built beyond their connections to the town centre. This has particular bearing on proposed developments to the southeast, southwest and northwest of the town:

- ❑ Developments to the southwest of the town (Edderston / South Parks) are dependent on being able to manoeuvre through Caledonian Road, which has restricted lines of sight at the little roundabout connecting to South Parks and Edderston Road and at the junction with Dukehaugh (and also South Parks with South Park Crescent), and is single track along much of its length as few houses along the south side of the road have off-road parking facilities. No remedies have so far been presented for managing this.
- ❑ All further development southeast of the town is contingent on the construction of a second road bridge – but nowhere has it yet been demonstrated how the currently favoured locations for a second bridge link to the existing roads system and/or facilitate vehicular movement to and from the existing housing, let alone any additional housing. It is also difficult to get away from the inevitability that provision of a second bridge will necessarily encourage further housing to the southeast and south of the town – a development that few in the town are supportive of.
- ❑ No changes in roads layout have been made to address existing congestion points along March St / Rosetta Road / Young St, let alone the increased traffic likely to result from current construction at Violet Bank I. Unwelcome proposals from the owners of the Rosetta Holiday Park for construction of 130 houses – in an area not designated for housing but for tourism related infrastructure (touring caravans and tents, static caravans and lodges) – has been persistently and strongly objected to on a range of grounds, prime of which are the increasingly unworkable nature of traffic management in this part of town and the brass neck of the developer in buying a holiday business as a going concern and then arguing it can only maintain commercial viability if 130 houses are built on the site. Notwithstanding this, it is evident from recent postings to the SBC ePlanning website that the developer and council planners are in serious discussions about funding the construction of a link between Rosetta Road and Edinburgh Road via Dalatho Crescent. Even with such a link, our inclination is to persist in our objection to the scale of housing development proposed.

**Action: *We believe there is urgent need for formal review of the connectivity issues in and across the town, and would suggest that this form a part of a planning charrette focused on the issue of connectivity within the settlement. A proposal to this effect should be submitted to, for example, the Scottish Sustainable Communities Initiative (by Vision for Peebles).***

**Making Peebles cycle friendly:** Clearly there is still much work to be done with respect to developing a roads system within Peebles that is appropriate to the size and layout of the town and the pressures to accommodate movement of people to and from work and town amenities, to accommodate commuters to work north, east and west of the town, and to allow a wide range of visitors to access the town, its many attractions and facilities, accommodation, and its nearby sports and outdoors amenities. But this still does not address non-road users – particularly pedestrians and cyclists. Multi-use long-distance paths is one thing, but facilitating movement within the town is quite another. Whilst there is a fairly well-developed network of off-road walking paths, Peebles is as yet one of the most un-developed when it comes to accommodating increased on-road and off-road bicycle use within the town. This is something that needs urgent attention – both in improving connectivity within the town, but also in the context of proximity to Glentress, the town’s emerging international reputation for cycling events, its links to long-distance cycle routes, and its aspirations to sustainable living. Providing off-road cycle routes to and from the town’s schools should form a particular priority. In these contexts, public funding is available for these types of initiatives

through various bodies, including The Big Lottery, Climate Challenge, Town Centre Regeneration, Cycling Scotland, and SusTrans.

**Action:** *This is another supporting argument as to why “connectivity” should form the focus of any formal planning event. In this context, Scottish Sustainable Community Initiative (SSCI) money is still available in the financial year 2014/15 to support Town Centre Regeneration Charrettes. In addition, however, we believe a separate initiative should be taken forward to make Peebles a bike-friendly town – and this should be perhaps be taken forward by a local grouping including, for example, the Community Trust, the Peebles Cycle Club, and TweedLove.*

**Windfarms and community benefit:** Turning to issues of sustainable energy production, we have two nearby windfarm applications currently in play, and a call from the Scottish Borders Community Council Network to support a proposal for a temporary moratorium on further windfarm applications. On this latter point the Community Council has given its support to this proposal. At the local level, the Cloich Forest windfarm application (for 18 x 132 metre high turbines, planned capacity of 54MW) is now with the Government Energy Consents Unit, following recent (June) submission of a formal response to the consultation from SBC Planners – which registered rejection. A revised application has been made with respect to Hag Law windfarm (a development that runs adjacent to and to the immediate west of the Cloich Forest proposal), which has now been reduced to 8 turbines (100 metres high, and planned capacity of 20MW) – a scale that puts it within the remit of the SBS Planning Committee, but given the proximity to the Cloich development is an application that is likely to be adjudicated by the Scottish government. Consultation on this application is still open, and we are asked to comment. Separately, the Hag Law developer is seeking a meeting with nearby Community Councils to discuss the issue of Community Benefit (the proposal is October 1<sup>st</sup>). In respect of their original application, the Community Council lodged a strong objection to this windfarm proposal, and also lodged formal interest in receiving Community Benefit from this scheme should it be consented and enter into operation (a similar position has been registered with regard to Cloich Forest windfarm). On balance, we believe that there is a greater than even likelihood that one or both of these developments will be approved.

**Action:** *Continue to object to the Hag Law windfarm proposal, restate our interest in receiving Community Benefit should this planning proposal be consented, and meet with the development to hear what Community Benefit proposals are being presented.*

**Housing development east of Edinburgh Road:** We have been approached by Sidon Developments to provide preliminary comment on their draft designs and layouts for 33 houses on their site below and to the north of Venlaw Castle. They wish to formally submit a planning proposal to SBC, but seek our comment; in support of this they have provided outline plans to us. As we have sought to make clear in earlier correspondence, this site is not within the current or proposed town development boundary, we are not supportive of the initiative, and the community council has received representations from local residents strongly objecting to these proposals. We are not inclined to change our position, and will continue to object to and resist this proposed development.

**Action:** *Inform Sidon that the Community Council is not supportive of this housing proposal.*

**Housing, Cardrona:** A proposal has been made by Renwick Country Properties for the construction of twenty houses to the east of the Macdonald Hotel, Cardrona. This is adjacent

to an earlier planning application (2004 and 2005) for a garden centre to the immediate east of the new application (and for which a revision to the parking arrangements was approved this week). We do not object to this housing development as such, but are of the view that the number of houses proposed is excessive, and constitutes over-development of the site.

**Action: Register concern about over-development of the site (too many houses).**

**Sewage capacity:** But in the context of all the above housing proposals, it has just come to the notice of SBC planners, courtesy of Scottish Water, that the Peebles sewage system is at maximum capacity, and that they (Scottish Water) cannot give approval to **ANY** housing development north of the river until such time as that capacity has been increased. Scottish Water is of the view that this level of investment and development will only be possible in the year 2017/18. Against this backdrop, SBC planners are suggesting that developers, whether seeking development of a single house or an estate, should make direct contact with Scottish Water to discuss the issue. As matters stand, this means that **NO** proposals can be entertained for north of the river – including Rosetta Holiday Park, a one house development at the back of Crossburn Caravan site, and Violet Bank II. To an extent this is evidence that the planning process is responsive to infrastructure capacity issues – but it remains the case that this is the exception. It is still the case that housing proposals are coming forward without realistic consideration of the impacts of the roads infrastructure, schooling, medical provision, etc.. As a community council we continue to be of the view that infrastructure capacity and development should come ahead of housing development – and it is our view that the planning process is there to implement this logic. Unfortunately our views continue to fall on deaf ears – and the planning process does not appear to be designed for this purpose – despite some welcome and more positive efforts by our planning officers illustrated in Appendices 1 & 2 to this report.

**Action: Seek clarification from SBC planning officers and our SBC councillors on the standing of this sewage issue (recent correspondence between Planning and the developers of the Hydro site suggest this constraint is not as serious as indicated).**

**Action: It is still the case that proposed developments seem to outstrip the capacities of town infrastructure and services. There is even greater urgency for completion of the Whole Town Master Plan.**

## Consultations

None

## Planning Applications

Details of planning applications, including plans, and council and community representations, can be accessed on the SBC eplanning website – <http://eplanning.scotborders.gov.uk/online-applications/>. Individual applications can be accessed by searching against the application number, or address, or by a more general weekly or monthly listing of applications, making sure to restrict the search to those relevant to “Peebles & District Community Council”.

## Housing developments

# AOCB

**Electric vehicle roadshow** – Monday 22 September – Peebles (Edinburgh Road Car Park), 10am to 3pm

### **Peebles Neighbourhood Review**

SBC has decided to cut £450,000 from its neighbourhood services budget over the next three years and is meeting with local communities to identify / discuss areas where savings can be made. These include not cutting grass so often (at least for certain areas), and passing responsibility for some verges / planted areas to adjacent residents and/or neighbourhood groups. Further information will be provided in a presentation from SBC to this coming Community Council meeting. There is also a proposal to seek public views through a public poster event – possibly an evening event at the Burgh Hall.

### **Public events, traffic management and inconvenience (see Appendix 3)**

There has been some criticism of poor organisation / communication in relation to recent cycling events involving road closures in Peebles. The organisers have been apprised of such comment, and have sought to address the issues raised. Nonetheless, there are two main issues that arise – that are cycling related, but not only cycling related.

- (i) There are many people in Peebles who are not involved with cycling, and have little interest in cycling, and thus would be quite unaware of the calendar of cycling events planned for Peebles. It is not clear that the organisers of these events are sufficiently aware of this fact, and seem to make the assumption that everyone will be familiar with the events' schedule. Much more needs to be done to engage with the community at large – and publication and ready availability of a calendar of planned cycling events taking place over the coming year would be particularly helpful.
- (ii) The frequency of public events requiring road closures in Peebles is increasing (and this does not just refer to cycling events). In most cases the inconvenience is taken in the stride of the community (Beltane, Xmas Lights, etc.), but as the number of such closures increases, tolerance reduces. One particular set of issues is where TweedGreen gets closed to all traffic (and parking) and where High Street traffic is routed along TweedGreen. Once in a blue moon is ok, but this is no longer so. Use of and traffic circulation around TweedGreen needs to be reviewed from a strategic perspective, and a more consistent and predictable approach taken.

### **Kingsmeadows Estate**

The Peebles Community Trust was able to submit bids for the Estate, with accompanying documentation on proposed development and future use of parts of the estate. It is awaiting news on the outcome of the bidding process.

The key focus of the bid is to bring the estate into community ownership and use, with a focus on extending the green parkland bounding the river that forms such a key feature of the town centre of Peebles, bringing the elements of the estate into economically productive use around the themes of woodland, wood, cycling, sustainable technologies and related technological innovation, and facilitating extension of the pedestrian / cycle paths system

through the estate with addition of a new pedestrian / cycle bridge from the estate to the water meadows on the north side of the river routing into the centre of town.

### **Living Streets – putting people first**

Living Streets is the national charity that stands up for pedestrians. We work with you to create safe, attractive, enjoyable streets where it's great to walk. It is providing free training in its **Community Street Audit** approach as a useful tool for community groups, local authorities, community planning partners, health partners, housing associations, local trades associations and others with an interest in getting more people walking and improving the quality of the local walking environment. The sessions are full day, and lunch and refreshments will be provided.

**Sept. 22<sup>nd</sup> – Glasgow, The Albany Centre**

**Sept. 30<sup>th</sup> – Dundee, Number 10**

**Oct. 28<sup>th</sup> – East Kilbride, The Village Centre**

**Nov. 4<sup>th</sup> – Falkirk/Camelon – Forth Valley Sensory Centre**

More information, and to sign up for a training session, go to

[http://www.livingstreets.org.uk/professionals/working-with-communities/community-street-audits\\_](http://www.livingstreets.org.uk/professionals/working-with-communities/community-street-audits_)

## Planning Applications. (There may be more by meeting so keep an eye on the SBC on-line e-planning).

### Special

[Mixed use development comprising of new housing, reconfigured caravan park incorporating static pitches, erection of new facilities building and sales office, conversion of house and stables to form 9 residential units and associated landscaping and infrastructure](#) | Land South East And West Of Rosetta Caravan Park Rosetta Road Peebles Scottish Borders | Ref. No: 13/00444/FUL | Received: Fri 05 Apr 2013 | Validated: Wed 10 Apr 2013 | Status: Pending Consideration |object|May| ||Rosetta - **object**

[Residential development comprising 13 dwellinghouses and 21 flats](#) | Land East Of Glentress House Innerleithen Road Peebles Scottish Borders | Ref. No: 14/00136/FUL | Received: Thu 06 Feb 2014 | Validated: Tue 11 Feb 2014 | Status: Pending Consideration | |Mar| |SBC|Innerleithen Road – **over-development**

[Formation of new access](#) | Land South West Of Nether Horsburgh Farmhouse Innerleithen Scottish Borders | Ref. No: 14/00573/FUL | Received: Fri 16 May 2014 | Validated: Mon 19 May 2014 | Status: Pending Consideration | |June| | |new haul road Glentress – already approved

[Erection of two dwellinghouses, provision of two additional parking spaces and alter/vary condition No 4 on original consent \(02/01783/FUL\)](#) | Site Of Former March Street Mills March Street Peebles Scottish Borders | Ref. No: 14/00635/FUL | Received: Sat 31 May 2014 | Validated: Wed 04 Jun 2014 | Status: Pending Consideration | |July| | |Ballantyne Place – **strongly object**

[Change of use of former railway to form cycle/pedestrian path](#) | Former Railway Route From Lyne Station To South Park Crescent Peebles Scottish Borders | Ref. No: 14/00637/FUL | Received: Sat 31 May 2014 | Validated: Wed 18 Jun 2014 | Status: Pending Consideration | |July| | |multi-use path – **strongly support**

[Erection of twenty dwellinghouses](#) | Land West Of Horsbrugh Ford Cottages Cardrona Scottish Borders | Ref. No: 14/00666/FUL | Received: Wed 11 Jun 2014 | Validated: Wed 18 Jun 2014 | Status: Pending Consideration | |July| | |Cardrona housing – **over-development**

Erection of Windfarm|Land South East Of Halmyre Mains Farmhouse (Hag Law) Romanno Bridge Scottish Borders | Ref. No: 14/00738/FUL | Received: Sat 28 Jun 2014 | Validated: Tue 08 Jul 2014 | Status: Pending Consideration | |July| |SBC|windfarm – **object**

### Listed

#### Conservation Area

[Erection of dwellinghouse with integral garage](#) | Land South Of 7 Bonnington Road Peebles Scottish Borders | Ref. No: 14/00228/FUL | Received: Sat 22 Feb 2014 | Validated: Tue 25 Feb 2014 | Status: Pending Consideration | |Mar| | | **???**

[Replacement window \(retrospective\)](#) | 39 Eastgate Peebles Scottish Borders EH45 8AD | Ref. No: 14/00564/FUL | Received: Wed 14 May 2014 | Validated: Tue 08 Jul 2014 | Status: Pending Consideration | |July| |SBC| – **no objection**

[Replacement windows \(retrospective\)](#) | 47 - 3 Rosetta Road Peebles Scottish Borders EH45 8HH | Ref. No: 14/00656/FUL | Received: Thu 05 Jun 2014 | Validated: Mon 09 Jun 2014 | Status: Pending Consideration | |July| | | – **no objection**

[Replacement windows](#) | 37 - 4 Rosetta Road Peebles Scottish Borders EH45 8HH | Ref. No: 14/00691/FUL | Received: Tue 17 Jun 2014 |

Validated: Mon 07 Jul 2014 | Status: Pending Consideration | |July| |SBC| – **no objection**

[Formation of access and erection of boundary fence](#) | 38 March Street Peebles Scottish Borders EH45 8EP | Ref. No: 14/00692/FUL | Received:

Mon 16 Jun 2014 | Validated: Fri 27 Jun 2014 | Status: Pending Consideration | |July| |SBC| **???**

[Replacement windows](#) | 44 Rosetta Road Peebles Scottish Borders EH45 8HJ | Ref. No: 14/00694/FUL | Received: Tue 17 Jun 2014 | Validated:

Mon 30 Jun 2014 | Status: Pending Consideration | |July| |SBC| – **no objection**

[Erection of replacement porch](#) | 23A George Street Peebles Scottish Borders EH45 8DL | Ref. No: 14/00710/FUL | Received: Fri 20 Jun 2014 |

Validated: Thu 03 Jul 2014 | Status: Pending Consideration | |July| |SBC| **???**

[Change of use from former joiners workshop to staff rest room](#) | Former Joiners Workshop To Rear Of 30 32 High Street Peebles Scottish Borders |

Ref. No: 14/00754/FUL | Received: Tue 01 Jul 2014 | Validated: Wed 02 Jul 2014 | Status: Pending Consideration | |July| |SBC| **no objection**

[Alterations and extension to dwellinghouse](#) | Orchard Lea Craigerne Lane Peebles Scottish Borders EH45 9HQ | Ref. No: 14/00770/FUL | Received:

Sat 05 Jul 2014 | Validated: Tue 08 Jul 2014 | Status: Pending Consideration | |July| |SBC| **???**

### **Regular**

[Extension to dwellinghouse](#) | 2 Witchwood Crescent Peebles Scottish Borders EH45 9AJ | Ref. No: 14/00572/FUL | Received: Fri 16 May 2014 |

Validated: Tue 15 Jul 2014 | Status: Pending Consideration | |July| | **???**

[Alterations and extension to dwellinghouse](#) | 12 South Park West Peebles Scottish Borders EH45 9EF | Ref. No: 14/00741/FUL | Received: Sat 28

Jun 2014 | Validated: Tue 01 Jul 2014 | Status: Pending Consideration | |July| | **???**

[Formation of new access road and erection of dwellinghouse \(renewal of previous consent 09/01777/PPP\)](#) | Land North And West Of 95 Edinburgh

Road Peebles Scottish Borders | Ref. No: 14/00797/PPP | Received: Tue 15 Jul 2014 | Validated: Tue 15 Jul 2014 | Status: Pending

Consideration | |Aug| |SBC| Crossburn – **no objection**

### **Rural**

[Erection of dwellinghouse](#) | Land West Of Shieldgreen Venlaw High Road Peebles Scottish Borders | Ref. No: 14/00138/FUL | Received: Thu 06 Feb 2014 |

Validated: Mon 10 Feb 2014 | Status: Pending Consideration | |Mar| | **???**

[Demolition of existing dwellinghouse and erection of replacement dwellinghouse](#) | 1 Crookston Cottage Peebles Scottish Borders EH45 9JQ | Ref. No:

14/00654/FUL | Received: Fri 06 Jun 2014 | Validated: Mon 09 Jun 2014 | Status: Pending Consideration | |July| | **???**

[Alterations to dwellinghouse](#) | Clan Alpine Lodge Peebles Scottish Borders EH45 8NB | Ref. No: 14/00686/FUL | Received: Sat 14 Jun 2014 |

Validated: Tue 17 Jun 2014 | Status: Pending Consideration | |July| | **???**

Erection of art mural | The Old Bakehouse Pennel's Close Peebles Scottish Borders | Ref. No: 14/00801/FUL | Received: 15 Jul 2014 | Validated: | Status: Pending Consideration | |Aug| |SBC|mural – **no objection** (planning application submitted by Community Council)

[Alterations and two storey extension to dwellinghouse](#) | Snowdrop Cottage 10 Rosetta Road Peebles Scottish Borders EH45 8JU | Ref. No: 14/00812/FUL | Received: Sat 19 Jul 2014 | Validated: Tue 29 Jul 2014 | Status: Pending Consideration | |Aug| | **???**

[Erection of conservatory](#) | 29 Glen Road Peebles Scottish Borders EH45 9AZ | Ref. No: 14/00839/FUL | Received: Fri 25 Jul 2014 | Validated: Mon 28 Jul 2014 | Status: Pending Consideration | |Aug| | **???**

[Formation of french doors from window \(Retrospective\)](#) | Ratho Cottage 40 Rosetta Road Peebles Scottish Borders EH45 8HJ | Ref. No: 14/00840/LBCNN | Received: Mon 28 Jul 2014 | Validated: Mon 28 Jul 2014 | Status: Pending Consideration | |Aug| | **???**

## **Appendix 1 – Correspondence from SBC Planning Officer to agent relating to housing proposal for Innerleithen Road (below Hydro) – Ref. No: 14/00136/FUL**

*(Extracted from SBC ePlanning system – <http://eplanning.scotborders.gov.uk/online-applications/>)*

Tony

I refer to our recent telephone conversation about the above development when I confirmed that the application was not ready for presentation yet to the Planning and Building Standards Committee for a number of reasons. These are as follows:

- the Scottish Water drainage capacity issue raised in my email of 9 June to you. Whilst we have had one meeting with them, there was no guarantee that the capacity issue would be eased before the expiry of any planning consent that you may obtain for your development. They recommended that you contact them to discuss what would be necessary to remove this embargo as, indeed, was recommended to you in my earlier email. A suspensive condition would be untenable if it prevented development until drainage proposals were resolved and that period was likely to be the length of the consent.
- requests were made for your consideration with regard to the flatted blocks in my email of 9 June. Having considered your proposals with regard to the flats, I still maintain that your consideration is needed of those points.
- I recall seeing some daylighting angles of the impacts of the revised application on existing houses to the western and eastern ends of the site but I now cannot locate these in the package of drawings submitted in June. Given that continued objection has been received from the owner of Glentress House in particular, I would ask you to provide sections in accordance with the "Privacy and Sunlight" SPG to demonstrate how your revised proposal would comply with daylighting and privacy angles and distances. This is especially as the "C" Type houses resulted in two houses on the terrace return rather than one as previously recommended to you.
- there have been comments from the Roads Planning service that could still result in layout changes and I would ask for your consideration of them - viewable online. One of the comments relates to the footpath link to connect the development with the cycle path which was also raised in my letter to you of 29 April. Your new proposals do not seem to have addressed this point so I would ask you to do so now.
- the suggested use of natural stone has not been picked up in your revised plans so I would intend to impose the requirement as a condition, should your application be supported.
- it seems that little response has been received to the issues raised in Points 9 and 10 of my letter. Please provide the necessary information.
- Point 11 referred to developer contributions and I am aware that you have had some contact with Jon Bowie but that you have not confirmed that you would meet the contributions as outlined in my letter. A response on this matter is needed before the application can be taken to Committee.

These matters, particularly the Scottish Water capacity problem, will impact on which Committee the application could now be presented to and I will need to send you an updated Processing Agreement with a changed Committee Date. Given the issues to be resolved and the preparation of my Committee Report two weeks before any meeting, it may be unrealistic to aim for 1 September - which would give only three weeks to resolve all the above issues. Consequently I am suggesting 6 October for potential Committee presentation and a revised Agreement will be sent out to you.

I look forward to receiving your responses on the above in due course,

Regards

Craig

## Appendix 2 – Correspondence from SBC Planning Officer to agent relating to housing proposals for Rosetta Holiday Park – Ref. No: 13/00444/PPP

*(Extracted from SBC ePlanning system – <http://eplanning.scotborders.gov.uk/online-applications/>)*

Alastair

As discussed and for a combination of the following reasons, a report will not be able to be placed on the agenda for the June 30th Committee as significant issues remain unresolved at this stage and need to be clarified before a report can be completed and put in front of the Committee. The next available meeting beyond 30 June is 4 August and we could work towards that provided the following issues are resolved:

- we still await reaction and response from SBHA to the issue of land facilitating a traffic link in the Dalatho area.
- the meeting with the Council's Legal Team over the issue of the link had to be truncated urgently and has been reconvened for next week.
- the revised Development Viability Report has been received and will need to be fully considered by the Department, informed by the Development Negotiator who does not return from annual leave until Monday.
- there may be a need for arrangement of a Committee Site Visit should one be required.
- of particular importance is information that we have recently been given from Scottish Water, that there is a sewage capacity issue at Peebles WWTW serving the town, impacting on new building works which require a connection to the public system. Whilst Scottish Water are raising a growth bid for improvements, there is possibly a more immediate impact on applications for new connection until improvements are implemented - and thus, potentially decisions on planning applications and building warrants for new build works. We have requested a meeting with Scottish Water to discuss the issue in more detail which will hopefully be happening in early July.
- This issue could impact on all applications for new-build within the town of Peebles, no matter how large or small, and the timescale they have given us is 2017/18 before improvements are effective and connections can be allowed. Whilst we will be discussing this matter with them in relation to current housing applications and LDP allocations, their original response to your application dated 30 April 2013 did initially indicate that the developer could assist if capacity was an issue. This would also be in line with Consolidated Local Plan Policy Policy Inf5 which suggests contact and negotiation between the developer and Scottish Water to resolve any waste water capacity issues. You may wish to take this opportunity to discuss your proposed development directly with them as there may be an effect on your revised Development Viability report and case put forward. In the meantime, we will proceed to meet Scottish Water separately to discuss the issue in more detail. Our two contacts are Kirsty Thin ([Kirsty.Thin@SCOTTISHWATER.CO.UK](mailto:Kirsty.Thin@SCOTTISHWATER.CO.UK)) and Ross Craig ([Ross.Craig@SCOTTISHWATER.CO.UK](mailto:Ross.Craig@SCOTTISHWATER.CO.UK)).

I will respond to you once we have further information and clarity on the aforementioned issues,

Regards

Craig

....

06 June 2014

Craig

Please find attached the development viability assessment we have prepared on the latest scheme. As before this is submitted for the Council's private review and information only and is not a public document as it contains commercially sensitive information.

You will note the return on capital employed is roughly half what was previously available, this is a direct result of the contribution for the bridge and the reduction in housing numbers to improve the setting of Rosetta House. This is obviously not a great return on investment for the applicants, but the scheme is viable and offers the significant opportunity for the Council to address its highways concerns regarding Rosetta Road.

I look forward to discussing matters further shortly.

Kind regards

Alastair

## Appendix 3 – Reducing council maintenance bills

Hi Alasdair,

I've now managed to coordinate diaries with Carol and we are both available on Wednesday 13<sup>th</sup> or Wednesday 20<sup>th</sup> August for an evening event.

I note that you are suggesting attending the CC meeting on the 14<sup>th</sup> August. I believe that I can attend this but cant confirm Carol's attendance at this time. If you would prefer that we attend the CC meeting on the 14<sup>th</sup> then I am happy to commit to that now.

In terms of the format of this event. I would suggest the following;

It's a walk in session where people can come in anytime during the two hours to view and comment on the planned changes.

We have hard copies of the plans showing the proposals available on the night

We have background information available should people require to know how we have got to where we are.

People are challenged to consider the planned changes and reflect on their appropriateness or otherwise, suggest alternative proposals which deliver the same outcome.

People are encouraged to consider if they are able/willing to get more involved in the maintenance of the town

What we will not be able to do is to debate the fundamental decision taken by council in January to remove £450,000 from the budget.

We can leave hard copies for the CC to use in any future engagement that it wishes to undertake. I think its fair to say as we are progressing round the region, that the likelihood of follow up events is going to be difficult to confirm at this time as we have over 60 community councils to engage with in a tight timeframe. What we would like is to be able to work with your community council to support us in having this discussion with your community.

Anyway, let me know what your thoughts are on the above

Thanks

jason

....

Hi Alasdair

From these minutes it doesn't appear that there is that much to discuss – the target areas of saving that the council would like to pursue have already been identifying (by them). But there is no information on what levels of costs are likely to be saved (a) if a reduced service is provided, or (b) if the community takes over some of these services (and what help will be provided to any community group). On the face of it these issues can be clarified on the basis of email, so that they can then be discussed on the basis of information provided. I am not sure we need both a presentation at the community council and a public meeting. If at the community council then surely there would be the expectation that we would recommend a course of action!!! If a public meeting, then we might encourage some wide debate but it would be rather up to attendees to voice their opinions / preferences (and thus any displays would be down to the council – again it might help their cause if they let us see these displays in advance of our next meeting).

If the issue were addressed more widely – what services could the local community reasonably seek to take on as part of a programme of localisation / empowerment / social responsibility, then the issue is that much greater, and open ended. And more in keeping with the idea of local democracy.

Bonnie Peebles gets mentioned. Insofar as the Community Council doesn't appear to have any practical influence in this area, isn't this something that the council / Jason should take up directly with Bonnie Peebles?

The council is going to be reluctant to quantify savings per community – because it then gives ammunition to dissenters. But on the other hand, we cannot make any reasonable judgement without such figures. Catch 22.

It's easy enough to book the Burgh Hall and be present at a poster event – but without being brought into the identification of solutions I would have thought we were either likely to stand on the sideline or canvas against taking on public responsibilities. I don't see any great problems with the community taking more on, but they need to do so with the access to the facts and with eyes open – i.e. as adults!!!

Crick

## Appendix 4 - SBC Community Planning Partnership Community Engagement Framework

The draft Engagement Framework proposes key principles to support Community Planning Partnership organisations in both general engagement and more specific consultation activity. It was developed following the 2013 Audit of Community Planning in the Scottish Borders which identified five distinct areas for improvement. These were:

- Strategic direction and leadership
- Governance and accountability
- Performance management
- Use of resources
- Community engagement

Within the community engagement area the need to effectively co-ordinate community consultation was identified as a key area for development.

In order to develop a partnership approach to community engagement activity the need to establish a clear set of principles to which all partners could agree was identified. The principles were developed from existing Partner community engagement policies/strategies. Common elements and good practice were drawn out whilst being aware of specific requirements, such as statutory duty, that one or more Partners may have. This work was undertaken by Scottish Borders Council and overseen by representatives from Partner organisations (Police Scotland, Scottish Borders Housing Association, Scottish Fire & Rescue Service and the Third Sector Interface).

The proposed Framework has been developed as three documents:

- Community Planning Partnership Community Engagement Framework
- Preparing to Undertake Community Engagement
- A Guide to Consultation

The three can be used independently or together to support all levels of engagement activity and include a list of organisations that can offer advice and help to Community Planning Partners on ways to engage, when appropriate, with specific communities.

I am contacting you, as a group that is included on this list, to ask:

- Is it appropriate for your organisation be included? Are the details correct? Please let me know if not.
- Do you think the Framework achieves its aim of providing the basis for a consistent approach to community engagement across the Partnership?

I am working to a very tight timescale and would be grateful if you would send me any comments by 29 August 2014. The aim is to take the finalised Framework to the next meeting of the Community Planning Partnership Strategic Board on 11 September for approval and adoption.

I would welcome the opportunity to discuss the Framework with you and the role that your organisation has in helping the delivery of a consistent approach to community engagement across the Community Planning Partnership. Please let me know if you would like to arrange a date to meet up to discuss this.