

Planning Committee (including Licencing matters) Report – Monday 10th February 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

Present – Crick Carleton (Chair), Anne Snoddy, Martin Tolhurst, Robin Tatler, Derek Horsburgh, Alan Mackenzie

Apologies – Gary Rennie, Alasdair Stewart, Lesley Morrison

Key issues this month are:

- Vision for Peebles Open Forum – debrief
- CC response to Local Community Empowerment Bill consultation
- CC response to Second Bridge consultation
- CC response to Local Development Plan consultation – closes 3rd March
- Cloich Forest Windfarm
- Rosetta Rd Caravan Park submission
- CC response to housing proposal at Innerleithen Rd / Hydro

Strategic issues

SESplan SPG – Housing allocations

Submission made to SESplan Housing SPG consultation – and included in batch of evidence – available to view at <http://sesplan-consult.objective.co.uk/portal/sg/hsgland?tab=list>. A copy of this is appended at **Annex A**.

The Community Empowerment (Scotland) Bill consultation

Robin Tatler prepared and circulated a response to this consultation. This has been submitted to the Scottish Government. A copy of the response is attached at **Annex B**.

A second bridge for Peebles

It is proposed that the Community Council submit a letter to SBC planning indicating supplementary comments on the whole second bridge issue / debate / questionnaire.

The text of this submission is attached at **Annex C**.

Draft Local Development Plan

The Local Development Plan is now out for consultation, and consultation will close on 3rd March 2014.

The draft of the plan can be downloaded in three volumes from the SBC website at http://www.scotborders.gov.uk/info/178/development_plans/659/local_development_plan. Note that these files are large.

In an effort to draw some of our thoughts on the issue together, we have developed the text to form our response to this consultation – shown as **Annex D**. If anyone wishes for other issues to be included, these need to be with Martin Tolhurst (acting convenor of the Planning Committee) by the end of February.

Peebles Town Master Plan / Vision for Peebles

All involved considered this a very successful and informative event, and look forward to its follow-up. Two further public events are scheduled for 26th April and 7th June.

Consultations

Cloich Forest Wind Farm

Additional material has been provided in support of this application – and addressing both SNH objections to the proposed development, and objections on visual impact (mainly a proposal to reduce turbine height). The main element of this additional material is revision of the installed capacity to 54MW (from 61MW) comprising 18 turbines with height of 115m (was 132m).

The material has been submitted to the Scottish Government, and we are asked to submit our consultation responses to the Energy Consents & Deployment Unit of the Scottish Government, by 4th March.

A CD is available with the relevant material is available. A summary of this material is appended. There will be a public information drop-in event on Thursday 20th February at the Barony Castle Hotel between 2.30 pm and 8pm.

The non-technical summary is reproduced at **Annex E**.

Rosetta Road Caravan Park

Additional evidence submitted – comments back by 20th Feb. We will resubmit original objections, plus additional comments (see **Annex F** – response from the Peebles Civic Society).

Innerleithen Road / Peebles Hydro housing development

Planning application has now been submitted, but has only yesterday been posted to the Planning Website. Pre-application comments are posted at **Annex G**. This will need to be addressed at the March meeting of the Planning Committee.

Veitch's Corner

Some minor activity evident – but little progress.

Cross Keys

Work on the site ongoing.

Planning Applications

AOCB

none

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

Special

[Mixed development incorporating residential, tourism and landscaping](#) | Land To South, East And West Of Rosetta Caravan Park Rosetta Road Peebles Scottish Borders | Ref. No: 12/01491/SCR | Received: Fri 30 Nov 2012 | Validated: Tue 04 Dec 2012 | Status: Pending Decision – **range of concerns (see Civic Society response – Annex F)**

[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 – **range of concerns (see Annex G)**

Listed

none

Conservation Area

[Installation of ATM machine](#) | 7 Eastgate Peebles Scottish Borders EH45 8AD | Ref. No: 14/00150/FUL | Received: Sat 08 Feb 2014 | Validated: Wed 12 Feb 2014 | Status: Pending Consideration – **no objection**

Regular

[Extension to dwellinghouse](#) | 1 The Meadows Peebles Scottish Borders EH45 9HZ | Ref. No: 14/00159/FUL | Received: Fri 07 Feb 2014 | Validated: Mon 10 Feb 2014 | Status: Pending Consideration – **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 – **no objection**

Annex A – Response to SESplan SPG on Housing

14 January 2014

Dear SESplan team

Due to pressure of work in the run-up to Christmas we did not make the cut-off date for this consultation, for which apologies. We appreciate that our comments may not be included in the consultation process, but felt we should transmit these to you, since they are the product of discussions held within the Community Council and its Planning Committee.

Overall we are of the view that the increased housing requirements affecting Peebles are excessive. The town is already suffering from a distinctly asymmetric development pattern that is detracting from the town's character, creating a dysfunctional relationship between the town's peripheral areas and the centre of town, and placing unachievable demands on community services and infrastructure. Increasing future housing allocations simply makes a bad situation worse. The model for future development of the town requires a complete rethink – before it is pressed to accommodate yet more new housing.

Evidence and methodology

- From the proposed SPG (and other readily available documentation) it is very difficult to establish what the existing and additional housing allocations are for each area; whilst we recognise that this is a contentious issue, and thus over-focus on the issue may not be encouraged, unfortunately it is of major significance to a community such as Peebles, and this information should be much more accessible to the general public.
- Methodologically the revisitation of housing allocations has overly focused on a few small housing areas (the Western Housing area is in fact a smaller area than we had assumed, only extending from Walkerburn to Peebles, and north to Eddleston), which we think is disproportionate.

Distinction between demand factors, and capacity to accommodate new housing

- Recent and on-going development of Peebles – with a particular focus on the settlement south of the Tweed, and within this with a particular focus on development to the south east of the settlement area – is producing a distinctly asymmetric development pattern, with developments to the south east of the settlement taking on the characteristics of a satellite settlement to the town, with very poor connections to the centre of the town; we would argue strongly that further development in the south east corner of the town (with or without a second bridge – which would not and is not intended to improve connectivity to the centre of the town) is detrimental to the character and setting of the town; since this is one of the very few potential areas for housing and economic development, we argue that the town cannot accommodate the additional numbers of houses that are being presented (noting that whilst the allocation covers a number of settlements, because Peebles is by far the largest of these settlements there will be an expectation, with or without rationale, that most new housing will be in Peebles).

- In the tabulations accompanying the SPG, reference is made to schooling capacity in Peebles – we do not think that these are an accurate reflection of the situation:
 - There is mention that Peebles High School “has room for already committed housing, but there may be very limited additional capacity”. Whilst this statement is factually accurate, it does not give the impression that the current state of affairs is serious. With housing development elsewhere in the catchment area of Peebles High School the school is effectively full, and has been for some time. Further, one of our three primary schools (Priorsford) is also at full capacity. To be clinically accurate, both these schools will reach 100% capacity within the next LDP period. There needs to be clearer recognition that these schools are full, and that at the very least there needs to be a reduction in the catchment area from which the High School takes pupils (currently 9 primary schools). Simply upping the future housing allocation for the area only exacerbates an already stressed and stretched situation.
 - Priorsford Primary school is located at the heart of the area where most current and planned housing expansion is focused; that it is full presents a major constraint to accommodating the increased intake that further housing development would require.

Over-concentration of additional housing on Peebles

- Whilst the additional housing proposals for the Peebles–Walkerburn corridor are relatively modest compared to other parts of the SESplan area, they represent something like a 20 per cent uplift on the existing figures; we think this is excessive.
- No additional allocation has been proposed for the West Linton area, on the basis that West Linton has undergone recent expansion; but this area includes a large number of rural settlements, including Broughton, Manor, Lamancha etc. – where there may yet be room / demand for further expansion.

There are smaller settlements where community infrastructure – such as shops, pubs, schools, bus service – is at risk, where modest expansion of housing allocation numbers might be appropriate and welcome.

Annex B – CC response to Local Empowerment (Scotland) Bill consultation

The Consultation divided into two sections – changes in legislation via the Bill and proposals for further consideration.

Starting with the Bill proposals:

1. Community Right to Request Rights in Relation to property

No response to this.

2. Community Right to Request to Participate in Processes to Improve outcomes of Service Delivery.

No comment – although we agree to this in principle as we are one of the named community bodies who can use this provision.

3. Increasing Transparency about Common Good

We agree with the provisions.

4. Defective and Dangerous Buildings - Recovery of Expenses

This does not really apply to us. The provisions are sensible, but how they will work in practice is another question...

Now the proposals for further consideration:

1. Improve and Extend Community Right to Buy

We are not affected by this as we are already entitled as a rural community with a population of under 10,000.

2. Stengthening Community Planning

This is about the establishment of Community Planning Partnerships (CPP). The idea is that these bodies should consider all development in the light of the needs of the community (rather like what we are trying to achieve with "Vision for Peebles). The Consultation Questions I think we should respond to (and my suggested) responses are:

- **Q52** What are your views on our proposals for requiring a CPP to be established in each local authority area, and for amending the core statutory underpinning for community planning to place stronger emphasis on delivering better outcomes? **We agree.**
- **Q53** What are your views on the core duties for CPPs set out above, and in particular the proposal that CPPs must develop and ensure delivery of a shared plan for outcomes (i.e., something similar to a Single Outcome Agreement) in the CPP area? **We agree - and cite "Vision for Peebles"**
- **Q54** Do the proposed duties of the CPP support effective community engagement and the involvement of the third and business sectors? What other changes may be required to make this more effective? **Community Councils should be represented.**

3. Allotments

The basic proposal is that local authorities will have a duty to provide allotments - with various proposed "triggers" depending on local demand.

The Consultation Questions I think we should respond to (and my suggested responses are:

- **Q61** Do you agree with the definition of an allotment site and allotment plot? How else would you suggest they be defined? **We agree.**
- **Q63** Do you agree with this duty to provide allotments? Are there any changes you would make? Do you agree with the level of the trigger point, ie that a local authority must make provision for allotments once the waiting list reaches 15 people? **Yes. We agree. However the proposal does leave the local authority with a "get out" clause, which they will use if they decide that there is not land available.**
- **Q64** Do you prefer the target Option A, B or C and why? Are there any other target options you wish to be considered? Do you agree with the level of the targets? **Option (B), the waiting list should be no more than 50% of the current number of allotment plots**
- **Q65** Do you agree with this list of local authority duties and powers? Would you make any changes to the above list? **Agree**
- **Q68** Do you agree that surplus produce may be sold? If you disagree, what are your reasons? **Provided the proceeds go to charity or local community as is suggested.**
- **Q69** Do you agree with this list of subjects to be governed by Regulations? Would you make any changes to the above lists? **Yes, we agree.**

Annex C – CC response to SBC Second Bridge consultation

The current debate is a distraction from more pressing issues

We wish to re-iterate our concerns on the disproportionate focus of attention on a second bridge debate relative to the other development issues facing the town, noting in particular that the origination of any discussion about a second bridge was a traffic study to examine ways of improving traffic flows across Peebles, and better managing traffic along the High Street. This particular debate has unconstructively shifted from a traffic management issue to a second bridge issue. The debate needs to be brought back to the former issue.

What is required is improvement in connectivity and traffic management across Peebles as a whole – for all modes of transport (pedestrian, cycle, car, bus and taxi) – and including paths, pavements and roads. We recognise that there are a number of bottlenecks in respect of motorised traffic movement around Peebles, that the disruption that these cause increases as further development in the town proceeds, but also that the scale of delays is minor in the greater scheme of things, and relative to what constitutes “traffic jams” in an urban context. And further, that the disruption caused by these bottlenecks can be greatly moderated by actions that do not require the construction of a second bridge, but are more to do with facilitating smarter alternate routing, including shifts to pedestrian and cycle alternatives, and more efficient use of road transport, and transport hubs.

We are also not won over by arguments that the Tweed Bridge is either at structural risk (SBC engineers have repeatedly indicated that it is structurally sound), or that its capacity to handle traffic will soon reach capacity (the basis of this statement is not clear, and high traffic movements across the bridge are restricted to very narrow time slots (commuter / school run), and light at all other times).

Against this background, the idea of a second bridge does not address an identified problem; indeed it can be argued to draw attention away from developing remedies to the wider connectivity issues, and away from developing remedies to specific points of congestion or disarticulation. It is also our view that the idea of a second bridge is much more oriented to substantial further housing development to the southeast and south of the Peebles settlement – a development that does not have the support of the community or the Community Council.

There needs to be a Plan B

We also recognise that the Draft Local Development Plan currently out for consultation ties the allocation of medium to longer-term land for housing and economic development to the construction of a second bridge. We are of the view that the overall weight of opinion within Peebles is that this is an unsustainable development proposal for the town, and should not be taken forward within the LDP. On this basis, we would like the council’s advice on how it could meet its legal responsibilities to allocate land for future housing / economic development – and finalise the LDP component for Peebles – if the second bridge option were to be removed from the planning equation.

Clarifying some of the issues of debate

The second bridge has stimulated debate, wide concern, and divergent views. The majority of people remain confused by what is being discussed, are without access to clear

presentation of the issues, and as a result are unable to state a clear opinion. This is an issue that we have had to address within the Community Council, and has led us to separate out three quite different issues associated with any discussion on the second bridge. These are:

- over-reliance on a single road bridge crossing presents a tangible risk for the community should that bridge be closed for any reason in the future;
- there is need for remediation of traffic congestion within the town – with a particular focus on congestion at the southern end of Tweed Bridge, and congestion on the High Street – which a second bridge might help achieve
- a second bridge would facilitate – indeed is essential – to expansion of the settlement footprint of Peebles south of the River Tweed.

Our views on these three issues, drawing on debate within the Community Council, and inputs to councillors arising from various forms of meeting with Peebles residents, are summarised below.

- ❑ In addressing the first issue (the risks attaching to over-reliance on a single bridge), an alternate to building a second road bridge would be to have a well-developed and effective disaster plan in place to specifically address the, unlikely but possible, situation where the Tweed Bridge cannot be used for road traffic. Such a plan would, for example, include the outputs of a detailed assessment of the feasibility of installing a temporary bridge crossing just north of south of the existing bridge. Should the Tweed Bridge be taken out of action as a result of accident it is feasible, *in extremis*, to erect a secure temporary alternate between Ninian's Haugh and Tweedgreen, and improvements are underway in development of a disaster plan routing road traffic along the back road to the bridge at Cardrona. We should also note that re-instatement of Manor Brig could provide temporary remediation under such circumstances.
- ❑ For the second issue (remediation of traffic congestion), opinion is divided as to whether or not Peebles can really be described as having a traffic congestion problem, or if it has, that a second bridge is the right or only means of addressing traffic congestion. On balance we are of the view that much needs to be done in this area **before** further consideration is given to a second bridge option. Building a second bridge does not of itself address the issue of bottlenecks or lead to a reduction in traffic congestion.
- ❑ The third issue appears to draw the more widely held view that significant further housing development south of the river will irreversibly alter the complexion, feel and attractiveness of Peebles – for the worse; and this is in part based on the experience that current consented developments at Whitehaugh and Kettleary are largely disconnected satellite developments to the town – representing unsustainable asymmetric development of the settlement – and that the infrastructure of the community cannot sustain such development.

Concluding remark

If pressed to take a position on the matter, most are of the view that a second bridge is an invitation to developers to seek to build several hundred more houses to the south of the river within the next 20 years, and that this would not be good for Peebles.

Annex D – proposed response to the consultation on the draft Local Development Plan

- Existing development to the south east of Peebles is disconnected from the town – more building in this area simply makes the current bad situation worse; this may be reasonably described as extreme asymmetric development of the town
- Polarisation of the town (north of the river, south of the river) will only get worse with the construction of further housing arising from building of a second bridge (not just in next ten years, but next twenty and thirty years), making for an untenable split town
- Needs to be much more focused effort on reconnecting the existing settlement pattern – through upgrading of paths and cycle network, amongst other issues
- There remain community issues associated with proposals for a second bridge across the Tweed. On balance, proposals for a second bridge need to be ditched in favour of a footbridge / cycle bridge around the same sort of proposed location – linking to pedestrian / cycle paths north and south of the new footbridge / cycle bridge
- The second bridge debate divides into three community concerns:

<p>over-reliance on a single road bridge crossing presents a tangible risk for the community should that bridge be closed for any reason on the future</p>	<p>This issue should be addressed through development of an appropriate disaster response strategy – and not through the building of a second road bridge – which is not addressed within the draft LDP</p>
<p>Remediation of traffic congestion within the town – with a particular focus on congestion at the southern end of Tweed Bridge, and congestion on the High Street</p>	<p>We are not won over by the arguments that the levels of traffic using the existing bridge are nearing capacity, or that traffic congestion (and delays to travel) is at a level that warrants the construction of a second bridge; we are, however, of the view that road and path connectivity across Peebles, in part reflecting the Victorian layouts in the centre of the town, do not meet modern requirements, and need to be optimised (physically and through management of demand) before promoting the idea of a second bridge as a traffic remediation measure</p>
<p>Facilitation of expansion of the settlement footprint of Peebles south of the River Tweed</p>	<p>The community is overwhelming of the view that further substantial expansion of the settlement footprint of the town south of the river is not needed, is unsustainable, and would lead in the first instance to further asymmetric development of the settlement, followed by polarisation of the town around separate settlements north and south of the river</p>
- Proposed housing and economic development by Edderston Ridge – the reporter addressing objections to the last amendment to the consolidated LDP rejected proposals for both housing and economic development at this location on the basis of poor area road access and traffic congestion. The basis of this objection remains – with effectively

a single track road along Caledonian Road by the Ambulance and Fire Station, and a pinch point associated with the roundabout at the bottom of Edderston Road. These traffic management issues need to be resolved **before** any further development in this area is included in the LDP

- Future housing needs need to be re-allocated to other sites north and south of the river – significantly, for example, medium and longer-term provision cannot be accommodated within the current development boundary north of the river
- There needs to be a much clearer statement of the composition of current and future housing allocations – including a statement of the existing number of houses in each category
- There is still a requirement for more truly affordable housing within Peebles – i.e. housing that people can afford to buy or to rent; this should not be interpreted as poorly designed or cheaply constructed housing
- A clear statement needs to be made that Priorsford Primary School is now at capacity, and that additional pupils will need to be directed to Kingsland Primary (nearly full) and Halyrude Primary
- A clearer statement needs to be made that the High School is at full capacity and its catchment area (9 primary schools) needs to be reduced to contain numbers
- The physical setting of the settlement of Peebles is such that its boundaries cannot be reasonably expanded much further – both north and south of the river; there are opportunities for some modest infill and expansion, north and south of the river, but the layout of the predominantly Victorian core of the settlement (which establishes the core character of the town) is not amenable to further large-scale (>100 house developments)
- There remain major weaknesses in traffic management within the Peebles – notably associated with Rosetta Road, March Street, Elcho Street Brae, Young Street and the Old Town, to do with Caledonian Road (the issues are to do with the straight section of this road and not with other parts), and to do with traffic movements associated with each of the schools – there is no mention of this in the plan, or how this could or should be addressed
- Insufficient attention is given to the provision of economic development land; exacerbated by the fact that existing sites with economic use are being replaced with residential development (such as Dovecot, and such as various workshop sites that are being replaced with one, two or three houses); Peebles has some outstanding medium scale businesses of national and international standing; there is no reason why more such business should not operate from the town, if suitable sites and support were provided; Peebles cannot survive as simply a dormitory to Edinburgh and Pentland Science Cluster
- There is concern that current / future allocations for economic land fall far short of requirements, and that presents a real and current problem with the identification of the Dovecot site for redevelopment; this is currently home to a wide range of businesses, all of which have been put on notice that they **might** have to relocate in the near future; efforts to identify premises that they can reasonably move to have been singularly unsuccessful; either redevelopment of this site should be nominated for economic use, or significant additional sites for economic development should be identified within this LDP

- There needs to be some explicit recognition of the impact of recently revised flood risk modelling undertaken and published by SEPA – part of which shows the land to the southeast of the town (Kittlegairy and beyond) to be at high risk of regular flooding
- The “core activity areas” need to be extended to include the Northgate, Cuddy Bridge, Old Town, and frontage to the east of Eastgate
- Connectivity across Peebles is poor – there are plenty of paths, footpaths and green spaces, but they are not joined into a coherent whole that meets the needs of both the community and visitors; there are clear opportunities for infill and further development of the core paths network in and around Peebles, and more needs to be done to facilitate the movement of children to and from school, residents to and from medical and other social support facilities, and residents to and from shops and leisure facilities; such developments fit well with the LDP focus on Green Networks – not to do something about this would suggest that Green Networks are more spin than practice
- In the context of green networks, and protection of key green areas, we are very supportive of designation of a large number of green areas for protection against development within this plan; in addition, however, we would note that there are other areas of structured woodland and/or fields / beds that would benefit from increased levels of protection (note the identification of some such key features within the Landscape Capacity Study undertaken by SBC landscape architects in 2007), much of which lies in private ownership; we would note in particular the woodland associated with Kingsmeadows House (currently on sale, with a brochure suggesting potential for significant development of new housing), and the need to protect green corridors surrounding and associated with access to the town’s four schools.

Annex E – Cloich Forest Wind Farm proposal – non-technical summary of latest addition to application

Introduction

In October 2012 Cloich Wind Farm LLP (a wholly owned subsidiary of Partnerships for Renewables Ltd) submitted an application to Scottish Ministers under Section 36 of the Electricity Act 1989 to construct and operate a wind farm at Cloich Forest (the Site) (National Grid Reference 320900 648193) approximately 2 km west of Eddleston in the Scottish Borders. The proposed development (Cloich Forest Wind Farm) was designed in partnership with Forestry Commission Scotland (owner of the Site) and comprised 18 wind turbines, each measuring 132 m to the tip of the blade, as well as such associated infrastructure as access tracks and a control building.

During determination of the Section 36 application a number of consultation responses to the Cloich Forest Wind Farm have been made, and some of these responses have lead Cloich Wind Farm LLP to amend the proposed development's design. The Section 36 application was accompanied by an Environmental Statement, which detailed an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) of Cloich Forest Wind Farm. The EIA appraised the proposed development's potential effects upon the local environment, focussing on a number of key environmental topics. As the proposed design of Cloich Forest Wind Farm has been amended, it has been necessary to review and revise the contents of the Environmental Statement.

These revisions have been set out in Supplementary Environmental Information (SEI) submitted to Scottish Ministers in January 2014. As well as revisions to the Environmental Statement, the SEI provides clarification on a number of points raised by consultees and additional environmental information as required. The SEI serves as an addendum to the Environmental Statement and the two documents should be read in conjunction. This NonTechnical Summary provides a brief overview of the more detailed technical information contained within the SEI.

Amendments to Cloich Forest Wind Farm

Similar to the original design, the proposed Cloich Forest Wind Farm as amended comprises 18 turbines; however there has been a notable reduction in the proposed development's scale. The candidate turbine has reduced in height from 132 m to 115 m to the tip of the blade. Using a smaller turbine has allowed a more compact and cohesive layout to be progressed, ultimately reducing the spread of development within the Site from 267 ha to 171 ha (36 % overall). In particular, the proposed turbine locations now occupy a more central position within the interior of Cloich Forest, beyond the outlying hill summits.

In terms of renewable energy, the smaller turbines would each have a generation capacity of 3 megawatts (MW). The installed capacity of Cloich Forest Wind Farm as amended would be 54 MW (18 x 3 MW turbines), reducing from 61.2 MW as originally proposed. Assuming an installed capacity of 54 MW, the amended proposed development could enable the generation of an estimated 132.5 gigawatt hours of renewable energy per year. This is

equivalent to the amount of electricity used annually by 32,479 average UK households and could avoid up to 56,954 tonnes of carbon being emitted each year. Table 1 sets out the potential electricity production and carbon savings of the amended proposed development at different capacity factors.

Table 1 Potential electricity production and carbon savings for the proposed Cloich Forest Wind

Farm as amended Capacity Factor* Electricity Generation (MW hours per year)	Homes Equivalent (based upon UK average consumption)	Carbon Savings - Tonnes CO	2 per year (based upon a grid mix of electricity generation)
25%	118,260	30,740	50,852
28%	132,451	32,479	56,954
30%	141,912	34,799	61,022
35%	165,564	40,599	71,193

* The net capacity factor of a wind farm is the ratio of its actual energy output (after potential energy losses have been accounted for) over a defined period of time (typically a year) to its energy output, had it operated at maximum power output, continuously, over the same period of time. A capacity factor of 28 % has been chosen for the amended Cloich Forest Wind Farm as this was the average capacity factor in Scotland between 2000 and 2012.

Other differences between the original Cloich Forest Wind Farm and as amended include the following:

- A reduction in the total area of coniferous forestry that requires to be felled from 172.1 ha to 132.7 ha;
- A reduction in height of the lattice steel anemometer mast from 85 m to 70 m; and
- An increase in the length of new access tracks to be constructed on-site from 5.3 km to 6.2 km.

Overview of the Supplementary Environmental Information

Information Additional to the Environmental Statement

Consultation responses to the Section 36 application requested greater information on the presence of peat across the Site, largely in relation to its management during construction of the proposed development, and the likelihood of carbon losses resulting from disposal and / or desiccation, as well as the potential risk of 'peat slide'.

A peat depth survey has now been undertaken and a full survey report is presented within the SEI. The survey confirmed the assertion presented within the Environmental Statement that peat coverage within Cloich Forest is very limited, with only three discrete areas having peat deeper than 1 m (the depth generally considered as presenting a peat slide risk). The layout of the amended proposed development has been designed to avoid these locations on the Site.

Additionally, the minor amounts of peat present mean full reinstatement following construction would be possible, with no disposal necessary elsewhere within the Site.

Potential Environmental Effects of the Amended Cloich Forest Wind Farm

The Environmental Statement assessed the proposed development in relation to a number of environmental issues, including landscape, visual amenity, cultural heritage, ornithology, ecology, hydrology, geology, noise pollution, traffic and the road network, as well as community and recreation / tourism. A review has determined that the conclusions of many of these assessments, first drawn on the original proposed development, also apply to the proposed development as amended.

Regarding landscape and visual amenity, overall the proposed development as amended is considered an improvement on its original design. Its reduction in scale, both in terms of height and spread across the Site, has led to a more unified layout contained within the centre of Cloich Forest beyond the outlying hills.

A revised assessment has determined that the most notable landscape and visual amenity effects of the amended proposed development would be contained within a 3.5 km radius around the Site. The receptors most likely to experience these effects are: Cloich Forest itself and part of the Plateau Outliers Landscape Character Area; some local recreational routes and core paths with views of the Site; two minor roads with views of the Site; the hill summits of White Meldon and Black Meldon, both of which have views of the Site; and certain residential properties in the vicinity of the Site.

Potential effects on other receptors in the local area, including landscape designations, settlements or 'A' class roads, are not considered to be significant. Views from Glen Tress Forest may be notably affected by the proposed development when it is observed in combination with the existing Bowbeat Wind Farm, although these effects would mostly result from the latter development. There may also be further significant effects should both the amended proposed development and the potential Hag Law Wind Farm (not yet submitted as a planning application), proposed for a site adjacent to Cloich Forest, go ahead.

In terms of their visual setting, the amended Cloich Forest Wind Farm would also affect a number of Scheduled Monuments (sites designated for cultural heritage importance), one Category A listed building (Spitalhaugh House) and an element of the local Historic Landscape Character. Potential effects upon buried archaeological remains are not considered to be of concern.

The amended turbine layout has also necessitated a revision to the draft Cloich Forest Design Plan presented within the Environmental Statement. The revised Forest Design Plan (2015 – 2025) is included within the SEI.

Obtaining Information and Representations

Copies of the SEI may be obtained from the following address:

Partnerships for Renewables
12 Melcombe Place
Station House
London
NW1 6JJ
Email: community@pfr.co.uk

A limited number of printed copies are available at a cost of £500 each, while a CD containing the documents in a PDF format can be obtained for £15. Alternatively, these electronic files can be downloaded from the Partnerships for Renewables website (<http://www.pfr.co.uk/cloich>).

Printed copies of this SEI may also be consulted at the following locations during normal opening hours:

Scottish Borders Council
Council Headquarters
Bowden Road
Newtown St Boswells
TD6 0SA

Scottish Borders Council
Contact Centre
Chambers Institute
Peebles
EH45 8AG

Newlands Centre
Romanno Bridge
West Linton
Scottish Borders
EH46 7BZ

Annex F – Peebles Civic Society submission to current revised planning application for Rosetta Holiday Park

Peebles Civic Society
Planning Application 13/00444/PPP
Rosetta Holiday Park Rosetta road Peebles

Mixed use development comprising of new housing, relocation of caravan park incorporating static pitches, erection of facilities building and sales office.

We continue with our objection to this application.

Procedural.

The previous application for this project was 13/00444/FUL to which we responded with our letter of 22 May 2013. We have received notification of the revised application by letter dated 20 January 2014 for application ref: 13/00444/PPP that we consider to be a revision and not a new application. This letter also advised that our comments with regard to application 13/00444/FUL would still be considered in the evaluation of this present application. We therefore now respond to the information given in the revised application.

We base our response on the revised Landscape Sketch Master Plan and the Rosetta Holiday Park Supplementary Report December 2013 accompanying the application. We note that pages 21-25 were not included in our copy and the on-line version also does not have these pages but has a page 25 as conclusion.

Scottish Borders housing requirements and the timing of the application

We note that the revised proposal reduces the number of houses from 172 to 130.

Since our previous response the Scottish Borders Council Proposed Local development Plan (LDP) has been issued for consultation. We are informed that the SESplan housing review has been taken into account in the preparation of the Proposed LDP.

For the current planning period the housing need for Peebles within the Western Strategic Development Area has been satisfied and no additional housing is suggested in the Proposed LDP to meet any shortfall.

The Proposed LDP addressing the housing needs for the forthcoming period 2019 to 2024 identifies two new sites for safeguarding in Peebles to satisfy the housing requirement: APEEB021 South of South Parks 50 houses and APEEB Violet Bank II 25 houses. The proposed site is not included in the Proposed LDP.

If permission were to be granted the addition of 130 houses would greatly exceed the target of 75 houses for Peebles.

Such a development would be of a windfall and infill nature. We consider that the amount of houses proposed significantly exceeds the amount that could be justified under this definition. As infill development we would also consider that the cumulative effect would be counter to conditions ii), iii) and v) of Planning Policy G7 Infill Development.

This application thus remains contrary to both the current LDP and the Proposed LDP. Any development here would be premature for the current planning period and that of the Proposed LDP.

Traffic Considerations.

We note that a revised Traffic Impact Assessment has been undertaken but we feel that although the TIA attempts to demonstrate that the increased traffic can be accommodated in theory. We consider that in practice the introduction of this traffic will seriously impact on the real traffic situation of the surrounding roads.

Infrastructure Considerations.

We are concerned that the documentation accompanying the revised application does not address any further the problem of satisfying potential deficiencies in the infrastructure of Peebles caused by this development. Until detailed proposals are submitted on how the infrastructure implications are to be met and funded, the consideration should still not be finalised by the Council. As such the application has not demonstrated that criteria v of policy G7 Infill Development is being satisfied.

Landscape Impact Considerations

We note that in the revised application Supplementary Report Section 3 Landscape Analysis the view from the east across the valley has not been addressed. The analysis concentrates on views out from the development and only cites the view in from the south. We therefore still contend that scant regard has been given to the visual impact of the development on the views from across the valley especially in relation to the proposed siting of the static caravans high on the valley side.

Indicative housing layouts.

We note that the Supplementary Report gives indicative layouts. These do not really indicate impact on the site but we note the intention to preserve open parkland to the front of Rosetta House.

We are still concerned that the access road for the housing zones A and B pass close in front of Rosetta House.

We note that the Holiday Park facilities' building has now been sited away from the stables building. This is an improvement but placing it at the far end of a row of touring caravan plots is to be questioned.

Annex G – Innerleithen Road proposed housing development – preliminary Community Council input following information event

The Planning Committee of Peebles Community Council reported to the December meeting of the full Council on the nature of the pre-application information event, and discussed the proposal in more detail at its meeting in January. Below are our preliminary thoughts on the proposals for the site.

- Overall we take a somewhat neutral position to the proposals – the site is not in the current or proposed Local Development Plan, and we do not expect this to change
- The site is not an infill site – the void is to frame the view of the Hydro, from below and from the other side of the valley – a view that the key elements of which should be retained
- The site is not a gap site – for the above reason, and that there is no structured housing at the other end of the property
- Much is made of the trees located along the old railway line as blocking sight lines from the hotel outwards, so that the development as proposed would be largely hidden; this is slightly ingenuous – the trees were planted after the railway was dismantled, and in all likelihood haven't been trimmed since – maybe it is time that their height was modified in the context of landscape and visual settings
- The lie of the land suggests that rather than having the highest new buildings at the front of the site, they should be at the back – offering more residents a view across the valley
- Innerleithen Road does not need another road junction – as proposed in your outline drawings; access to the site should be re-oriented via the western entrance to the Hydro
- The boundary and development proposals for this site bring into question how the strip to the west of the plot (to the rear of the row of existing houses) might be used in future – you have indicated that this site is not in the ownership of your client, but would become rather isolated should your proposed development proceed
- we would also wish to see some consideration (by your client and by the Hydro) of how this development might impact on future layout and redevelopment of the Hydro grounds to the rear of the site
- We have real concerns about the use of the old railway track to rear of your proposed development plot; should your proposed development proceed, we would wish to see this redeveloped as an extension of the Innerleithen-Peebles multi-use path – as an explicit right of way, or through transfer to community ownership
- This also brings into focus concerns about the relationship between the owners of the proposed development site and of the Hydro site
- There is a requirement to include 25% affordable housing on all developments – it is not clear how this is to be addressed with respect to this development

We will address the specific proposals at such time as a planning application is lodged with SBC planners