- 1.0 <u>General</u>
- 1.1 No items
- 2.0 Planning Applications Current Interest
 - 2.1 **Tweedbridge Court** 19/01471/FUL Building expected to start early this year.
 - 2.2 Kingsmeadows House, Peebles 19/00182/PPP (New Flats) 2.2.1 Approved but pertinent to 20/01624/PAN
 - 2.3 Kingsmeadows House, Peebles 20/01624/PAN
 - 2.4 Erection of 14 apartments and 5 dwellinghouses and access Kingsmeadows, Peebles Ref No: 21/01563/SCR
 - 2.4.1.1 Awaiting further developments.
 - 2.5 **Cloich Windfarm** –21/01134/S36 This appears to have changed to an application without being spotted by anyone as it was filed on 08 July last and there is only one objection noted. However, it may be the case that SBC have not kept the file up to date. As we previously agreed, we are taking a neutral stance on this other than itemising some concerns. This writer has notified the other Tweeddale Community Councils of the ommisions.
 - 2.5.1 Archaeological Officer report (21/01/22). This writer recommends that anyone with an interest should access the report directly. It notes a significant adverse impact visually and that the development is contrary to Historic Environment Policy for Scotland HEP2 and HEP3 and SBC policy EP8a. A decision based solely on this report would be unlikely to go ahead. The report does note though, that as this is an update to the original application that was previously approved, then it is likely to be approved regardless.
 - 2.6 Scawd Windfarm 20/00880/SCO
 - 2.6.1 We now await a full planning application
 - 2.7 **Castle Venlaw 21/00939/FUL 20/01493/LBC** (Revision to LBC 18/01286/LBC) **18/01287/FUL** (Location of heat pumps)
 - 2.7.1 Still rumbling on. SBC Planning and the developer have still not reached an agreement on the location of all the heat pumps.
 - 2.7.1.1 From SBC With all due respect, it is not for us to prove...... Anyone with interest in this saga should look it up on the portal. No follow up since November last!
 - 2.8 Change of use of pavement to form outside seating area 42 44 High St, Peebles Ref No: 21/00597/FUL
 - 2.8.1 Required to apply for a change of use.
 - 2.8.2 Owners rebuked for operating before the planning applications had been determined. Apologised and provided an explanation which some may find acceptable. However, the last dated document was 03 September and therefore there appears to have been no follow up from SBC in over five months.
 - 2.9 **Land east of Knapdale, Castle Venlaw**. Following the failures to obtain planning consent either on application or on appeal, this land has now been put up for sale through McEwan Fraser Legal

- 2.10 Edderston Farm change of use to Events Venue Ref No: 21/01327/FUL.
 - 2.10.1 Environmental Health have objected based on noise pollution to neighbours and considers the noise impact assessment inadequate as it does not allow for outdoor areas nor detail the sort of equipment being considered.

3.0 <u>New Planning Applications</u>

The writer recommends no action on any of the following subject to PCC agreement except as highlighted.

- 3.1 Change of use of building to form 2 no Holiday lets and erection of bicycle store Office and workshop, Dovecot Road Industrial Estate, Peebles Ref No: 22/00175/FUL
 - 3.1.1 This is the same building that was granted PP in 2020 for conversion to a dwelling. After PP was approved, the agent emailed to try and have the existing parking included in the site. However, SBC responded that the parking spaces are adopted for general use as part of the public road and cannot be considered a part of the development. The response reminds the agent that his client was informed of this in 2018. It is possible that this made the original proposal lack viability as a residence. The new proposal would presumably hope to obviate this problem. Having considered the plan, there are two questions that come to mind.
 - 3.1.1.1 A) How will the holiday parking affect other residents?
 - 3.1.1.2 B) Who owns the corner site that is proposed for a bike store and waste bins?
- 3.2 **Erection of managers accommodation with office and reception** Land North of Falladale, Peebles Ref No: 22/00145/FUL
- 3.3 **Extension to form a front porch** 2 Standalane Terrace, Peebles, EH45 8LT Ref No: 22/00136/FUL
- 3.4 **Change of use of flat to form additional accommodation to dental surgery** – Flat 36B and dental surgery, 36 High Street, Peebles – Ref No: 22/00124/FUL
- 3.5 **Alterations and extension to dwellinghouse** Strontian, 4 Dean Park, Peebles Ref No: 22/00116/FUL
- 3.6 **Replacement windows** 11 Young Street, Peebles Ref No: 22/00115/FUL
- 3.7 **Refurbishment and replacement windows** Drumsheugh Villa, 4 Crossland Crescent, Peebles – Ref No: 22/00099/FUL
- 3.8 **Erection of 3 no holiday pods** Land East of Park Hotel, Innerleithen Road, Peebles Ref No: 22/00091/FUL
 - 3.8.1 This is a repetition albeit some changes of the previous application that was not supported by SBC. Below is a precis of what the Civic Society think about the proposals
 - 3.8.2 Questions of sustainability cover a much wider scope as is set out in policies PMD1 and PMD2 in the draft LDP2, and the relevant issue here is whether the proposed development will contribute positively to the surrounding environment, or not. One further thought is that the suggested concept of "potting sheds" or "greenhouses"

plays down the real scale of the proposed buildings, which is perhaps a concern. The drawing showing the more detailed plans and sections of the proposed building is misleading in that it has not been changed from the first application, and still shows the timber screen fence that was previously proposed adjacent to the public The current plan shows that no thought has been given to the appearance of the development within the landscape setting of the existing garden, nor the visibility from the public areas to the northwest.

- 3.9 **Alterations to dwellinghouse** Eastgate house, Innerleithen Road, Peebles Ref No: 22/00067/FUL
- 3.10 Alterations and extension to dwellinghouse 33 Edderston Ridge, Peebles Ref No: 22/00066/CLPU
- 3.11 **Erection of replacement fence and erection of gate arch** Cabbage Hall, Tweed Green, Peebles Ref No: 22/00058/FUL and 22/00057/FUL
- 3.12 Replace existing flat roof construction and external alterations to side elevation – Venlaw rise, Edinburgh Road, Peebles – Ref No: 22/00053/FUL & ref No: 22/00013/CLPU
- 3.13 **Installation of two rooflights** Apartment 11, Kingsmeadows House, Kingsmeadows Road, Peebles Ref No: 22/00041/FUL
- 3.14 **Removal of tree** Dun Whinny, Springwood Terrace, Peebles Ref No: 22/00027/TCA
- 3.15 **Erection of garden room** The Mill House, Scotsmill, Kailzie, Peebles Ref No: 22/00014/FUL
- 4.0 <u>Previous Planning Applications removed from this report (No ongoing interest to</u> <u>PCC)</u>
 - 4.1 Alterations to dwellinghouse Lindores, 60 Old Town, Peebles, EH45 8JE Ref No: 21/01969/FUL
 - 4.2 **Erection of Boundary Fence** 1 Gallow Hill, Peebles, EH45 9BG Ref No: 21/01930/FUL
 - 4.3 **Alterations and Extension to Dwellinghouse -** 23 Standalane View, Peebles, EH45 8LS Ref No: 22/00003/FUL
 - 4.4 **Replace existing flat roof construction and external alterations to side elevation** – Venlaw Rise, Edinburgh road, EH45 8DZ – Ref No: 22/00013/CLPU

Scottish Borders Community Council Network (SBCCN)

As per the previous report, the writer had emailed all the Tweeddale community councils to see what interest there was in forming an effective area focus group that could feed in to the SBCCN. The initial response was disappointing. One, CC showed interest and there was little response from the other ten. The writer followed up on the original communication and two CCs responded by giving the opinion that from their experience working with SBC was generally unproductive and that SBC failed to take any of their feedback into account in the decision-making process. However, the writer has continued to work on the project and at the time of writing, including PCC, four CCs have now signified interest in forming a focus group.

Next SBCCN Meeting 23 February

The Proposed Additional High Street Pedestrian Crossing

No change

Peebles Parking Working group

The group held a meeting on 02 February and the writer considers that it had some value. Much of the discussion centred around the potential format for a survey to identify user needs and the discussion raised some points that met with general agreement. Such as

- The questions should not ask do you believe that there should be a parking charge (yes or no). Rather, the question should ask what a reasonable charge would be.
- When asking about charges, the consultation should identify a possible level of revenue and the sorts of causes that may be able to benefit from them.

Further, there was consideration of what sort of issues could be supported from the parking revenue stream. The writer asked the following questions whilst noting that the process must be completely transparent.

- How is the fund managed?
- How does a body apply to it?
- Is there an adequate audit trail?
- What is the authorisation process?

Next meeting 09 March

Extract from November minutes copied from SBC website for interest.

In response to a request at the last meeting, Ms Gilhooly gave an update an electric charging for vehicles. Transport Scotland had funded EV chargers to date. This funding had now all been spent. There were 31 chargers across 14 towns and villages but there were no plans to provide more at present until further advice had been received from Transport Scotland. Users did not have to pay at present, but a report was being prepared for Council to introduce charging. It was noted that the installation of rapid chargers was more expensive than destination chargers. The Chairman considered at all car parks in Peebles should have a rapid charger and that this should form part of the Groups final report. Ms Gilhooly advised that provision was dependant on the capacity of the national grid and the cost of providing additional sub-stations was high. The UK and Scottish Government needed to work together on this. The Chairman highlighted the need for bus chargers if the Eastgate car park was to become a transport interchange.

With regard to the information needed for the survey it was agreed that the information from previous surveys be re-circulated before the next meeting. The types of questions to be asked were discussed and it was agreed that both quantitative and qualitative types would be required. In response to a suggestion that school pupils could be used to carry our surveys, Ms Gilhooly advised that it was the analysis that was important which was why using a firm like Buchanan's

would give more useful data. However, school pupils could be used to alert parents to the survey. The survey would be promoted via a press release and would also be available online. With regard to charging a narrative could also be added explaining that the money was spent in the community. In response to a suggestion that the money could be used to fund the public toilets, Mr Haldane agreed to check if there were any restrictions on what the money could be used for. It was suggested that a separate survey be prepared for traders, and it would be helpful to have a trader representative on the Group.

It was agreed that there would be a citizen space questionnaire, a hand delivered questionnaire for Traders and in person car park surveys. Ms Gilhooly advised she would speak to Buchanan's about carrying out the in-person surveys. She further suggested that May was a good month to conduct these surveys.

Common Good

Next meeting 23 February

I have been asked to raise the issue of the Haylodge Park Toilets

At the time of writing, the only item brought to the writer's attention that may be Common Good but which is not listed is the Drill Hall