1.0 General

- 1.1 Cloich Windfarm –19/01489/SCO As per discussions at the last meeting we have not objected to the development but have raised the following areas as concerns.
 - 1.1.1 Lack of full and effective consultation
 - 1.1.2 Lack of consideration in the non-technical overview of the needs of local houses, small settlements, farms, and businesses
 - 1.1.3 A statement noting that the conditions imposed upon the previously approved development should carry through to the newly proposed development.
 - 1.1.3.1 Duration of consent is 25 years
 - 1.1.3.2 Commence within 5 years of the date of consent
 - 1.1.3.3 EDF not permitted to consign the consent to a third party
 - 1.1.3.4 Serious incidents of HSE to be reported
 - 1.1.3.5 Implementation in strict accordance with the approved plans
 - 1.1.3.6 Development not to commence until full details submitted and approved
 - 1.1.3.7 Development not to commence until final details of the sub-station submitted and approved
 - 1.1.3.8 Micro-siting basically the turbines, etc. need to be sited where planned for with a bit of wriggle room
 - 1.1.3.9 Development not to commence until the design for the Borrow Pits has been submitted and approved [basically a small quarry]
 - 1.1.3.10 Independent Planning monitoring officer to be appointed
 - 1.1.3.11 Independent Ecological Clerk of works to be appointed
 - 1.1.3.12 Construction method statement to be produced
 - 1.1.3.13 Construction hours to be restricted to reduce the effect on neighbours
 - 1.1.3.14 Traffic management plan to be produced
 - 1.1.3.15 Habitat management plan to be produced
 - 1.1.3.16 Biodiversity management plan to be produced
 - 1.1.3.17 An independent Archaeological Clerk of Works to be appointed
 - 1.1.3.18 Woodland planting scheme to be developed
 - 1.1.3.19 Turbine noise not to exceed certain limits
 - 1.1.3.20 Private water supplies to be protected through the production of a method statement
 - 1.1.3.21 Flood risk and water management plan required
 - 1.1.3.22 Redundant turbine removal plan
 - 1.1.3.23 Aviation safety notification to be made
 - 1.1.3.24 Aviation lighting plan to be provided and approved
 - 1.1.3.25 Development not to start until a decommissioning plan has been produced and approved
 - 1.1.3.26 Performance bond to be lodged
 - 1.1.3.27 Public path and access plan to be produced.

- 1.2 **Peebles Parking Working group** The writer could not attend the meeting on 15 September and awaits the minutes.
- 1.3 **Community Council Network** The writer could not attend the AGM and awaits the minutes. However, in absentia had proposed that the network start a quarterly newsletter to exchange information and facilitate collaboration between CCs.

2.0 Planning Applications - Current Interest

- 2.1 Tweedbridge Court This month perhaps?
- 2.2 Rosetta Holiday Park (13/00444/PPP)
 - 2.2.1 SBC have emailed the owner to enquire if this application is now dead and can be withdrawn
- 2.3 Kingsmeadows House, Peebles 19/00182/PPP (New Flats) 2.3.1 Approved but pertinent to 20/01624/PAN
- 2.4 Kingsmeadows House, Peebles 20/01624/PAN
- 2.5 Erection of 14 apartments and 5 dwellinghouses and access Kingsmeadows, Peebles Ref No: 21/01563/SCO
 - 2.5.1 The developer has made enquiry as to whether an Environmental Impact assessment is required for a potential future development. The writer has written to SBC to support the need for an EIA.
- 2.6 Ballantyne Place 20/00691/FUL
 - 2.6.1 Today (08/10/21). The site owner bulldozed the community garden. This is a very complex situation as it is made up of the rights of the owner and the rights of the other householders on the estate as enshrined within their house deeds. One can understand the site owners' chagrin at having spent £30,000 to secure the site with a view to building and then being refused permission. However, this was his business risk and he also lost on appeal to the Scottish Government. His deeds and the other householders' deeds are identical and allow for appeal and arbitration over disputes. He has ignored this civilised approach and taken an action that many will find repugnant. It is likely that his action will not help him on any subsequent application for planning approval. The writer supposes that this action was taken with a view to subvert the decisions already made and will argue this at any future committee meeting.
- 2.7 **Scawd Windfarm 20/00880/SCO** 2.7.1 No change
- 2.8 Castle Venlaw 21/00939/FUL 20/01493/LBC (Revision to LBC 18/01286/LBC) 18/01287/FUL (Location of heat pumps) 2.8.1 Appears little change since the last report.
- 2.9 Change of use of bank to form restaurant with takeaway facility and installation of extraction flue 78 High Street Peebles Scottish Borders EH45 8SW Ref. No: 21/00412/FUL | Received: Fri 12 Mar 2021 | Validated: Tue 16 Mar 2021 | Status: Registered
 - 1.1.1 Unchanged Planning officers have written to the applicant recommending withdrawal based on the environmental health officers report which considered that there were no adequate measures possible to mitigate nuisance to neighbouring properties.

- 2.10 Change of use of pavement to form outside seating area 42 44 High St, Peebles Ref No: 21/00597/FUL
 - 2.10.1 Required to apply for a change of use.
 - 2.10.2 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 has been no follow up from SBC in over a month.
- 2.11 Internal and external alterations and installation of illuminated and non-illuminated signage The Tatler, Peebles 21/00989/LBC 2.11.1 See Appendix 1: Letter of support for Manse Interiors.
- 2.12 Illuminated and non-illuminated signage and awning The Tatler, High St. 21/00988/ADV 2.12.1 As previously
- 2.13 **Erection of 4 Holiday Pods** Land east of Park Hotel, Peebles Ref No: 21/01117/FUL
 - 2.13.1 This application has now been withdrawn
- 2.14 DDL Care Cavalry Park, Peebles Ref No: 21/00486/FUL
 - 2.14.1 Letter of support see Appendix 2 This application was refused, and PCC was asked to consider whether DDL could be supported in an appeal. This writer finds the SBC decision to have been without reasonable form or substance.

3.0 New Planning Applications (Since 05 January 2021)

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

- 3.1 **Ash 7m High to cut to stump –** Strathearn, Springhill Road, Peebles Ref No: 21/01617/TCA
- 3.2 **Installation of chimney flue** 18 Craigearne Drive, Peebles Ref No: 21/01608/FUL
- 3.3 **Discharge of planning obligation pursuant to planning permission T134/88 and T127/88** Falla Brae House (Holding No11) Eshiels Ref No: 21/01611/MOD75
- 3.4 **Erection of dwellinghouse (renewal of planning permission** Garden ground of Ailort, Langside Drive, Peebles Ref No: 17/01023/PPP
- 3.5 **Replacement windows** Parkview, SpringHill Road, Peebles Ref No: 21/01587/FUL
- 3.6 Work to trees 24 Morning Hill, Peebles Ref No: 21/01580/TPO
- 3.7 Erection of 14 apartments and 5 dwellinghouses and access Kingsmeadows, Peebles Ref No: 21/01563/SCO
- 3.8 Alterations to dwellinghouse, alterations and extension to garage o form accommodation, widen drive and erect wall High Beeches, Edinburgh Road, Peebles Ref No: 21/01535/FUL
- 3.9 **Extension to dwellinghouse** 6 Kittlegairy Park, Peebles Ref No: 21/01522/FUL
- 3.10 **Extension to provide orangery** Neidpath View, Caledonian Road, Peebles Ref No: 21/01516/FUL

- 3.11 Alteration to garage to form accommodation Orchard Lea, Craigearne Lane, Peebles Ref No: 21/01512/FUL
- 3.12 **Change of use to form dog grooming business** Forsyths, Old Town, Peebles Ref No: 21/01490/FUL
- 3.13 **Variation to groundwork around telecoms mast** SW of Crookston farmhouse Ref No: 21/01490/FUL
- 3.14 Alterations and extension to dwellinghouse Hillburn, 13 Kingsmuir Drive, Peebles Ref No: 21/01493/UL
- 3.15 **Erection of dwellinghouse** SW of 1 Whitehaugh Cottage, Glen Road, Peebles Ref No: 21/01471/FUL
- 3.16 **Alterations and extension to dwellinghouse** –the Ponderosa, 38 The Meadows, Peebles Ref No: 21/01456/FUL
- 3.17 Alterations and extension to dwellinghouse Strontian, 4 Dean Park, Peebles Ref No: 21/01455/FUL
- 3.18 Work to Trees Rose Park, Peebles Ref No: 21/01460/TPO
- 3.19 **Work to Trees** The Loanings, Peebles Ref No: 21/01459/TPO
- 4.0 <u>Previous Planning Applications removed from this report (No ongoing interest to PCC)</u>
 - 4.1 Work to Trees 26 Edderston Road, EH45 9DT Ref No: 21/01429/TPO
 - 4.2 **Alterations to Boundary Wall** Garden ground of Craigmount, Bonnington Road, Peebles Ref No: 21/01373/LBC
 - 4.3 **Alterations and Extension to Dwellinghouse** 7 Kittlegairy Way, EH45 9DL Ref No: 21/0336/FUL
 - 4.4 **Replacement of High School** Springwood Road, Peebles Ref No: 21/01332/SCR
 - 4.5 **Alterations and Extension to Dwellinghouse** 77 Kingsland Square, EH45 8EZ Ref No: 21/01330/FUL
 - 4.6 **Vehicle access Application** 7 South Park Drive, EH45 9DR Ref No: 21/01303/VAA
 - 4.7 **Alterations and Extension and erection of Garage** Bungalow, Nether Horsburgh, Innerleithen Road, EH44 6RE Ref No: 21/01301/FUL
 - 4.8 **Alterations and Extension and erection of Garage** Fidra, Craigearne Lane, EH459HQ Ref No: 21/01300/FUL
 - 4.9 Internal and External alterations to grooms, stables, and coachman's cottages, alterations to cider press to form 2 no holiday cottages and re-roofing entire courtyard roof Kailzie, Peebles Ref No: 21/01290/FUL and Ref No: 21/01289/LBC

Peter Maudsley Planning Convener Peebles and District Community Council

Appendix 1 - Internal and external alterations and installation of illuminated and non-illuminated signage – The Tatler, Peebles – 21/00989/LBC – Letter of support for Manse Interiors, bearing in mind that we all wish to see this shop open.

01 October 2021

Planning and Regulatory Services Scottish Borders Council Headquarters Newtown St Boswells Melrose TD6 0SA

By email

Internal and external alterations and installation of illuminated and non-illuminated signage – The Tatler, Peebles – 21/00990/FUL

To Whom it May Concern Support for applicant on appeal.

This letter is written in support of the application by Manse Interiors for the work necessary to upgrade the previous Tatler coffee house to their corporate standards. The building has stood empty for circa 5 years and has seriously impinged on the amenity and look of the High Street. Few companies would be able to take on a similar project, in this case with an investment of around £750,000. if Manse Interiors were not to take on the project, it could remain empty for a considerable period and whilst empty to continue to deteriorate. Manse Interiors will utilize local tradesmen for the work and once completed provide employment for 2 full time and 4 part time positions. We understand the companies wishes to maintain their corporate image. A corporate image is just that, it cannot be fragmented. However, we also fully understand the need to preserve the historical ambiance of the High Street. Manse Interiors have demonstrated some flexibility and we would urge both parties to show a willingness to compromise in order that progress may be made.

Yours Faithfully

Peter Maudsley Planning Convener

Appendix 2 - Part change of use of ground floor to class 10 and alterations to form additional office space from attic floor - Ref. No: 21/00486/FUL Letter of support for DDL Care Services.

16 September 2021

DDL Care Services 3Rowan Court Suite 3 Cavalry Park Peebles EH45 9BU

Dear Ms Bradley

Part change of use of ground floor to class 10 and alterations to form additional office space from attic floor Ref. No: 21/00486/FUL

To Whom it May Concern Support for applicant on appeal.

Peebles and District Community Council have been asked by DDL Care Services Limited to provide support for their appeal. This writer has reviewed the documentation provided on the SBC Planning Portal, reviewed documentation provided by DDL, researched the quality of provision provided to clients and clarified some aspects of the history and plans with staff. Consequently, we believe that DDL are worthy of support.

Setting aside the policies identified in the SBC Planning Officer's report (ED1 & PMD3) there appear significant weaknesses and anomalies in the officer's conclusions. Firstly, there is a statement that to support the proposal "would set an undesirable precedent". The precedent has already been set several times through past decisions. 2008: Training Centre approved, 2015: Beauty therapy approved, 2019: Gymnasium approved, 2015: Dental surgery approved, 2016: Nursery approved. None of the foregoing applications could have been considered industrial. The report states that there will be a loss of amenity for the future; this is manifestly wrong. There will be a conversion of presently unused space into usable space in the attic. Internal structure of the ground floor can always be converted back to any layout that any future business may require. However, it is important to recognise that DDL own the building and have no plans to move.

Forward Planning would apparently have expected the applicant to search for alternative premises to take their plans forward, why? The business exists on the site and DDL own it, they like the site, and moving premises would be costly and disruptive. Common sense dictates that if an existing premises can be made to work, then that would seem to be the correct strategic direction to take. This is particularly true where the business owns the facility.

Returning to Policy ED1, the report identifies "that other commercial activities may be considered if they enhance the quality of the business park as an employment location". Discussions have identified that the plans going forward allow for the creation of approximately 10 additional staff. This is surely to be welcomed.

Policy PMD3 allows for "an alternative use that offers significant community benefits that are considered to outweigh the need to maintain the original proposed use". I doubt anyone could

argue that DDL Care Services are not providing a vital service to their existing clients. The proposals are designed to expand this care provision and in so doing relieve pressure on NHS services and provide an alternative to those services historically provided by Scottish Borders Council and the NHS that have been withdrawn.

The Planning Officer in his conclusions, states: "The change of use would lead ultimately to the loss of allocated business and industrial land" and to reiterate, this is patently incorrect. There is no loss. The site is owned by the applicant and used as offices. There is no current industrial use to lose. The building is to be enhanced and put to additional use including an expected increase in employment of staff. In the unlikely event that DDL sold the building, any future business would wish to tailor the facility to their needs and would presumably, if required apply for consent to do so. Where then is there a loss?

Yours Faithfully

Peter Maudsley Planning Convener