

Peebles & District Community Council
Planning Report
September 2021

1.0 General

- 1.1 **Cloich Windfarm** –19/01489/SCO – At the time of writing, we have had a mixed response from members and as such we had considered that we could not take a position on the development. However, the Chair of Eddleston Community Council has requested to address our meeting as he has details with which we are not familiar.
- 1.2 **Traffic and Speeding** – We are often approached by members of the public regarding the issue of speeding. Consequently, the writer maintains an ongoing contact with SBC in order to ascertain the latest data available. It is worth highlighting the following.
 - 1.2.1 **Innerleithen Road – AVERAGE SPEEDS**
 - 1.2.1.1 **30 MPH LIMIT** – 30.2
 - 1.2.1.2 **20 MPH (latest)** – 24.0
 - 1.2.2 **Kingsmeadows Road – AVERAGE SPEEDS**
 - 1.2.2.1 **30 MPH LIMIT** – 30.5
 - 1.2.2.2 **20 MPH (latest)** – 25.8
 - 1.2.3 **Neidpath – AVERAGE SPEEDS**
 - 1.2.3.1 **30 MPH LIMIT** – 27.3
 - 1.2.3.2 **20 MPH (latest)** – 22.8
 - 1.2.4 **South Parks – AVERAGE SPEEDS**
 - 1.2.4.1 **30 MPH LIMIT** – 22.6
 - 1.2.4.2 **20 MPH (latest)** – 19.4
 - 1.2.5 **Edinburgh Road – AVERAGE SPEEDS**
 - 1.2.5.1 **30 MPH LIMIT** – 25.3
 - 1.2.5.2 **20 MPH (latest)** – 23.4

We can take from this that speed average' are down, with slightly less effect on South Parks and with minimal effect on Edinburgh Road. Dependent upon your personal viewpoint, this may be seen as a positive result. However, it is also clear that the 20 mph is not well adhered to. Congested roads can also be seen to be slower than uncongested roads, and this is not a surprise. There are two points that the writer believes should be made. Firstly, pedestrian perception tends to ascribe higher speeds than reality some of the time. Secondly, not all the time! There are definite instances of drivers not even paying lip service to speed limits. We have all witnessed this. Some members of the public think this is a responsibility for the PCC to act. However, we have no authority and can only consult with authorities. SBC have some ability to review traffic, review road design and within their budget constraints take some limited actions. Speeding is an offence. The only authority with an ability to detect such an offence and to take appropriate action are the police. If members of the public are concerned, they should let us know and we will, if we agree, argue the case and provide support. However, there will be no improvement unless the public approach the police themselves in numbers in order to make their case and to report specific incidents where relevant.

SBC are awaiting the outcome of a Napier University evaluation of traffic data and will be meeting with Councillors early October to discuss the

Peebles & District Community Council

Planning Report

September 2021

findings before reporting to Council by the end of the year with any recommendations.

SBC are looking at possible designs for a light controlled crossing outside the Post Office, and these will go to Councillors and the community council for discussion in the coming months. Further, SBC are also looking at a potential improvement for pedestrians close to the roundabout on Caledonian Road / South Parks as a result of a recent site visit with members. This will likely be a build out like that further up South Parks.

- 1.3 **Peebles Parking Working group** – New meeting 15 September 2021 at 10:00
- 1.4 **Community Council Network** – The writer notes that several community councils have serious concerns relating to levels of policing across the Scottish Borders. As we previously identified, staffing levels seem low for the area to be covered and when an arrest is made, two officers are lost to the system in order to accompany a defendant to either Dalkeith, Edinburgh or Hawick in order to process them.

2.0 Planning Applications - Current Interest

- 2.1 **Tweedbridge Court** – October perhaps?
- 2.2 **Rosetta Holiday Park (13/00444/PPP)**
 - 2.2.1 No further information – Technically still live since 17/04/17.
- 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**
 - 2.4.1 Awaiting next stage
- 2.5 **Ballantyne Place - 20/00691/FUL**
 - 2.5.1 At the time of writing there is no further news to relay.
- 2.6 **Scawd Windfarm – 20/00880/SCO**
 - 2.6.1 No change
- 2.7 **Castle Venlaw – 21/00939/FUL 20/01493/LBC (Revision to LBC 18/01286/LBC)**
 - 2.7.1 This saga continues. For those interested, it can be viewed on the [SBC planning portal](#).
- 2.8 **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.
- 2.9 **Change of use of pavement to form outside seating area – 42 – 44 High St, Peebles – Ref No: 21/00597/FUL**
 - 2.9.1 Required to apply for a change of use.

Peebles & District Community Council
Planning Report
September 2021

- 2.9.2 Rebuked for operating before the planning applications had been determined. Apologised and provided an explanation which some may find acceptable.
- 2.10 **Internal and external alterations and installation of illuminated and non-illuminated signage** – The Tatler, Peebles – 21/00989/LBC –
2.10.1 **See Appendix 1:** Extract from Heritage and Design Officer who has raised an objection.
- 2.11 **Illuminated and non-illuminated signage and awning** – The Tatler, High St. – 21/00988/ADV
2.11.1 **As previously**
- 2.12 **Erection of 4 Holiday Pods** – Land east of Park Hotel, Peebles – Ref No: 21/01117/FUL
2.12.1 **SBC Cannot support the application and suggest withdrawal.**
- 2.13 **Site East of Dogcraig Cottage, Scotsmill, Peebles** – 20/01350/PPP – **This was refused in January and subsequently appealed. The appeal has been allowed.**
- 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 **Work to Trees** – 26 Edderston Road, EH45 9DT – Ref No: 21/01429/TPO
- 3.2 **Alterations to Boundary Wall** – Garden ground of Craigmount, Bonnington Road, Peebles – Ref No: 21/01373/LBC
- 3.3 **Alterations and Extension to Dwellinghouse** – 7 Kittlegairy Way, EH45 9DL – Ref No: 21/0336/FUL
- 3.4 **Replacement of High School** – Springwood Road, Peebles – Ref No: 21/01332/SCR
- 3.5 **Alterations and Extension to Dwellinghouse** – 77 Kingsland Square, EH45 8EZ – Ref No: 21/01330/FUL
- 3.6 **Vehicle access Application** – 7 South Park Drive, EH45 9DR – Ref No: 21/01303/VAA
- 3.7 **Alterations and Extension and erection of Garage** – Bungalow, Nether Horsburgh, Innerleithen Road, EH44 6RE – Ref No: 21/01301/FUL
- 3.8 **Alterations and Extension and erection of Garage** – Fidra, Craigearne Lane, EH459HQ – Ref No: 21/01300/FUL
- 3.9 **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
- 4.0 Previous Planning Applications removed from this report (No ongoing interest to PCC)
- 4.1 **Deposition excavated soil/ gravel (retrospective)** – Field East of Knowesland, 2 Edinburgh Road, EH45 8DZ – Ref No: 21/00896/FUL
4.1.1 Application refused

Peebles & District Community Council
Planning Report
September 2021

- 4.1.2 Archaeology Officer was dismayed to see the extent of the spoil over the terraces as he considers them of possibly national importance. He also considers that it will need a removal plan to attempt to mitigate against further damage. For those who are interested in the archaeology and history of the terraces there are documents on the SBC planning portal that are worth a visit.
- 4.2 **Vehicle access** – 7 South Park Drive, EH45 9DR – Ref No: 21/01303/VAA.
- 4.3 **Replacement windows** – 13A Rosetta Road, EH45 8JU – Ref No: 21/01234/FUL
- 4.4 **Replacement Windows and doors** – 3 Buchan Gardens, Peebles – Ref No: 21/01202/FUL
- 4.5 **Erection of wooden shelter (Retrospective)** – Land NW of 4 Edderston Cottages, Peebles – Ref No: 21/01197/FUL
- 4.6 **Erection of sign board (Retrospective)** – Crossburn Caravan Park, Edinburgh Road, Peebles, EH45 8ED – Ref No: 21/01147/ADV
- 4.7 **Replacement windows (Retrospective)** – 11 Kirkland street, EH45 8EU – Ref No: 21/01158/FUL
- 4.8 **Change of use from Class 1 to class1/Class 3** – 42-44 High St, Peebles – 21/01146/FUL
- 4.9 **Alterations and extension to Dwellinghouse** – Tantah Croft, Edderston Road, Peebles, EH45 9JD – Ref No: 2101143/FUL
- 4.10 Erection of pergola (Retrospective) – 58 George Street, Peebles, EH45 8DN – Ref No: 21/01132/FUL

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 - [Extract from Heritage and Design Officer](#)

Traditionally, rendered buildings on Peebles High Street are painted a light colour (usually cream or off-white). The window surrounds and other aspects of the building are then sometimes picked out in a contrasting, darker colour. The proposed colour in this application and the application of a darker colour across the full elevation is not traditional for the area and will detract from the special interest of the listed building and from the character of the conservation area. This aspect of the proposal cannot be supported. The elevation should be retained in a lighter colour, preferably a cream or off-white. The window surrounds and other aspects could be painted in a contrasting colour, as could the ground floor. On balance, the contrasting colour applied round the windows and/or to the ground floor could be the proposed colour if this is desired.

The existing shopfront is relatively simple in its dimensions, design and detailing. The proposed awning is not an integrated feature of the existing shopfront and will detract from its simple design. When open, the historic fascia and shopfront will be largely obscured. The amendment to the application to remove signage from the fascia indicates that the awning is proposed to be open the vast proportion of the time, exacerbating the degree to which the shopfront will be obscured and increasing the harm caused. When

Peebles & District Community Council Planning Report September 2021

the awning is closed, the boxing placed above the fascia will still be very visible, altering the proportions of the shopfront/fascia, with a poor visual relationship with the fascia and console brackets, and thus detracting from its historic character. As per the guidance, lettering is not a traditional part of the awning and historic awnings are not usually intended as a primary advertisement. The SPG indicates lettering should be avoided or – where accepted - no higher than 150mm. The SPG also indicates that awnings should generally be avoided on listed buildings due to loss of character.

It is acknowledged that examples of awnings exist on Peebles High Street; with the exception of one, these are concentrated on the north side of the road, where they were required due to the sunpath. There is no historic rationale to an awning in this location. It will erode the different historic characters of the two sides of the street, which both contributes to the conservation area and the setting of the listed building, as well as causing harm to the integrity and special interest of the listed building itself. For these reasons, the awning is not supported and should be removed from the proposal.

The proposed signage should all be non-illuminated as per the SPG guidance for conservation areas and due to the negative impact, this would have on the historic integrity of the listed building. The hanging sign (sign 1) would appropriately be fixed using a bracket. It would appropriately be of timber construction with painted lettering and no larger than the existing.

It is acknowledged that there is an existing timber board between the windows of the shopfront (sign 2). It has however been out of use for some time and is understood to now be removed. It is not part of the historic shopfront design nor a traditional feature of such shopfronts. It detracts from the historic shopfront design and would appropriately be removed.

Loss of signage (sign 3) from the fascia itself as now proposed is untraditional; painted or individual lettered signage should be retained in this location.

The internal changes can be accepted, although should any historic features be uncovered during the strip-out, these should be retained.

Changes should be made to the application as set out above. Without these changes, the application does not preserve the special interest of the listed building nor the character of the conservation area (as the primary setting of the listed building) and therefore does not comply with planning policy, nor the statutory test to which the local planning authority must have special regard.