

SCOTTISH BORDERS COUNCIL

**APPLICATION TO BE DETERMINED UNDER POWERS DELEGATED TO
CHIEF PLANNING OFFICER**

PART III REPORT (INCORPORATING REPORT OF HANDLING)

REF: 22/00422/AMC

APPLICANT: Granton Homes Ltd

AGENT: EMA Architecture and Design

DEVELOPMENT: Erection of block of residential flats comprising 14 No units with associated parking and access (approval of all matters specified in planning permission 19/00182/PPP)

LOCATION: Site In Grounds Of Kingsmeadows House Kingsmeadows
Kingsmeadows Road
Peebles
Scottish Borders

TYPE: AMC Application

DRAWING NUMBERS:

Plan Ref	Plan Type	Plan Status
20121(OS)001-A	Location Plan	Refused
20121-PL-001	Existing Site Plan	Refused
20121-PL-014	Proposed Site Plan	Refused
20121-PL-013	Proposed Site Plan	Refused
20121-PL-005	Proposed Plans	Refused
20121-PL-006	Proposed Plans	Refused
20121-PL-007	Proposed Plans	Refused
20121-PL-008	Proposed Plans	Refused
20121-PL-009	Proposed Roof Plan	Refused
20121-PL-012	Proposed Sections & Elevations	Refused
20121-PL-010	Proposed Elevations	Refused
20121-PL-011	Proposed Elevations	Refused
599-01-01	Landscaping Plan	Refused
599-01-04	Landscaping Plan	Refused
22-005-600	Landscaping Plan	Refused
22-005-VS-01	Other	Refused
22-005-AT-01	Other	Refused
22-005-AT-04	Other	Refused
22-005-700	Other	Refused
22-005-701	Other	Refused

NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: 511

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS:

Of the 511 representations received: 1 was a general comment; two representations were received from the same email address; 31 did not contain material objections and; 84 representations were received from 39 individual addresses. Other than the general comment, all the representations were in the form of objections.

The material grounds can be summarised as follows:

Loss of trees;
impact on environment;
impact on ecology;
impact on amenity;
increased traffic;
road safety;
impact on infrastructure;
flood risk;
development not in keeping;
impact on setting of listed building;
impact on conservation area;
lack of affordable housing;
design issues;
noise and light pollution;
contrary to local plan policies;
cumulative impact of development;
lack of EIA;
Scale of development

Consultation responses were received from:

Roads - further information required. The principle of development on this site has already been accepted through earlier applications. The comments from Roads Planning Service (RPS) are therefore based on the specific design and construction details of the prospectively adoptable road and associated infrastructure.

- o The extent of road which requires to be constructed to an adoptable standard is from Kingsmeadows Road to a turning area at the entrance to the car parking. The turning area needs to be sufficient enough to allow turning for refuse and service vehicles within the public domain. Swept path analysis should be provided to show appropriate turning manoeuvres.

- o An element of the parking requires to be public to cater for visitor parking and this will equate to 25%, resulting in 4 spaces.

- o The service strip shall be a minimum of 2 metres in order to cater for all public utilities.

- o The service strip and the swale/filter trench should be on opposite sides of the road.

- o The road will require kerbing to provide edge restraint over its full length. This can be laid flush for drainage purposes next to the swale.

- o Confirmation of what drainage infrastructure Scottish Water are prepared to adopt and which infrastructure is to remain private must be provided. It is not good practice to have private drainage infrastructure within the public road and the drainage layout may require to be altered to address this.

- o The swale would be better served on the opposite side where the ground is more permeable.

- o The construction specifications for the prospectively adoptable areas of road are inadequate. Overall construction depth should be 450mm.

- o Details of the proposed street lighting layout are required to ensure there is no conflict with the existing trees. Until the above points have been satisfactorily addressed, RPS is unable to comment further on or offer support to this application.

Heritage and Design Officer - objection. The principle of development in this location has been accepted under permission in principle 19/00182/PPP. Although detailed design remains subject to approval, the original permission in principle included preliminary designs for a contemporary three storey building which was designed to appear secondary in height to the main listed building. This was considered to be taking the proposal in an acceptable direction. Condition 8 of 19/00182/PPP indicates that the AMC application should be based upon the location, scale and general design principles shown in the supporting plans and design statement submitted with the PPP application.

A thorough assessment of the site's historic and architectural significance and character analysis has not been provided. This should have provided an assessment of the significance and character of the house, landscape and wider conservation area. Proposals should have been informed by this assessment, to clearly respond to the site's specific significance and character. The current proposed design responds in a very limited manner to the character and significance of the site. For reasons of its height, form, footprint, proportions, roofscape and detailed design as set out further below, the current design is considered to have an adverse impact on the setting of the neighbouring listed building, the Peebles Conservation Area and the local designed landscape.

SCALE & MASSING The additional floor (relative to the designs shown in the PPP application) means that the building responds poorly to the proportions and floor-heights of the listed building. The revised footprint creates a relatively bulky massing at odds with that of the listed building and with limited visual relief. It has the potential to create a relatively deep plan with internalised halls and bathrooms, and deep kitchens/living spaces. The proposed does not respond to the neighbouring courtyard of the listed building or the 'rear', 'service' location of this part of the building. The proposed height (incorporating four floors) and bulky footprint are unduly prominent in relation to the listed building. They do not read as a secondary element that allows the listed building to retain its dominance within its historic grounds.

DESIGN The roof form has been altered since pre-application stage to incorporate pitched roofs. The use of pitched forms and breaking up the roof form into multiple elements is appropriate. However this does not overcome the issue of the building's overall height. Recessing top floor means the roof form does not relate to the building below, the use of gable ends (finished in zinc) is compromised and the large terraced area (and its associated railings and likely structures added once in use) does not respond to the character of the listed building or provide an appropriate overall roofscape.

The proposed largely projecting balconies are not considered characteristic of the site or area. Although adjusted slightly since pre-application, the elevational design has limited relationship to the design, proportions and hierarchy of those to the listed building. The window sizes and proportions similarly have a limited relationship with those of the main listed building and result in elevations of limited design quality and visual relief in themselves. The materiality (the original indicated sandstone, zinc and timber windows, the current proposal is for render, stone cladding and zinc) are not considered to be of sufficient quality or to respond to the setting of the listed building.

Parking and landscaping requires further consideration to ensure it is not dominant around the building. The Wendy House is an interesting feature of historic interest and its retention is appropriate. Its location requires consideration as part of the wider landscape proposals and in terms of its potential for use as part of play provision. Its ongoing maintenance should be accommodated.

Landscape Architect - objection. The original application 15/00822/PPP included a tree survey and arboricultural implication assessment (AIA) which identified 35 no trees removed to accommodate the proposed residential block (T3101 - T3135) and a further 3no trees (T3146, T3157 & T3158). The AIA advised that by utilising the existing roadway (south from the development to the Kingsmeadows Road) it would be possible to retain all other trees along the upgraded access drive. Condition 6 of the 19/00182/PPP consent required both a tree survey which must include an arboricultural impact assessment (AIA) and an arboricultural method statement (AMS) which show how any development, including the upgrading and widening of the access from Kingsmeadows Road and parking areas would be carried out while minimising impact on retained trees and; the easterly communal parking to be located wholly outwith the root protection areas of trees T818, T822 and T823.

While the current application provides a tree survey incorporating an AIA, it now identifies that in the order of 11no additional mature trees (all Cat A or B) are to be removed as part of the upgrade of the access drive. The arboriculturalist makes no explanation of why the 11 trees along the access drive, that he originally deemed could be retained, should now be removed and merely suggests that as the wider grounds are well wooded the removal of a further 11 mature trees will not significantly affect the overall landscape and amenity of the area. Given the mature nature and category of the trees to be removed, the Landscape Architect cannot agree with his assessment.

An arboricultural method statement was not submitted (Condition 6 of 19/00182/PPP) - this should have been provided as part of or to supplement the Tree Proposals and Protection Plans. The magenta line on the plans appears to be the line of proposed protective fencing but there is no information of how the parts of the root protection areas of retained trees within the developable area will be treated to minimize damage.

Given the increased number of trees that are proposed for removal to form the road access and the lack of any practical solution e.g. no-dig road construction through the trees or an alternative access

road layout to avoid taking the vehicular access through this part of the woodland, the Landscape Architect cannot support this application in its current form.

Ecology Officer - Information not supplied for: condition 10 - CEMP; condition 11 - bat licence; condition 12 - Species Protection Plans; condition 13 - Habitat and Landscape Management Plan and; condition 14 - lighting for bats. In terms of condition 7, the Estate Management Plan, some small changes need to be made. The maintenance plan table lists rough grass which is to be cut 4x per year in April, June, August and October. Such frequent cutting will likely reduce the potential biodiversity benefits of the habitat. Cutting it 2 or a maximum of 3 times a year would be better. Also, there seems to be no detail provided on the landscape plan as to which seed mix is proposed for the rough grassland and it is unclear as to where the rough grassland will be. Shrubs and hedges are proposed to be pruned in April and August- this would be within the bird breeding season and could conflict with the protection afforded to birds under the Wildlife and Countryside Act. Shrubs and hedges should be trimmed between September and March (inclusive) with checks made for nests prior to cutting.

Flood Risk Officer - no objection. In September 2019 and May 2020, the FRO provided a formal response to the planning application referenced 19/00182/PPP. Within, it was stated that no objections were raised to the application on the grounds of flood risk, after a suitable Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) was submitted and the plans submitted to show finished floor levels of 159.02mAOD, a level above the 1 in 200 year flood level, plus freeboard. Furthermore, in principle objection was raised to the drainage plans, as the Preliminary Drainage Strategy showed that attenuation storage will be provided and accommodate the 1 in 200 year plus climate change storm event. In terms of the current application, the FRO stated that the FRA submitted for the previous application is still appropriate. That showed any flooding at a 1 in 200 year flood event is confined to the north-eastern corner of the site and is located away from the portion of the site proposed for development. The proposed development would still be located outwith the indicative flood extent for the 1 in 200 year flood event. Within the FRA it was proposed that the finished floor levels at the northern section of the site are set at a minimum of 159.02mOD. These floor levels are acceptable and provide 600mm of freeboard above the 1 in 200 year plus climate change flood level. The proposed FFLs are 159.10mAOD, this is an appropriate level to mitigate against flood risk. The FRO also noted that in principle, the drainage appears to be appropriate within the layout drawings and details drawing. However, the FRO would require the submission of information confirming that the drainage is designed to cope with the 1 in 200 year plus climate change storm event.

Archaeology Officer - The application proposed is for the purification of the various planning conditions made to the previous planning permission in principle. A Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) has been submitted and would go towards fulfilling the first part of that archaeological condition but the implementation of the fieldwork with the associated recording, reporting and archiving of the fieldwork (such as for any revealed finds, features and/or deposits) are also required for the full purification of the condition. A further revised version of the WSI was submitted direct to the Archaeology Officer and he noted that he is generally content with that as this will provide something towards suitable opportunities for the identification, excavation and recovery or recording of any archaeological finds, features and/or deposits during the groundworks for the progression of this application and is content to recommend the approval of the WSI version 2 for its implementation through the fieldwork proposed and also the recording, reporting and required by the further parts of the planning condition. Upon those being satisfactorily carried out and reported to the Archaeology Officer, he advises that the condition could be purified.

SEPA - no objection. SEPA views the FRA conducted in 2019 for the site at the PPP stage (19/00182/PPP) to be based on appropriate methods and its representation of flood risk at the site is in line with all other evidence that is currently available. The proposed building footprint is outwith the functional floodplain. The FRA recommended that finished floor levels should be a minimum of 159.02m AOD, based on the 1 in 200 year + climate change level and 600mm freeboard. Therefore, the finished floor levels of 159.1m AOD - shown in drawings 20121(PL)010 & 20121(PL)011 - are appropriate based on the findings of the FRA.

Scottish Water - no objection, There is currently capacity at both Bonnycraig Water Treatment Works and Peebles Waste Water Treatment Works.

Community council - objection. The community council considered that the site is home to wildlife and mature woodland. The proposal would have a negative visual effect on the listed building and its setting. Potential impact on the River Tweed SAC/SSSI and on EPS. The community council considered the application to be contrary to policies PMD1, PMD2, EP1, EP2, EP3, EP7, EP9, EP11, EP12, and EP13. The community council also objected to the proposed felling of the trees to enable the development.

Peebles Civic Society - objection. The proposal would be detrimental to the setting of the listed building and the conservation area and there would be a negative impact on ecology and the woodland setting. The civic society considered the application contrary to policies EP1, EP2, EP3, EP7, EP9, EP10, EP11, EP12, and EP13.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES:

In determining the application, the following policies and guidance were taken into consideration:

Scottish Borders Local Development Plan 2016

PMD1 - Sustainability

PMD2 - Quality standards

PMD5 - Infill developments

HD3 - Protection of residential amenity

EP1 - International nature conservation sites and protected species

EP2 - National nature conservation sites and protected species

EP3 - Local biodiversity

EP7 - Listed buildings

EP8 - Archaeology

EP9 - Conservation areas

EP10 - Designed gardens and landscapes [SBC- Kingsmeadows]

EP12 - Green networks

EP13 - Trees, woodlands and hedgerows

IS2 - Developer contributions

IS6 - Road adoption standards

IS7 - Parking provision and standards

IS8 - Flooding

IS9 - Waste water treatment standards and sustainable urban drainage

Supplementary Planning Guidance:

Biodiversity (2005);

Development contributions (2015, updated 2022);

Green space (2009);

Local biodiversity action plan: Biodiversity in the Scottish Borders (2001);

Local landscape designations (2012);

Placemaking and design (2010);

Privacy and sunlight guide (2006);

Sustainable urban drainage systems (2020);

Trees and development (2008);

Waste management (2015).

Recommendation by - Randal Dods (Planning Officer) on 19th May 2022

This application is for the approval of all matters specified in conditions in relation to the erection of residential apartments within the grounds of Kingsmeadows House, Kingsmeadows Road, Peebles.

Kingsmeadows House is a category B listed building and the site lies within the conservation area and locally designated Kingsmeadows designed garden and landscape.

Description of proposal

It is proposed to erect a four storey block of flats of modern design 9m to the east of Kingsmeadows House. The external materials would comprise rendered walls, a stone clad feature element, aluminium clad windows, a standing seam zinc roof and zinc fascias. Access would be taken from a newly formed access and driveway on the B7062 Kingsmeadows Road. Planning Permission in Principle was granted under application 19/00182/PPP. The principle of development is accepted. This application is made to discharge the conditions of the PPP approval.

Planning history

The relevant planning history for this site can be summarised as follows:

15/00822/PPP - erection of residential apartments, granted, 30 Mar 16

19/00182/PPP - erection of residential apartments (renewal of previous consent 15/00822/PPP, granted)

In addition to the above, a screening request was submitted. The details are below.

21/01563/SCR - erection of 14 apartments and 5 dwellinghouses and associated access, EIA not required, 8 Nov 21

Assessment

Condition 1 states: "No development shall commence until the details of the layout, siting, design and external appearance of the building(s), the means of access thereto, car parking and the landscaping of the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority".

The layout and siting are generally similar to that proposed before however, the footprint of the building has increased. That would create a relatively bulky massing which would be at odds with the category B listed building.

In terms of design and external appearance, as set out in the Heritage and Design Officer's (HDO) response, the design would not be appropriate. In summary, although the use of pitched forms and breaking up the roof form into multiple elements is appropriate, those does not overcome the issue of the building's overall height. In addition, the shallow roof pitches are entirely out of keeping with those found on Kingsmeadows House. Recessing the top floor means the roof form does not relate to the building below, the use of gable ends is compromised and the large terraced area does not respond to the character of the listed building or provide an appropriate overall roofscape. The proposed largely projecting balconies are not considered characteristic of the site or area. The elevational design has limited relationship to the design, proportions and hierarchy of those to the listed building. The window sizes and proportions similarly have a limited relationship with those of the main listed building and result in elevations of limited design quality and visual relief in themselves. The materiality (the original indicated sandstone, zinc and timber windows, the current proposal is for render, stone cladding and zinc) are not considered to be of sufficient quality or to respond to the setting of the listed building.

In terms of access and parking, Roads commented that further information was required. That information would relate to requirements for visitor parking, turning area, drainage, construction specifications and street lighting. Were the proposals to be otherwise acceptable, I would have required the submission of the information requested. The HDO noted that the parking required further consideration to ensure that it was not a dominant feature in the setting. In relation to the landscaping and also the access, the Landscape Architect objected to the loss of an increased number of trees than proposed previously in the earlier PPP in order to form the access road.

Taking all of the above into account, the proposal would not comply with condition 1.

Condition 2 states: "No development shall commence until all matters specified in conditions have, where required, been submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority. Thereafter the development shall only take place except in strict accordance with the details so approved". This related to timing of applications and discharge of conditions and no action is required here.

Condition 3 states: "No development shall take place within the development site as outlined in red on the approved plan until the developer has secured a written scheme of investigation (WSI) detailing a

programme of archaeological works. The WSI shall be formulated and implemented by a contracted archaeological organisation working to the standards of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA). The WSI shall be submitted by the developer no later than 1 month prior to the start of development works and approved by the planning authority before the commencement of any development. Thereafter the developer shall ensure that the programme of archaeological works is fully implemented and that all recording, recovery of archaeological resources within the development site, post-excavation assessment, reporting and dissemination of results are undertaken per the WSI".

The Archaeology Officer advises that a written scheme of investigation (WSI) has been submitted and would go towards fulfilling the first part of that archaeological condition but the implementation of the fieldwork with the associated recording, reporting and archiving of the fieldwork (are also required for the full purification of the condition. A further revised version of the WSI was submitted direct to the Archaeology Officer and he noted that he is generally content with that as this will provide something towards suitable opportunities for the identification, excavation and recovery or recording of any archaeological finds, features and/or deposits during the groundworks for the progression of this application and is content to recommend the approval of the WSI version 2 for its implementation through the fieldwork proposed and also the recording, reporting and required by the further parts of the planning condition. Upon those being satisfactorily carried out and reported to the Archaeology Officer, he advises that the condition could be purified. At this stage, there is only partial compliance with condition 3.

Condition 4 states: "No finished floor levels to be below 159.02m AOD". The FFL shown on the drawings is 159.1m. That is acceptable to both the FRO and SEPA. I have no reason to question those assessments. The terms of condition 4 are therefore met.

Condition 5 states: "The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced before fully detailed design proposals for foul and surface water drainage, including SUDs measures, have been submitted to and approved by the planning authority". The FRO has assessed the submitted drawings and noted that, in principle, the drainage appears to be appropriate within the layout drawings and details drawing. The FRO would, however, require the submission of further information confirming that the drainage is designed to cope with the 1 in 200 year plus climate change storm event. I have no reason to question that assessment. In terms of condition 5, there is partial compliance.

Condition 6 states: "The first application for matters specified as conditions application should be accompanied by: An updated and detailed tree survey in accordance with BS 5837:2012 clearly demonstrating the impacts of the proposed development on existing trees within the site. The tree survey must include an arboricultural impact assessment (AIA); an arboricultural method statement (AMS) which show how any development, including the upgrading and widening of the access from Kingsmeadows Road and parking areas would be carried out while minimising impact on retained trees; the easterly communal parking area to be located wholly outwith the root protection areas of trees T818, T822 and T823".

The Landscape Architect (LA) noted that whilst application provides a tree survey incorporating an AIA, it now identifies that in the order of 11 additional mature trees are to be removed as part of the upgrade of the access drive. The applicant's arboriculturalist makes no explanation of why the additional trees along the access drive, originally deemed for retention, should now be removed and merely suggests that as the wider grounds are well wooded the removal of further mature trees will not significantly affect the overall landscape and amenity of the area. Given the mature nature and category of the trees to be removed, the LA cannot agree with the assessment contained in the applicant's submission. In addition, an arboricultural method statement was not submitted. I have no reason to question the LA's assessment. Were the proposals to be otherwise acceptable, I would have required the submission of further information. As it is, the application does not comply with the terms of condition 6.

Condition 7 states: "The first application for matters specified as conditions application should be supported by a management plan for the site and the remainder of the parkland/woodland, detailing maintenance, curtilage, access and boundary treatment proposals. That should include for an open plan area along the riverbank north of the development, free from individual gardens, fences, gates and other structures". The Ecology Officer (EO) commented that some small changes would need to be made to the submitted Estate Management Plan. Were the proposals to be otherwise acceptable, I would have required the submission of further information. As it is, the application has partial compliance with condition 7.

Condition 8 states: "The development submitted with the application for approval of matters specified as conditions to be based upon the location, scale and general design principles shown in the supporting plans and design statement submitted with this application". As noted for condition 1 above, the scale and design of the proposal is not acceptable and does not comply with that which was approved under 19/00182/PPP. The application does not comply with condition 8.

Condition 9 states: "The development to be served throughout by roadways, footpaths and parking to adoptable standards. Included within the requirements are the following:

- o Detailed route of the proposed access road, including detailed design of the junction with Kingsmeadows Road;
- o visibility splays of 2.4 by 43 metres to be provided in both directions onto Kingsmeadows Road at the new junction;
- o proposed access road to be 5.5 metres wide for the first 15 metres or other agreed distance. Thereafter the road may taper down to a minimum width of 3.7m and can be shared surface in nature - or 3.2m with a remote footpath/service strip of a minimum of 2m width;
- o new road to include satisfactory drainage measures and appropriate SUDS feature;
- o allowance to be made for street lighting and other utilities. The detailed layout of street lighting will be covered by Road Construction Consent which is required for the development;
- o parking provision to be 175% for communal parking - only 25% to be adopted;
- o swept path analysis to be provided to demonstrate that the turning area at the end of the proposed public road can accommodate a refuse vehicle;

all details to be agreed in writing with the planning authority before the development is commenced and completed before the fifth residential unit is occupied". As noted above, Roads required further information to be submitted before support could be given to the proposal. I have no reason to question their assessment. Were the proposals to be otherwise acceptable, I would have required the submission of further information. As it is, the proposal does not comply with condition 9.

Condition 10 states: "No development shall commence until a construction environmental management plan (CEMP) incorporating the latest good practice guidelines and statutory advice (as outlined in Ecology Baseline Report, ITP Energised, November 2019 and GPP5: Works and maintenance in or near water) to protect the River Tweed SAC/SSSI has been submitted to and approved in writing in writing by the planning authority. Any works shall thereafter be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved in writing scheme". The EO noted that a CEMP had not been submitted. Were the proposals to be otherwise acceptable, I would have required the submission of that information. As it is, the application does not comply with condition 10.

Condition 11 states: "No development shall commence until the following has been provide to the planning authority: copy of the relevant European Protected Species licence (or Bat Low Impact Licence confirmation, as appropriate) or, a copy of a statement in writing from Scottish Natural Heritage (licensing authority) stating that such a licence is not necessary for the specified development". The EO advised that a bat licence had not been provided. Were the proposals to be otherwise acceptable, I would have required the submission of that information. As it is, the application does not comply with condition 11.

Condition 12 states: "No development shall commence until a species protection plan (SPP) for bats, otter, badger and breeding birds has been submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority. The SPP shall incorporate provision for a pre-development supplementary survey and a mitigation plan. No development shall be undertaken except in accordance with the approved in writing SPP". The EO advised that an SPP had not been provided. Were the proposals to be otherwise acceptable, I would have required the submission of that information. As it is, the application does not comply with condition 12.

Condition 13 states: "No development shall commence until a landscape and habitat management plan (LHMP) has been submitted for the written approval of the planning authority. Thereafter, no development shall take place except in strict accordance with the approved LHMP". The EO advised that an LHMP had not been provided. Were the proposals to be otherwise acceptable, I would have required the submission of that information. As it is, the application does not comply with condition 13.

Condition 14 states: "No development shall commence until a conservation lighting scheme for bats, in accordance with good current practice, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority. Thereafter, no development shall take place except in strict accordance with the approved plan".

The EO advised that a bat lighting scheme had not been provided. Were the proposals to be otherwise acceptable, I would have required the submission of that information. As it is, the application does not comply with condition 14.

Conclusion

The design, layout and details of the proposed development would not respect the character or appearance of the conservation area, the setting of the listed building and the locally designated landscape. As a result, the proposal does not fulfil the requirements of conditions 1 and 8 of the planning permission in principle. In doing so, the application fails to comply with Scottish Borders Local Development Plan 2016 policies PMD2; PMD5; EP7; EP9 and; EP10. Other material considerations have been accounted for but these do not outweigh the harm that would result from the development.

The proposal would result in the loss of trees over and above what was accepted in the planning permission in principle. That would be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the conservation area and the locally designated landscape. As a result, the proposal does not fulfil the requirements of conditions 1 and 6. In doing so, the application fails to comply with Scottish Borders Local Development Plan 2016 policies EP9; EP10 and; EP13. Other material considerations have been accounted for but these do not outweigh the harm that would result from the development.

The applicant has not submitted information relating to ecology and the proposal does not fulfil the requirements of conditions 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 of the planning permission in principle. In doing so, the application fails to comply with Scottish Borders Local Development Plan 2016 policies EP1; EP2 and; EP3. Other material considerations have been accounted for but these do not outweigh the harm that would result from the development.

An insufficient level of information has been provided to allow the proposal to be assessed fully against the matters referred to within conditions 5, 7 and 9 of the planning permission in principle.

REASON FOR DECISION:

The design, layout and details of the proposed development would not respect the character or appearance of the conservation area, the setting of the listed building and the locally designated landscape. As a result, the proposal does not fulfil the requirements of conditions 1 and 8 of the planning permission in principle. In doing so, the application fails to comply with Scottish Borders Local Development Plan 2016 policies PMD2; PMD5; EP7; EP9 and; EP10. Other material considerations have been accounted for but these do not outweigh the harm that would result from the development.

The proposal would result in the loss of trees over and above what was accepted in the planning permission in principle. That would be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the conservation area and the locally designated landscape. As a result, the proposal does not fulfil the requirements of conditions 1 and 6. In doing so, the application fails to comply with Scottish Borders Local Development Plan 2016 policies EP9; EP10 and; EP13. Other material considerations have been accounted for but these do not outweigh the harm that would result from the development.

The applicant has not submitted information relating to ecology and the proposal does not fulfil the requirements of conditions 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 of the planning permission in principle. In doing so, the application fails to comply with Scottish Borders Local Development Plan 2016 policies EP1; EP2 and; EP3. Other material considerations have been accounted for but these do not outweigh the harm that would result from the development.

An insufficient level of information has been provided to allow the proposal to be assessed fully against the matters referred to within conditions 5, 7 and 9 of the planning permission in principle.

Recommendation: Refused

- 1 The design, layout and details of the proposed development would not respect the character or appearance of the conservation area, the setting of the listed building and the locally designated landscape. As a result, the proposal does not fulfil the requirements of conditions 1 and 8 of the planning permission in principle . In doing so, the application fails to comply with Scottish Borders Local Development Plan 2016 policies PMD2; PMD5; EP7; EP9 and; EP10. Other material considerations have been accounted for but these do not outweigh the harm that would result from the development.
- 2 The proposal would result in the loss of trees over and above what was accepted in the planning permission in principle. That would be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the conservation area and the locally designated landscape. As a result, the proposal does not fulfil the requirements of conditions 1 and 6. In doing so, the application fails to comply with Scottish Borders Local Development Plan 2016 policies EP9; EP10 and; EP13. Other material considerations have been accounted for but these do not outweigh the harm that would result from the development.
- 3 The applicant has not submitted information relating to ecology and the proposal does not fulfil the requirements of conditions 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 of the planning permission in principle. In doing so, the application fails to comply with Scottish Borders Local Development Plan 2016 policies EP1; EP2 and; EP3. Other material considerations have been accounted for but these do not outweigh the harm that would result from the development.
- 4 An insufficient level of information has been provided to allow the proposal to be assessed fully against the matters referred to within conditions 5, 7 and 9 of the planning permission in principle.

“Photographs taken in connection with the determination of the application and any other associated documentation form part of the Report of Handling”.