



Lauderdale Community Council

Minute of Meeting of Lauderdale Community Council on
Monday 13th August 2018 in Lauder Public Hall at 7.30pm

1. Welcome and Apologies

Present: Jack Ponton, *Chairman*, Irene Thomson, *Vice Chairman*, Anne Hogarth, *Secretary*, Stephen Potts, Judi Gunn, Craig McBeth, Steve Aitchison

Apologies received: Edward Maitland-Carew, Gaye Colquhoun,

11 members of the public

2. Declarations of Interest. None at present.

3. Discussion on planning application 18/00792/FUL, erection of 38 no. dwellinghouses, formation of access, landscaping and associated infrastructure on land north of 48 Thirlestane Drive, Lauder.

3.1 Jack led the meeting by running through some draft suggestions for the Community Council's reply to the Planning Department consultation.

3.2 Number, density and layout of housing units.

3.2.1 The Developer's proposal has too many houses. SBC's 2016 Local Development Plan (page 394) put the site capacity at 30. A 27% increase on this is clearly unacceptable.

3.2.2 The scheme as proposed looks too dense and cluttered. The alternative layout suggested by SBC's landscape architect has slightly fewer houses and a less cluttered appearance. If the development were to be consented it should have a layout based on this but with fewer units.

3.3 Parking.

3.3.1 While the Developer claims that guidelines on parking provision have been met, the CC believe that an unreasonably small number of spaces are available for visitors. In a rural area it is likely that most visitors will arrive in cars. Lack of spaces will result in visitors parking on approach roads with implications for safety and possible contention with other residents. This problem would be somewhat alleviated by a reduction in the number of houses.

3.3.2 Stephen noted that garages are mostly too small for modern cars – there are no planning rules for a standard size for garages. Therefore garages are only used for storage and cars are parked on the forecourts or on the street.

3.4 Pedestrian Safety.

3.4.1 The proposed pedestrian access to the north would join Factor's Park where there is no footpath. This would not be safe. Pedestrian access should be to the west where there is an existing footpath. However, after discussion, it was claimed that the path to the west has no footway either and, for safety, this should be rectified.

3.5 Drainage.

3.5.1 It is understood that there are continuing drainage issues from the previous development and the CC is concerned that SEPA have made no assessment but merely provided a link to their general guidance. The CC would urge SBC to ensure that this is properly dealt with.

3.6 Plantings, hedges and paths.

- 3.6.1 Firm and continuing arrangements should be put in place to ensure proper maintenance of these so that the responsibility does not end up with SBC, the Community Council or volunteers.
- 3.7 There were no comments from Community Council members to be added to these so the meeting was opened to the floor.
- 3.8 The question was raised about the ownership of this development land. It had originally been gifted by Thirlestane Estates to be used as a new primary school. No one was certain whether Thirlestane Estates still had an interest or whether the land is now owned by Scottish Borders Council or Persimmon Homes. If SBC own it, the land is now being used for commercial development and some benefits should come back to the Town. This will be followed up.
- 3.9 It was noted that some houses were large with garages attached and 9 were 'affordable'. None would be available for rent.
- 3.10 The question was asked whether these plots could be kept as a 'green space' for the Town.
- 3.11 It was noted that in the previous development that the parking spaces in front of and beside houses were not large enough and that parked cars protruded into the footway and street.
- 3.12 There is no play area planned but there is an area of open space at the south of the proposed development.
- 3.13 It was emphasised that there should be a factoring arrangement about grass cutting and hedge trimming and that it should not be the responsibility of volunteers or the Community Council.
- 3.14 There was concern about the height of the houses which would spoil the view from the original development.
- 3.15 There was concern about subsidence to the present supporting wall when the development begins.
- 3.16 Jack asked the meeting if when the CC comment on the consultation, should it read; "we are concerned", or "object to the whole application" or "object to the application in its current form". It was agreed that the CC object to the application in its current form.

4. Football Club Proposal

- 4.1 Although Alistair and David who have had the most to do with this proposal, were not present, it was explained that the football club has applied to put up an 8 foot high chain link fence on the horse field side of the Castleriggs with some socketed goalposts to make 2 new training pitches.

Date of Next Meeting – Monday 10th September 2018 at 7.30 in Lauder Primary School.