

**Archived:** 27 January 2021 23:14:51

**From:**

**Sent:** Mon, 25 Jan 2021 20:05:28

**To:**

**Subject:** LDP Proposed development BESH1001

**Sensitivity:** Normal

---

CAUTION: External Email

Please disregard my previous email which was sent in error prior to completion.

**Reference Scottish Borders Council (SBC) draft Local Development Plan (LDP), proposed development BESH1001.**

As a long standing resident of the Eshiels community, I fully support the contents of the report prepared and submitted by Planning Consultant, [REDACTED] on behalf of the Eshiels and Glentress communities.

In particular, I object on the following grounds :

1. I believe that Scottish Borders Council has been inconsistent in its arguments and **not complied with its own policies** with regard to sustainability and quality standards, nor do I believe it has been consistent in its interpretation of what constitutes a special landscape area and “appropriate developments”. There appears to be no cohesion or consistency in adhering to all relevant Council policies and this development appears to be totally at odds with what the Council’s policies seek to achieve. The proposed development is totally out of keeping with the surrounding environment and, therefore in my view, wholly inappropriate. It has been suggested that the proposed development would integrate with the nearby existing council depot and recycling centre but I cannot accept that argument when these facilities are discretely out of sight on the opposite side of the main A72. On the other hand, this proposed development is in full view of the main road in the middle of open countryside, to the detriment of local residents, destination tourists, and passing visitors.
2. There are **more suitable and available sites** for this type of development within the town of Peebles itself , making it more accessible and sustainable and more in keeping with Council policies. Why ask staff and customers of businesses to travel 2 miles by car or public transport when they could more easily walk or cycle to a town based location?
3. There are a number of **practical and financial reasons** why this site is unsuitable, namely a) extensive and disruptive road alterations would be required, b) the site itself is geographically and geologically unsuitable (e.g. half of it is on a slope and the other half is liable to serious flooding), c) major costly infrastructure works would be required for roads, foul and surface water drainage, landscaping, utilities etc.
4. I am led to believe that the owner of the land is unwilling to sell and that the Council therefore would require a Compulsory Purchase Order(CPO) to proceed with this development. In light of the above objections, and the general negative feeling within the community, to proceed on the basis of a compulsory purchase order would be particularly distasteful.

Sincerely,

Robin Leith

