

Archived: 18 January 2021 11:10:17

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Fri, 15 Jan 2021 19:41:10

To:

Subject: AGALA029 Netherbarns

Sensitivity: Normal

CAUTION: External Email

I write to make my objection to the proposal to build 45 houses on land opposite Abbotsford House and firmly object to this being included in the Local Development Plan.

It is no exaggeration to say that the area in question forms an integral part of the environs of Abbotsford House and grounds due to its proximity and the fact that it is encompassed in every outlook from the house and grounds. I am dismayed that it should be placed so needlessly at risk of destruction. Once built on this amenity area and its relationship to Abbotsford can never be reinstated or recovered.

This particular landscape is of exceptional historic importance on account of its nearness and association to Sir Walter Scott's world-famous home.

The area's amenity and natural beauty is of incalculable value to the tens of thousands of Borders residents and visitors from all over Scotland and the rest of the world who appreciate it, use the paths and walkways, admire the outlook, and who believe it to be a significant part of one of Scotland's most outstanding historic environments; there are few areas in Scotland as renowned and which hold such natural, historic and literary significance combined.

To build on the proposed Netherbarns site at all will be to destroy it forever but, worse still, it will mar the entire estate of Abbotsford House and grounds by permanently scarring its views and diminishing its ambiance as well as removing a much valued green space.

It will thereby also adversely affect the vital social and economic benefits to the local community and surrounding area which the Abbotsford Trust, its staff and many volunteers have so professionally and painstakingly built up over many years.

Not only would the final result of the proposed development be detrimental, the process of construction and its long-term consequences will have an irreversible negative impact on the area overall, disturbing the peace of the location as well as its ecology and value to wildlife.

Tree planting may be considered a necessary part of this development, but the proposal to provide a belt of trees will not in fact screen the 45 properties from view in either the long or the short term. To offer this as some solution is simply tokenism.

I would urge that this proposal be reconsidered and an alternative development site be found.

I submit this objection in the strongest terms.

Yours faithfully,

Mary Carmichael