

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 22 January 2021 20:55  
**To:** localplan  
**Subject:** Re: Forward Planning - Local Development Plan for Ashkirk: Objection

CAUTION: External Email

Dear Sir/Madam,

We wish to object to the proposed plan for Ashkirk on the grounds outlined below:

1. This plan for Cransfield site is described as "infill" development. Given that Ashkirk has approximately 50 households at the moment, 12 houses does not represent an infill but a substantial and transformative development in a quiet village. This is also true of the actual area proposed: this is not a small addition, it is the size of a substantial proportion of the existing village area. A development one third of the proposed size might reasonably be considered as "infill".
2. Ale Water being part of the River Tweed Special Area of conservation and wildlife site of international importance, such substantial development with the additional traffic, pollution and noise is completely inconsistent with this.
3. In the plan, no evidence was presented for a need for additional affordable housing in Ashkirk. Indeed, the population figures given in the plan are nearly twenty years out of date.
4. Parts of the Cransfield site gets flooded after rain and heavy snowfall.
5. Affordable development by its nature is largely aimed at families. There are no facilities in the immediate area, including schools, surgeries, shops and such.
6. Transport would be required to Selkirk and Hawick at the least. While public transport exists, it is totally inadequate for the functions outlined above. This would imply car ownership, and probably two cars per household in many cases. This in itself should be contrary to modern aims and the necessity to reduce greenhouse gases, besides being incompatible with the lived reality of those who, in principle, require affordable housing.

It has implications for local road infrastructure, which will be considered further below:

The road from Ashkirk towards Ettrick is not sufficiently robust even for existing traffic. As it is, the road collapses and disintegrates into the brook (the Hillside Sinks) and as such, presents a substantial danger to road users. The junction opposite the Smiddy is very tight with extremely poor visibility and is already a source of congestion with frequent timber lorries and traffic to the golf course. The junction also accommodates a busy garage which requires parking for clients. Because of the existing buildings and infrastructure, this junction cannot be sufficiently modified to accommodate increased traffic, in contradiction to the claims made in the council's plan. The site could, based on these facts, be classified as a potential death trap for children, who would be expected to be cycling, exploring and generally making use of life outdoors in this wonderful setting. Furthermore, the road is not serviced by the council and thus does not get cleaned or gritted in the winter.

Yours faithfully,

Dr Michael Kenward

Dr Pirkko Korkia-Kenward

