

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 January 2021 11:38
To: localplan
Subject: Scottish Borders Council proposed Local Development Plan 2020 Eshiels site BESH1001

CAUTION: External Email

Dear Sir/Madam,

I write to object in the strongest possible terms to the above proposal which seems badly researched and not thought through. I list a number of points which I believe demonstrates this claim.

- the proposal does not meet the Scottish government's planning policy on 'effectiveness'. Please see report from [REDACTED] 25/01/2021 for further detail on this point.

- the proposal would appear to contradict a number of the Councils own planning policies (from Volume 1 of Proposed Development Plan).

- Sustainability Policy PMD 1 (page 40). This states that the Council will apply sustainability principles which will underpin all the Plan's policies such as the protection of natural resources, landscapes, habitats and species and the minimisation of light pollution (para 1.4, sections c) and h).

- Quality Standards Policy PMD 2 (page 41). This policy states that all new developments will be expected to be of high quality in accordance with sustainability principles, designed to fit and integrate with its landscape surroundings. This proposal, BESH1001 will be in full view from the A72 looking out of place within a rural setting.

In addition the following four policies demonstrate that this proposal does not fit with the statement 'the right development in the right place' which I understand is the view of the Scottish Government and Scottish Borders Council.

- Special Landscape Areas Policy EP5 (page 114) This policy is to ensure that local areas such defined, as is this area, are afforded adequate protection against inappropriate development. These areas must be protected and that their potential is maintained and enhanced.

- Countryside around towns Policy EP6 (page 116). The area of the Tweed Valley further east, Galashiels to Melrose, appears to benefit from this policy. Why should this policy also not apply to the Peebles to Walkerburn section too?

- Protection of Greenspace EP11 (page 130). The aim of this policy is to give protection to a wide range of defined types of green space (also known as 'open space') within settlements. I would strongly contend that this proposed development BESH1001 would seriously threaten the green space or open space within the Eshiels and Glentress settlement. In addition this policy is also meant to give protection to these green spaces from piecemeal development.

-Green Networks Policy EP12 (page 133). The aim of this policy is to promote and support developments that enhance Green Networks. This proposal will not extend and improve green network opportunities and links. By creating a business park on 5ha in a rural setting will actually do exactly the opposite and reduced the area of green space.

In my opening paragraph I referred to the quality of research carried out before this proposal was drafted. Apparently the Council delegated the 'search' for land to an outside consultant who had little knowledge of the local

area. The previous proposal for houses in Eshiels, now withdrawn due to the existence of the Roman camp, clearly demonstrate this point.

Also, has the Council carried out an employment feasibility study prior to drafting this proposal?

This proposal is in many ways 'in the middle of nowhere'. It would appear to clearly breach a number of the Councils policies which are designed to protect and enhance the rural setting of this section of the Tweed Valley. It is this special rural setting that is attractive to all types of visitors.

But the big question for the Council is, does this proposal meet its Vision and Aims for Sustainability and Climate Change? I fear not! This is clearly an out of town development. Bringing this proposal forward which encourages folk to jump in their car is surely not the way ahead.

I should be grateful if you will acknowledge you have received this message.

Donald Wallace



I

Sent from my iPad