

Archived: 27 January 2021 17:55:07

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Mon, 25 Jan 2021 12:35:34

To:

Subject: SCOTTISH BORDERS COUNCIL PROPOSED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2020

Sensitivity: Normal

Attachments:

[Representation to SBPLDP.pdf](#)

CAUTION: External Email

Dear Sirs,

**ESHIELS AND GLENTRESS COMMUNITY GROUP
ESHIELS SITE BSHI001 – LAND AT ESHIELS
SCOTTISH BORDERS COUNCIL PROPOSED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2020**

Marwick Planning are planning advisor to the Eshiels Working Group (Messers Lee, Mackintosh and Wallace; all residents of Eshiels) acting as the representatives for the Eshiels and Glentress Community Group.

This representation on behalf of the Community Group relates to the Business and Industrial Development and Safeguarding Proposal BSHI001, land at Eshiels. The Community Group **strongly objects** to the proposed allocation with the reasoning robustly outlined within this submission. For these reasons, we would contend that the allocation is deleted from the Proposed LDP by either the Scottish Borders Council, or the Reporter in due course and not form a part of the adopted LDP moving forward.

Kind regards

Dave

David Marwick | Director

Marwick Planning

43 Cameron Street | Dunfermline | KY12 8DP

Tel 01383 603 759 [REDACTED]

david@marwick-planning.co.uk | www.marwick-planning.co.uk



This communication is from Marwick Planning and contains information which is confidential and may be privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender immediately. Any use of its contents is strictly prohibited and you must not copy, send or disclose it, or rely on its contents in anyway whatsoever.



43 Cameron Street - Dunfermline - KY12 8DP

25th January 2021

Forward Planning
Council Headquarters
Scottish Borders Council
Newtown St Boswells
TD6 0SA

Via email: localplan@scotborders.gov.uk

Dear Sirs,

**ESHIELS AND GLENTRESS COMMUNITY GROUP
ESHIELS SITE BESH1001 – LAND AT ESHIELS
SCOTTISH BORDERS COUNCIL PROPOSED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2020**

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Marwick Planning are planning advisor to the Eshiels Working Group (Messers Lee, Mackintosh and Wallace; all residents of Eshiels) acting as the representatives for the Eshiels and Glentress Community Group, hereinafter referred to as “the Community Group”, with the individual addresses of the Community Group named within Appendix 1 of this submission.
- 1.2 This representation on behalf of the Community Group relates to the Business and Industrial Development and Safeguarding Proposal BESH1001, land at Eshiels which is 4.9 hectares in size within the Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP). The Community Group **strongly objects** to the proposed allocation with the reasoning robustly outlined within this submission. For these reasons, we would contend that the allocation is deleted from the Proposed LDP by either the Scottish Borders Council, or the Reporter in due course and not form a part of the adopted LDP moving forward.

2.0 Eshiels

- 2.1 Eshiels is located in the heart of the Tweed Valley Special Landscape Area. The character of Eshiels has been established particularly by its layout and setting, located where the lower slopes of Cardie Hill and Falla Brae slope down to meet the River Tweed.
- 2.2 Eshiels is a small settlement 2 miles to the east of Peebles and principally comprises a small cluster of houses and farm buildings within a very rural setting. The settlement is made up of the Scottish Borders Recycling

Centre and residential units to the south of the A72 referred to as Lower Eshiels; and a cluster of residential units and farm buildings to the north of the A72 referred to as Upper Eshiels; and, Glentress to the east of Upper Eshiels. Glentress Forest is set within the Tweed Valley Forest Park and is a hub for many activities that attracts locals and visitors to the area for tourism and recreation.

3.0 Local Development Plan 2 Main Issues Report

- 3.1 'Ericht Planning Consultants' made a representation to the LDP2 Main Issues Report (MIR) on behalf of the Community Group in 2019. The representation related to sites MESH1001 and MESH1002 which had been identified within the MIR as '*preferred options*' for mixed use development, including proposed allocations for housing of 200 units and 40 units respectively over a total of 26.1ha. Following further investigation regarding the access and in discussion with Historic Environment Scotland (HES), it was concluded that the necessary upgrade to the existing Eshiels junction could not be undertaken without impacting negatively on the scheduled monument and therefore HES were unable to support the required works needed to bring the sites forward into the Proposed Plan. In addition, not all the land owners of the site were willing to release their land for development which questioned the effectiveness of the site being able to come forward in this LDP cycle.
- 3.2 In that context, the housing element of sites MESH1001 and MESH1002 were deleted and not carried forward to the Proposed Plan. Notwithstanding this, a business and industry designation was maintained and allocated as site BESH1001 which this representation is objecting to.

4.0 Scottish Planning Policy (SPP)

- 4.1 The purpose of the SPP is to set out national planning policies which reflect Scottish Ministers' priorities for the planning system and for the development and use of land. It is non-statutory, but the SPP is a material consideration that carries significant weight. In the new planning reforms, the SPP is to be incorporated within the National Planning Framework in the future, consolidating the Scottish Government spatial strategy and planning policy. This change will make Scottish Planning Policy part of the Development Plan, however for the time being it remains a material consideration.
- 4.2 The SPP focuses on plan making, planning decisions and development design in support of the Scottish Government's purpose of creating a more successful country, with opportunities for all of Scotland to flourish, through increasing sustainable economic growth.
- 4.3 For planning to make a positive difference, Development Plans and new developments need to contribute to achieving a successful, sustainable place by supporting sustainable economic growth and regeneration, and the creation of well-designed, sustainable places. The SPP introduces a presumption in favour of development that contributes to sustainable development. Notwithstanding this, the SPP makes it quite clear in paragraph 28 that '*the aim is to achieve the right development in the right place; it is not to allow development at any cost*'.

5.0 Assessment

Effectiveness

- 5.1 Deliverability has come into greater focus in SPP and advocates a sharp focus on the delivery of allocated sites. The independent review of the Scottish Planning System (May 2016), Empowering Planning to Deliver Great Places, confirmed the vital role which deliverability plays in successful planning. Proposal 5: Making Plans that Deliver, in the Scottish Government's consultation paper 'People, Places and Planning' (January 2017) advocated a focus on providing greater confidence on the effectiveness of sites and when they can be delivered, including appraisal of information before any site is allocated. Consultation responses agreed that plans could be strengthened by setting out the information required to accompany proposed site allocations. The Scottish Government's Position Statement on 'People, Places and Planning (June 2017) noted that establishing development viability is essential to securing greater certainty of delivery.
- 5.2 Planning Advice Note (PAN) 2/210 Affordable Housing and Housing Land Audits sets out '*effectiveness criteria*' relating to housing in that sites distinguishing effective sites '*i.e. unconstrained sites, from those which are affected by constraints which cannot be overcome in time to contribute to housing land requirement*'. There are

no similar criteria that relates to business and industry land but this seems a logical starting point to ensure that any allocated sites are effective and brought forward within the LDP cycle. In that context, to assess a site's effectiveness, it must be demonstrated that within the LDP cycle of 5 years the site can be developed for business and industrial use, and will be free from constraints on the following basis:

- **Ownership** – *the site is in the ownership or control of a party which can be expected to develop it or to release it for development.*
 - The site is owned by [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] has not promoted the site for business and industry through the local development plan process, no developer has been identified to develop the site, and, he has stipulated that the land is not for sale. In that context, you do not have a willing land owner and therefore the site is not in the ownership or control of a party which can be expected to develop it or to release it for development. The Council has noted that they may proceed to purchase the site through a Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO), but even so this process has not commenced and would take some time and would also be subject to any appeal by the land owner. This would also bring into question 'defect funding' as an effectiveness criterion which is noted further below.
 - This was also highlighted at the MIR stage by Erich Planning in that LUC's 'Western Rural Growth Area: Development Options Study' (August 2018) stated that 'the original intention of the study was to contact the relevant landowners to determine their level of interest in bringing shortlisted sites forward for development. However, a lack of readily available landowner information, and the need to bring the study to a close, meant that there was insufficient time to undertake meaningful engagement with landowners. It was agreed with the Council that landowners would have the opportunity to participate in future consultation on the study outputs'.
- **Physical** – *the site, or relevant part of it, is free from constraints related to slope, aspect, flood risk, ground stability or vehicular access which would preclude its development.*
 - Site constraints are discussed later in this representation in further detail, but for the purposes of this criterion, the Proposed LDP allocation text notes the following constraints which have not been assessed adequately to date including, flood risk from the Linn Burn and any other water courses, as well as the River Tweed; no public foul sewer within the vicinity; protection of existing boundary features; landscaping to mitigate impacts on the wider setting; assessment of ecology impacts; assessment of potential impacts on River Tweed Special Protection Area and Site of Scientific Special Interest; impacts on the setting of the Eshiels Roman Camp (Scheduled Monument); new junction onto the A72; Drainage Impact Assessment and Water Impact Assessment; and, potential contamination to be addressed. The allocation text makes no comment regarding the site's topography which slopes steeply to the north of the site. In that context, the site is not free from constraints which could preclude development of the site, and all should have been assessed in detail before this stage to ensure that the site could be made effective within the LDP period.
- **Contamination** – *previous use has not resulted in contamination of the site.*
 - Although it seems that the land has always been undeveloped, and no real evidence to suggest that this site is brownfield land or that its historic uses may present development constraints, the Proposed LDP text regarding the allocation states 'potential contamination to be addressed'. In that context, there is again uncertainty regarding constraints which should have been assessed in detail before this stage to ensure that the site could be made effective within the LDP period.
- **Deficit Funding** – *any public funding required to make business or industrial development economically viable is committed by the public bodies concerned.*

- If hypothetically the Council gained control of the site, as the site is undeveloped, there would be a number of key infrastructure works that would be required to be undertaken in order to successfully market the site/plots to potential occupiers. As a minimum, cut and fill would be required to provide a platform for development, utilities installed, and road infrastructure put in. Public funding would be required for this and the Community Group would ask the Council if these significant monies have been committed in order make this site effective in the LDP period?
- **Infrastructure** – *the site is either free from infrastructure constraints, or any required infrastructure can be provided realistically by the developer or another party to allow development; and,*
 - The site is greenfield by definition and therefore there are many infrastructure constraints that have yet to be assessed and deemed acceptable in the context of the locale and many national and local designations. Again, this should have been assessed in detail before this stage to ensure that the site could be made effective within the LDP period. This also relates to deficit funding if the Council takes control of the site at any time in the future, as currently there is an unwilling landowner.
- **Land Use** – *business and industry is the sole preferred use of the land in planning terms.*
 - The site has been designated within the Proposed LDP for business and industry, assessed as such and deemed as an acceptable land use for the site in planning terms to date by the Council. Notwithstanding this, the allocation has not been through an independent assessment at examination by a Scottish Government Reporter and therefore the Community Group would strongly contend that the site is not an appropriate site or location for business and industry which has been comprehensively outlined within this representation.

5.3 In that context, it is evidently clear that the proposed allocation fails the ‘*effectiveness*’ criteria in a significant way and therefore if this allocation was taken forward into the adopted LDP, the Council would have allocated an ineffective site which could not be brought forward for development within the LDP period.

Location of Proposal BESH1001

5.4 The proposed allocation is located within the Northern Housing Market Area, and locally identified with the Tweeddale Locality.

5.5 SPP states that

‘Local development plans should allocate a range of sites for business, taking into account current market demand; location, size, quality and infrastructure requirements; whether sites are serviced or serviceable within 5 years; the potential for a mix of uses; their accessibility to transport networks by walking, cycling and public transport and their integration with and access to existing transport networks. The allocation of such sites should be informed by relevant economic strategies and business land audits in respect of land use classes 4, 5 and 6’.

5.6 We have already established that the proposed allocation is not an ‘*effective site*’ that can be developed within the LDP period. Although Peebles only lies 2 miles to the west, the proposed site is isolated in a rural setting and bears no relationship to any other development at that locale. The allocation of the site and its development would contribute to and encourage further ribbon development along the A72. There are no existing class 4, 5 and 6 uses located within Eshiels or its immediate locale, therefore would not provide for sustainable development, and have a detrimental impact on other issues which are described in more detail below.

- 5.7 With Peebles being located in close proximity to the west, further allocations for business and industry should be concentrated there where the population is based, existing such uses exist, and would promote more sustainable modes of travel to reach them as opposed to heavy reliance on the private car to reach the proposed allocated site.
- 5.8 Within the Employment Land Audit 2019, the take up in established land supply over the last 5 years across the whole of the Scottish Borders Council administrative boundary was around 10.2ha, equivalent to an annual take up rate of around 2ha a year. Within the Northern HMA, the take up in established land supply over the last 5 years in Peebles has been 0.3ha in total.
- 5.9 The established business and industrial land supply for the Scottish Borders is 102.2ha, and although there is only 3.8ha in the Northern HMA which accounts for 3.7% of the overall supply, there is a site available at South Parks (zEL204) which is 0.9ha in size. In the context that there has only been 0.3ha uptake in the last 5 years, this could give potentially up to 15 years worth of industrial land supply, plus potential vacancies at both Cavalry Park, and existing premises at South Park. Any further expansion at either Cavalry Park or South Park could be achieved which would be a far more sustainable option than a premature allocation on the north side of the river at Eshiels just because there are perceived capacity issues with the only crossing of the River Tweed. Potential longer term mixed use allocations have been identified including that at Peebles East (South of the River) at SPEEBO05 which is 32.3ha in size for the provision of land for housing, employment, and a potential new school site. This would be a far better location to allocate business and industrial land within what would be defined as within the envelope of Peebles and in close proximity to existing uses and easily accessible by other modes than the private car. Peebles High School will now be built on the existing school site which would then free up further potential space (6.0ha) at Peebles East for additional business and industrial land.

Landscape

- 5.10 As noted, Eshiels is a small settlement 2 miles to the east of Peebles with no visual connectivity to Peebles. The proposed allocation would look alien located on the north side of the A72 and to the landscape setting in the Tweed Valley Special Landscape Area (SLA). There is no enclosing landform in this location and the site is very prominent in the landscape setting and especially on the approaches to and from Peebles. The area is exposed and its development will have a material detrimental impact upon the setting of Eshiels and will appear incongruous with the wider landscape. It will also add further development pressure at this location and ribbon development along the A72. It is considered that the proposed site for business and industry in close proximity to the A72 will have a significant detrimental impact upon the landscape setting, with landscaping taking many years to mature as has been the case and continues to be the case at Cardrona village.
- 5.11 In terms of the Council's proposed Policy PMD2 *'Quality Standards – Placemaking and Design'*, it is not considered that development at this location would be based on a clear understanding of the context or the *'sense of place'* of the existing settlement of Eshiels. The development of the allocated site would not be of a scale appropriate to the surroundings and would result in a loss of the openness, with a significant detrimental impact upon the local landscape character.
- 5.12 SPP notes that *'proposals for business, industrial and service uses should take into account surrounding sensitive uses, areas of particular sensitivity or interest and local amenity, and make a positive contribution towards placemaking'*.
- 5.13 As noted above, the site is located within the Tweed Valley SLA. The broad valley is the most familiar of the Borders Valleys and accordingly it has a strong sense of place. The varied mix of landscape elements is highly representative, with forestry, woodland, open hillsides and pastoral farmland all juxtaposed. The valley provides the setting to several settlements and the landscape unfolds through the valley, presenting new vistas alternately dominated by forestry, farmland and grassy and rocky slopes. This attractive landscape is a major attraction for visitors and tourists and a development at this location and scale will not only have a materially detrimental and irreversible impact upon the SLA but will also have a negative impact upon visitor enjoyment of the local area. Proposed Policy EMP5 *'Special Landscape Areas'* seeks to safeguard landscape quality and will have particular regard to the landscape impact of proposed development, including the visual impact. The Community Group would contend that the significant adverse landscape impact through the development of

the proposed site would not be outweighed by social or economic benefits of national or local importance, therefore does not adhere to proposed Policy EMP5.

- 5.14 There are a number of Scheduled Monuments within close proximity to the proposed allocation. Eshiels Roman Camps 90m Ssw of No 4 Eshiels is located adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site, straddling land on both the north and south side of the A72. Glentress, St Leonards Hospital lies adjacent to the eastern boundary of the Roman Camp on the south side of the A72, with Horsburgh Castle in an elevated position beyond to the south east of the Roman Camp.
- 5.15 Four other Schedule Monuments are found on elevated positions overlooking the proposed site:
- Horsburgh Castle Farm, Settlement 930. Nnw of Castle Hill located to the east;
 - Janet's Brae, Fort 750m E of Peebles Hydropathic located to the west;
 - Janet's Brae, Fort 550m E of Peebles Hydropathic located to the west; and,
 - Tor Hill, Fort on the south side of the River Tweed.
- 5.16 The Roman Camp was a notable constraint which was not adequately investigated at the MIR stage of the process, and the wider sites (MESH1001 and MESH1002) for residential development were subsequently deleted and not taken forward into the Proposed Plan. The Community Group would strongly contend that the historic and archaeological impact has still not been investigated adequately with significant assets of national importance in close proximity to the proposed allocation which could have a significant adverse impact upon them. Proposed Policy EP8 *'Historic Environment Assets and Scheduled Monuments'* does not permit development proposals which would destroy or adversely affect the appearance, fabric or setting of Scheduled Monuments. The Community Group does not believe that the allocated site would offer substantial benefits of social or economic nature that would clearly outweigh the national value of the site, and, there are multiple alternative means of meeting the development *'need'*. Therefore, the development of the allocated site would not adhere to proposed Policy EP8.
- 5.17 Adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site are Canmore and Historic Environment Records regarding ring ditch, and medieval village. The Council's Archaeology Officer noted these at the MIR stage and also noted that there is the potential for prehistoric burials and a cemetery around this location.
- 5.18 The development of the proposed allocation would not align with the requirements of sustainability set out in proposed Policy PMD1 *'Sustainability'* regarding the long term sustainable use and management of land; the protection of landscapes; and, the protection of built and cultural resources.

Ecology

- 5.19 The site has a number of mature trees located down the western and northern boundaries of the site. At the MIR stage, the Council's Ecology Officer concluded that there was a moderate biodiversity impact with potential for bats (EPS), badger and breeding birds. The wider site having an improved pasture with mature broadleaf treeline on the boundary and field boundary. There is also potential connectivity to the River Tweed SAC and SSSI via the Linn Burn which has the potential for detrimental impact upon both these designations. Proposed Policy EP1 *'International Nature Conservation Sites and Protected Species'* and EP2 *'National Nature Conservation Sites and Protected Species'* aim to protect SACs and SSSIs and it must be demonstrated through appropriate assessment that development will not adversely affect the integrity of the site. The Community Group contend that the appropriate assessments have not been undertaken, there are multiple alternative means to meet the development *'need'*, and, there are no imperative reasons of overriding public interest including those of a social or economic nature. In that context, the development of the proposed allocation would not adhere to the aims and objectives of proposed Policies EMP1 and EMP2. The development of the

proposed allocation would not align with the requirements of sustainability set out in proposed Policy PMD1 'Sustainability' regarding the protection landscapes, habitats and species.

Transportation

- 5.20 The site lies 2 miles to the east of Peebles which as explained above is not in line with the aims and objectives of achieving sustainable development, as this location would require an over reliance on the private car to access the services and facilities there within. The site does not benefit from public transport infrastructure. There is a bus stop in close proximity to the site, but the buses block the carriageway when stopping to drop passengers off/pick them up which provides a road safety issue, and there are limited safe areas for pedestrians to wait for buses to arrive. In that context, improvements would need to be investigated such as cycle and pedestrian routes from Glentress and Eshiels to the site, and further onto Peebles, as well as improvement to pedestrian infrastructure along the A72.
- 5.21 While a multi-use/shared path does currently exist from Peebles to Innerleithen, it crosses the A72 some considerable distance from the site and winds around the recycling centre and therefore there is no direct link to this off road route from the site. In that context, there is no safe off road infrastructure in place that the site can connect to for pedestrian or cycle access from Peebles, meaning that there would be increased pedestrian traffic along the pavement of the A72 which is currently a 50mph road which is putting pedestrian traffic at greater risk. The development of the proposed allocation would not align with the requirements of sustainability set out in proposed Policy PMD1 'Sustainability' regarding the encouragement of walking, cycling, and public transport in preference to the private car.
- 5.22 The allocated site lies within an identified 'Green Network' where proposed Policy EMP12 'Green Networks' states that 'where a proposal comes forward that will result in a negative impact on the natural heritage, greenspace, landscape, recreation or other element of a Green Network, appropriate mitigation will be required' and, where 'other developments are required that cross a Green Network, such developments must take account of the coherence of the Network. In doing this, measures which allow access across roads for wildlife, or access for outdoor recreation will be required'. Development and fragmentation of the Green Network will not assist in recreation, the creation of an environment that promotes a healthier living lifestyle, and the protection and enhancement of biodiversity, and the potential to improve the quality of the water environment, promote flood protection, and reduce pollution.

Hydrology

- 5.23 When undertaking a site visit, there was clearly visible standing water on the site in the south east location associated with the open ditch along the eastern boundary of the site coming from the Linn Burn to the north. The text relating to the allocation notes that a Flood Risk Assessment is required to assess the risk from the Linn Burn and any other small watercourse which flows through and adjacent to the site. The watercourse which runs through the site should be protected and enhanced as part of any development. The River Tweed may also require consideration. Consideration will need to be given to bridge and culvert structure within and adjacent to the site which may exacerbate flood risk. There may be a culverted watercourse at the southern end of the site therefore a feasibility study will be required to investigate the potential to channel restoration. There is genuine risk of surface water flooding once development has taken place. This again is another significant constraint that should have been adequately investigated by this stage to demonstrate that the site is effective within the LDP period.
- 5.24 A Drainage Impact Assessment and Water Impact Assessment would be required in respect of Waste Water Treatment Works and Water Treatment Works. Currently there is no foul sewer servicing the site.

- 5.25 Proposed Policy EP15 *'Development Affecting the Water Environment'*, and Policy IS8 *'Flooding'* are relevant to Hydrology. There are clear constraints that have not been adequately assessed to demonstrate that the proposed allocated site could be brought forward for development within the LDP period and the Community Group contend that the proposal would result in a significant adverse effect on the water environment through impact on its natural and physical characteristics; the site is potentially at risk of flooding and increasing the probability of flooding elsewhere. In that context, the development of the proposed allocation would not meet the aims and objectives of proposed Policies EP15 and IS8.
- 5.26 The development of the proposed allocation would not align with the requirements of sustainability set out in proposed Policy PMD1 *'Sustainability'* regarding the long term sustainable use and management of the land; and the preservation of water quality.

6.0 Summary

- 6.1 The Community Group strongly contends that the allocated business and industrial site BESH1001 should not progress into the adopted LDP2 for the following reasons:
- The site fails the effectiveness criteria and therefore if this allocation was taken forward into the adopted LDP, the Council would have allocated an ineffective site which could not be brought forward for development within the LDP period;
 - If hypothetically the Council gained control of the site, as the site is undeveloped, there would be a number of key infrastructure works that would be required to be undertaken in order to successfully market the site/plots to potential occupiers. Public funding would be required for this and the Community Group would ask the Council if these significant monies have been committed in order make this site effective in the LDP period?
 - With Peebles being located in close proximity to the west, further allocations for business and industry should be concentrated there where there is the population base, existing such uses exist, and would promote more sustainable modes of travel to reach them as opposed to heavy reliance on the private car to reach the proposed allocated site;
 - There are more suitable and more readily deliverable sites within the Northern HMA which can contribute to the business and industrial land supply requirement;
 - This attractive landscape is a major attraction for visitors and tourists and a development at this location and scale will not only have a materially detrimental and irreversible impact upon the SLA but will also have a negative impact upon visitor enjoyment of the local area;
 - The historic and archaeological impact has still not been investigated adequately with significant assets of national importance in close proximity to the proposed allocation which could have a significant adverse impact upon them and their setting;
 - The site presents moderate biodiversity constraints, including potential impact upon the River Tweed SAC and SSSI;
 - There is no direct and sustainable off road link to Peebles to or from the site for pedestrians and cyclists; and,
 - Flooding issues have not been investigated adequately.
- 6.2 Overall, there are considerable constraints noted herein which would prevent development of the site within the lifetime of the LDP2 and therefore the Community Group respectfully request that the site is deleted from the Proposed Plan and restored back to its countryside use within the adopted Plan.
- 6.3 We look forward to receiving confirmation that the representation has been received. In the meantime, if there are any queries or further information required, please do not hesitate to contact me [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Yours faithfully



DAVID MARWICK
Director
Marwick Planning

APPENDIX 1: THE ADDRESSES OF THE ESHIELS AND GLENTRESS COMMUNITY GROUP WHO ARE REPRESENTED BY THIS SUBMISSION

- Yellow = Upper Eshiels (North of A72);
- Green = Lower Eshiels (South of A72); and,
- Orange = Residential units just east of the entrance to Glentress Forest

1 Eshiels Steading

Braeside, Eshiels

Brookside, Eshiels

Buth Obrack

Cardie Hill House, Eshiels

Carrick Lodge

Cumberlands

Eshiels House

Eshiels House Cottage

Falla Brae House, Eshiels

Glentress Cottage, Eshiels

George Swan

Kildye

7 Eshiels Holdings

Garden Park

Lady Blair

Linnburn Farm, Eshiels

Low Falla, 11 Eshiles Holdings

Millburn, Eshiels Steading

Millie Bank, 4 Eshiels Holdings

Smithfield, Eshiels

The Chestnuts, Eshiels

The Elms, Eshiels

The Gables

The Old Granary, Eshiels Steading

The Shieling, Eshiels

Tig-Na-Dochas

Trail House, Stables, 4 Eshiels Steading

Woodlea, Eshiels

2a Eshiels Holdings

Aspen Cottage, Eshiels

Balgray, Eshiels

Cardin, 1 Eshiels Mill

Craiguart B&B, Eshiels

Cruin, Eshiels

Dunalton, 4 Eshiels Mill

Dunrigg, Eshiels Mill

Enniskerry, Eshiels

Eshiels Cottage

Hope Rigg, Eshiels

Kiltane, Eshiels

Lang Haugh, 3 Eshiels Holdings

Lauriston, 6 Eshiels Holding

No 1 Gasworks, Eshiels

No 2 Gasworks, Eshiels

No 7 Holding, Eshiels

Norna, Eshiels

Sherradale, Eshiels Mill

Springdale, Eshiels Mill

The Beeches, Eshiels Mill

The Shieling, Gasworks

Torhill, Eshiels Mill

Woolton, 2 Eshiels Mill

Woodside

1 Eshiels Holdings

Clanalpine Lodge, Glentress

Dunslair, Glentress

Eshiels Hope, Glentress

Glentress Hotel

Hillview, Glentress

Kirnlaw, Glentress

Mossbank, Glentress

Ons Husie, Glentress

Skogholt, Glentress