

Response ID ANON-VDDE-RPPG-V

Submitted to **Proposed Scottish Borders Local Development Plan**

Submitted on 2021-01-21 14:53:25

About you

Are you responding as an: individual, group / organisation, agent?

Individual

Individual

What is your name?

Individual name:

Claire Lee

What is your email address?

Individual Email:

[REDACTED]

What is your address?

Address line 1:

[REDACTED]

Address line 2 :

Address line 3:

[REDACTED]

Town / city:

[REDACTED]

Postcode:

[REDACTED]

What is your contact telephone number?

Contact number:

[REDACTED]

Proposed Local Development Plan Menu

Where would you like to go?

Submit your response to the consultation (Exit)

Comment on Sites in Settlements A to E

Which Site are you commenting on?

Site A to E:

Eshiels: BESH1001: Land at Eshiels: Business and Industrial

What are your comments regarding this Site?:

I wish to object to the proposed development of a business park (BESH1001) due to be included in the Local Development Plan (LDP). My objections are:

1. I don't think Scottish Borders Council have carried out due process correctly and so the proposal should be rejected. The residents of Eshiels were never consulted about this specific development. It never appeared in the Main Issues Report (MIR), and now Scottish Borders Council (SBC) tells us it will be included in the final LDP they submit to the Scottish Government despite our objections. The residents of Eshiels and Glentress never had the opportunity to comment properly on this proposal in the MIR.
2. As I shall mention below, this is not an 'effective' site within the definition of the Scottish Government's Scottish Planning Policy. SBC have not carried out complete and proper investigations of the site. There are many restrictions on the site which SBC's own internal people state can be mitigated against, but no detail report of the cost of such mitigation. SPP states that no development should be made 'at any cost'. This proposal should not be included in the LDP until a full costing of work required has been carried out.
3. It must be against the SBC climate emergency agenda to promote a business park 2-miles outside of a town where walking to the site is not particularly convenient relative to sites within the town. This is not a modern way to develop business sites. With more people working from home and push to get people out

of their cars, this just seems counter to Government policy which SBC should respect.

4. The Scheduled monument of a temporary Roman Camp is nearby (100 meters to the east) . The proposed development site needs to be exhaustively investigated to be sure no there are no other ancient monuments within it
5. This is a rural area; Eshiels is not connected to Peebles. A business park is not in keeping and has no right-of-place. It would be counter to the ethos of the Tweed Valley Special Landscape Plan to build a business park. The development would be in conflict with SBC Special Landscape Areas Policy EP 5, Protection of Greenspace EP 11, and Green Networks Policy EP12.
6. It would be totally incongruous to build a business park two miles out from Peebles surrounded by agricultural ground on three sides and the busy A72 road on the fourth. This is counter to SBC Quality Standards Policy PMD 2
7. The site would be unsightly and give visitors a poor impression of the Tweed Valley. It will have a negative effect on tourism in the immediate area which is just the opposite of what SBC is trying to achieve in conjunction with Forestry and Land Scotland at Glentress forest;
8. Noise and light pollution will be considerable which is against Sustainability Policy PMD 1. Screening by planting trees will take over 20-years to have any impact;
9. The site is not good use of tax-payers money. It's only 5 hectares (12 acres) in size. Around 35% of that is unusable (too steep) whilst further ground will be lost to screen planting and the requirement for a new road layout at the entrance and of course across the site.
10. I am concerned this will contribute to ribbon development all along the Tweed Valley from Peebles to Innerleithen. The rest of the valley will be open season for developers if this business park goes ahead;
11. Surface water run-off from the site will add to the flood risk. Just the other side of the A72 is considered flood plain by SEPA. The site regularly has water sitting on it after heavy rain and the height difference ('fall') between the site and the Tweed into which it would drain is less than 5 meters over approx 1km length.
12. The development will reduce biodiversity in the area removing an important corridor by which wildlife links the country with the town.
13. The demand for new business parks has not been proven by SBC. I question the need for piece-meal business parks such as the one proposed at Eshiels which only add to ribbon development along the Tweed Valley SLA. SBC have not proved there is a need for an additional business park which will be in such a wrong, irreversible setting.
14. SBC are out-sourcing their perceived problem beyond the bounds of Peebles town and ignoring their prior designation of areas within Peebles. If there is a real demand for business land then SBC should insist that land which is designated 'Mixed Use' within the envelope of Peebles, does in reality becomes 'Mixed Use' rather than letting developers build the land with 100% houses which then puts further pressure on the infrastructure and leaves SBC without their business land.
15. Other sites which could have an element of business land according to SBC's own designation are available north of the river within Peebles:
 - i. RPEEB001 (0.41 ha) at Dovecot Road
 - ii. zEL204 (0.92 ha) South Park
 - iii. MPPEEB007 (2.25ha) at March Street Mill in central Peebles.
 - iv. MPPEEB006 (6.41 ha) at Rosetta Road
16. Currently the main business park in Peebles is south of the river (Calvary Park). It sits only 50% full. There is ample space for business units here for many years to come.
17. [REDACTED] Further unnecessary cost and hassle for a site that's just not worth it as a business park in the first place. It should remain as agricultural ground, protected in the Tweed Valley Special Landscape Area.

This site should NOT be included in the LDP. It's a poor site in the wrong place. It would make a poor business park. SBC have not proved there is a need for such a site in terms of demand; it would be bad use of tax-payers money due to the low proportion of land that could be use – so much lost due to roads and steep ground; it should not be placed in Eshiels because of the detrimental impact on landscape and tourism which is meant to be protected within the Tweed Valley SLA. It would make a pig's ear out of a silk purse.

What would you like to do now?

Proposed Local Development Plan Menu (includes Exit option)