

Response ID ANON-VDDE-RA2R-T

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

Submitted on **2021-01-23 11:37:12**

About you

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

Individual

Individual

What is your name?

Individual name:

Alistair Lee

What is your email address?

Individual Email:

[REDACTED]

What is your address?

Address line 1:

[REDACTED]

Address line 2 :

Address line 3:

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 write to object to the inclusion of the proposed development of a business park at Eshiels (BESH1001) in the Scottish Borders Council Local Development Plan (LDP). My objections are numerous and are as follows:

1. The idea of placing a business park 2-miles out from the nearest town beggars belief. There is a climate emergency right now and placing a business park at Eshiels will only contribute to that problem. According to website: carbonindependent.org the average car produces 14.3kg CO2 per gallon. Assuming 50 car journeys there and back per day at 30 miles/gallon (the car engines will be cold hence the lower MPG figure), over a year that amounts to 17 tonnes of CO2. That is a huge amount that SBC will be responsible for. The SBC recently announced a climate emergency along with other regional councils in Scotland. How can the extra production of CO2 be part of that agenda? Business parks should be contained within towns so people can walk and cycle to work. And let's not forget that more and more people are working from home these days which is likely to carry on into the future. Is there really a need for a business park at Eshiels? SBC have provided no proof that one is required.

2. There are other sites suitable as business park within Peebles. 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. MPEEB007 (2.25ha) at March Street Mill in central Peebles.

iv. MPEEB006 (6.41 ha) at Rosetta Road

3. 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. A new business park at Eshiels is NOT required.

4. SBC are out-sourcing their perceived shortage of business parks 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 they designate as 'Mixed Use' within the envelope of Peebles, does in reality become '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.

5. A business park is not in keeping with the landscape at Eshiels 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 many SBC policies such as 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 massive 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. Glentress Forest is hugely popular with walkers and mountain bikers. The latter come from all over the UK to bike in Glentress Forest. The proposed development seriously risks damaging the tourism potential of Glentress Forest which will impact on the economy of Peebles and the whole of the Tweed Valley. SBC have not provided any Cost: Benefit analysis of building this proposed business park.

9. The site is not an 'effective' site within the definition of the Scottish Government's Scottish Planning Policy (SPP). 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 is provided regarding the cost of such mitigation. SPP states that no development should be made 'at any cost'. SBC have carefully avoided investigating what that cost will be. This proposal should not be included in the LDP until a full costing of work required has been carried out. If an argument is to be made by SBC that economic necessity outweighs negative landscape and tourism impact, at least some attempt should be made to quantify that by investigating the cost of mitigating flooding, installation of an infrastructure, provision of low-carbon access from Peebles and survey for ancient monuments. None of this has been done and yet it should have been done by SBC according to Government Guidelines.

10. I also wonder if SBC has carried out due process correctly in proposing this business park. 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. For this reason alone the proposal should be rejected out of hand. Due process has not been followed.

11. 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 there are no other ancient monuments within it. This has not been done. The site should not be included in the LDP until such survey work has been carried out.

12. 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;

13. 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) in the NW corner, whilst further ground will be lost to screen planting, a bus-stop pull-in area, and the requirement for a widened new road layout at the entrance, and then of course roads across the site.

14. I am concerned this will contribute to ribbon development all along the Tweed Valley from Peebles to Innerleithen.

15. Surface water run-off from the site will add to 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 which floods onto the A72. The height above sea level differential ('fall') between the site and the Tweed into which it would drain is less than 5 meters over approx 1km length. That is bound to lead to drainage problems.

16. The development will reduce biodiversity in the area removing an important corridor by which wildlife links country to the town (Peebles). This would be bad news for the attempts being made to restore the red squirrel in the area by Scottish Wildlife Trust 'Saving Scotland's Red Squirrel'.

17. The current owner states he has no intention of selling. A Compulsory Purchase Order will be required, against which the owner can appeal. These are issues SBC should address before it includes a site in the LDP.

A business park at Eshiels (BESHIE001) should NOT be included in the LDP. SBC have not proved there is a need for a park; a park at Eshiels would generate a lot of unnecessary carbon; SBC have not carried out a C:B analysis; it is a poor site anyway and would be bad use of tax-payers money; it runs the risk of seriously damaging the tourism potential and landscape values of the area and it is likely to flood (as it does each year).

What would you like to do now?

Proposed Local Development Plan Menu (includes Exit option)