

## Response ID ANON-VDDE-RAFS-F

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

Submitted on 2021-01-25 15:37:34

### About you

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

Individual

### Individual

What is your name?

Individual name:

Fiona Andrew

What is your email address?

Individual Email:

[REDACTED]

What is your address?

Address line 1:

[REDACTED]

Address line 2 :

[REDACTED]

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?:

Name [REDACTED]

E mail: [REDACTED]

### PROPOSED SCOTTISH BORDERS LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

I respond with bewilderment to the ' identification of the area referred to as BESH1001 for use as a Business and Industrial site.

Is this a poor taste joke perpetrated by the SBC? Surely not!?! Have SBC been involved in a dare or wager with this as the result? Surely not?!?! Is this pay back for the shelving of the housing estates a few metres along the road thanks to the local protest and pesky Romans? Surely not?!?!

If the SBC wish to be a laughing stock and pave the way for a white elephant, then .....

Why would anyone in their right mind think that a random, intrusive, incongruous industrial site plonked on a green field close to domestic dwellings on an attractive stretch of road into the tourist town of Peebles would be an asset, let alone a good idea?

1. The area is a special landscape area. Why is it 'NECESSARY' to identify land for a new Business and Industry site there when there are other alternatives close to existing sites eg Cavalry Park, Mill Rd

## 2. TRANSPORT ISSUES

- new access from A72 - danger, accident, slowing down of traffic etc
  - increased road use by vans, lorries, extra cars, with subsequent degradation of an already poor quality and maintained stretch of road. Road works significantly impact on journey times, irritation and pollution due to idling engines and that is now BEFORE an industrial site adds to it
  - if workers there are - most will travel to work by car adding to traffic and pollution and may very well make another journey for lunch in Peebles. Walking not an easy option if time constraints and cycling would be in reality, along the main road or perhaps even the very narrow pavement ...
- The environmentally conscious may travel by bus with additional stops causing more traffic slowing and congestion.

## 3. TOPOGRAPHY

- land has a huge slope in one corner rendering a substantial area unusable or at least needing a lot of levelling work
- there is a watercourse which can overflow
- run off water in times of heavy rain causes significant A72 road flooding as the land stands, never mind tarmacadam and building over huge amounts of grass that can only add to the issue

## 4. SBC POLICY

- this development was not mentioned in the MIR, it has suddenly been drawn from the conjurors' hat so noone has had the opportunity to comment until now. Poor and wrong?
- ED7 mentions 'protecting the environment and appropriate to location' for sites in the countryside. This does neither and would adversely impact on both.
- there is mention made of 'agricultural, horticultural or forestry operations' all of which would be in keeping with the area but NOT in relation to BESH1001 so presumably the site would be for anything but this? One can only surmise as there is little detail
- the Sustainability Policy PMD1 is supposed to protect natural resources, landscapes etc, minimise light pollution etc. This development flies in the face of these
- there is supposed to be a 'respect for amenity and character with no significant impact on nearby uses particularly housing' or does Applefalls (house cheek by jowel) and the properties close by on the other side of A72 not count? Then there are the two Eshiels mill settlements which will be impacted by noise, loss of dark skies, increased traffic and those using Glentress who will be able to see the blot on the landscape from the western bike trails and walks.

## 5. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

- see transport and pollution mentioned above
- see really concerning potential road flooding mentioned above
- see ED7 and environmental protection mentioned above
- see impact on current residents mentioned above
- has a proper survey on flora and fauna been done. Is the destruction of habitat, mature trees etc acceptable?
- what about potential historic and archaeological damage/ loss. The Romans are known to have had a presence very close. It is likely they may be a presence on the site designated. May be better to develop an historical tourist venue than a badly sited industrial one.
- landscaping is frequently woefully inadequate and not fit for purpose and actually does not cut noise effectively or often screen well. So the inexorable march of development along the A72 goes on. Is it a long term ambition to join Galashiels to Peebles eventually? In the ugliest way? The Cardrona N Horsforth proposal in addition to Eshiels adds more weight to this theory.

Were there no other options for industrial expansion, I would have some sympathy with out of the box suggestions, but there are in town possibilities which would have less impact, are a more common sense solution and are likely to be more successful than a small, alien, unthought through, illogical development that BESH1001 undoubtedly is.

## What would you like to do now?

Proposed Local Development Plan Menu (includes Exit option)