

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 January 2019 18:15
To: localplan <localplan@scotborders.gov.uk>
Subject: Local Development Plan 2 ADOPL004

Dear Sir /Madam

[REDACTED] the area within Local Development Plan 2 ADOPL004, and as such, [REDACTED] reservations about the proposed development for a number of reasons, including those set out below:

- You are promoting an unsustainable expansion of a place that has no facilities in the immediate area, with the exception of a village hall some half a mile away.
- The proposal would increase dependency on the use of motor vehicles within the local area as there are limited bus services between local towns, with those services having recently been reduced. Home owners, and their families, would most likely need two or more vehicles per household as a result. As such this site is not a sustainable location for development.
- New developments such as this should be targeted in places that already have the necessary local infrastructure including shops, educational facilities with capacity, and opportunities for employment. This is not case for Dolphinton.
- We understand that there is no public sewage available to support this proposal. An additional 10 houses plus the 5 already allocated will have a negative impact on soil if soaks are used. Our ground already suffers because of the impact of the old railway yards previously located on the site, and as such there is already a risk of flooding to some degree, which would be greatly increased with the pressure on the land of an additional 10 houses within the vicinity. There is also limited infrastructure for dealing with surface water in Loanend, with only a basic SUDS system is in operation.
- The Dolphinton Waste Water Treatment Works is over 1km away from this site and, as stated on the assessment, may need upgrading.
- ADOLP003 Issue 113 - this is an interesting document as throughout there is clear evidence that this was doubtful in the first place but still was authorised.
- On the plan for the site done in 2016/2017 it clearly shows a road to ADOLP004 which indicates the land owners forward thinking. However he states that acknowledging the previous refusals for 12 and 14 dwellings, he now seeks a more modest development of 5 dwellings as a natural extension. This appears to us to be a somewhat misleading statement.
- It's questionable whether this site should be considered brownfield in the first place. Such an additional development would completely change the whole character of the local area.
- Finally, and particularly in relation to our own property, we would like to highlight to you that 1) we purchased the property in 2016, 2) one of the main reasons was the uninhibited view to the countryside from the rear of the property including from the kitchen, TV Room, and two of the bedrooms, 3) the openness and quietness of the existing development, and 4) an understanding that there would be no development of the land immediately to the rear of our property. A development such as that proposed will have a direct impact on our property both in terms of noise, and light, and we would expect value too, taking a family property in an open and picturesque spot, and boxing it in with a new development.

We would ask that any proposal for development on the land to the rear of our property be rejected.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

