

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (SCOTLAND) ACT 1997**

**Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 2013**

**Application for Planning Permission**

**Reference : 15/01410/PPP**

**To : G S Chapman Ltd Unit 1 Sunnyside Farm Lamancha West Linton EH46 7AZ**

With reference to your application validated on **19th November 2015** for planning permission under the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 for the following development :-

**Proposal : Erection of vehicle repair workshop and associated parking**

**at : Land West Of Dunrig Spylaw Farm Lamancha West Linton Scottish Borders**

The Scottish Borders Council hereby **refuse** planning permission for the **reason(s) stated on the attached schedule**.

**Dated 19th January 2016  
Regulatory Services  
Council Headquarters  
Newtown St Boswells  
MELROSE  
TD6 0SA**

**Signed**



.....  
**Chief Planning Officer**

**APPLICATION REFERENCE : 15/01410/PPP**

**Schedule of Plans and Drawings Refused:**

<b>Plan Ref</b>	<b>Plan Type</b>	<b>Plan Status</b>
	Location Plan	Refused

**REASON FOR REFUSAL**

- 1 The proposal does not comply in principle with Adopted Local Plan Policy D1 in that the proposal would more reasonably be accommodated within the Development Boundary of a settlement rather than in this particular location. Further, the Applicant has not demonstrated any overriding economic and/or operational need for this particular countryside location.
- 2 Taking account of the greenfield nature of the site and lack of existing screening available within the surrounding area, the proposal does not comply with Adopted Local Plan Policies D1 and G1 in that the operation of the business, including the storage of general vehicles at the site, would be unsympathetic to the rural character of the site and surrounding area, and would have an unacceptably detrimental landscape and visual impact upon the appearance of the site and its environs.

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE APPLICANT**

If the applicant is aggrieved by the decision of the Planning Authority to refuse planning permission for or approval required by a condition in respect of the proposed development, or to grant permission or approval subject to conditions, the applicant may require the planning authority to review the case under Section 43A of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 within three months from the date of this notice. The notice of review should be addressed to Corporate Administration, Council Headquarters, Newtown St Boswells, Melrose TD6 OSA.

If permission to develop land is refused or granted subject to conditions, whether by the Planning Authority or by the Scottish Ministers, and the owner of the land claims that the land has become incapable of reasonably beneficial use in its existing state and cannot be rendered capable of reasonably beneficial use by the carrying out of any development which has been or would be permitted, the owner may serve on the Planning Authority a purchase notice requiring the purchase of his interest in the land in accordance with the provisions of Part 5 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997.

**SCOTTISH BORDERS COUNCIL**

**APPLICATION TO BE DETERMINED UNDER POWERS DELEGATED TO  
CHIEF PLANNING OFFICER**

**PART III REPORT (INCORPORATING REPORT OF HANDLING)**

**REF :** 15/01410/PPP

**APPLICANT :** G S Chapman Ltd

**AGENT :**

**DEVELOPMENT :** Erection of vehicle repair workshop and associated parking

**LOCATION:** Land West Of  
Dunrig Spylaw Farm  
Lamancha  
West Linton  
Scottish Borders

**TYPE :** PPP Application

**REASON FOR DELAY:**

---

**DRAWING NUMBERS:**

Plan Ref	Plan Type	Plan Status
	Location Plan	Refused

**NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: 0**

**SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS:**

No representations.

**ROADS PLANNING SECTION:** has advised as follows:

"Normally I would be against the principle of this type of business in such a rural location. However it is worth noting that this business currently operates in a rural location, therefore it is almost a like-for-like replacement in terms of location. In addition, the fit-for-purpose building will be located on land where the Applicant currently resides, which potentially reduces commuting traffic. The traffic generation associated with this type of business is generally less than a general mechanical repair garage.

Given the above, I would be seeking for an appropriately worded condition to be placed on any consent whereby the business is tied to the applicants dwelling (Dunrig) and that the proposed building can only be used in connection with a vehicle body shop business, unless otherwise approved.

The single track public road serving the site benefits from a number of passing places and the proposed site lies a short distance from the A701. The proposed access to site is located at a point where traffic speeds are low and good visibility can be achieved in all directions.

The application is for outline consent; therefore the details of the access and parking areas will be covered at detailed planning stage should this proposal be granted consent. However, I will expect the access to be constructed to the following specification; 75mm of 40mm size single course bituminous

layer blinded with bituminous grit all to BS 4987 laid on 375mm of 100mm broken stone bottoming blinded with sub-base, type 1.

In summary, I am able to support the principle of this business at this location providing conditions on the restriction of use and details of access are placed on any consent".

**ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH (CONTAMINATED LAND):** no comments.

**ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH (AMENITY AND POLLUTION):** has considered this proposal with respect to noise nuisance and private water supply. It notes that it is proposed that private water and drainage systems are used for the premises and advised that the Applicants should confirm the proposed hours of operation of the business and confirm the numbers and types of equipment to be used on the premises.

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT:** would normally support the protection and creation of jobs, but advises that the decision on whether this proposal is acceptable is guided by Council policy D1 in the 2011 Local plan and ED2 in the LDP. The Applicant therefore needs to provide justification to satisfy these policies. Should approval be supported under the policy, it is suggested that a condition be applied to ensure that only the specific use applied for is possible, and this be restricted to ensure that no other alternative business uses in class 4, 5 or 6 be allowed, unless that use also satisfies the policies mentioned above. In terms of the viability of the proposed business, it is advised that Economic Development cannot comment on this aspect without some clarity on the nature and size of the business use planned for this building. If appropriate, it is noted that the Applicant could be provided with advice from Business Gateway to assist them.

#### **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES:**

Consolidated Scottish Borders Local Plan 2011

Policy D1 - Business, Tourism and Leisure Development in the Countryside

Policy EP5 - Air Quality

Policy G1 - Quality Standards For New Development

Policy H2 - Protection of Residential Amenity

Policy Inf4 - Parking Provisions and Standards

Policy Inf11 - Developments that Generate Travel Demand

**Recommendation by** - Stuart Herkes (Planning Officer) on 18th January 2016

#### **SITE DESCRIPTION, PLANNING HISTORY AND PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT**

The site is an area of open agricultural land outside of the Development Boundary, which lies adjacent to the public road. There are no existing buildings on the site or within the near vicinity. It has no planning history.

The application seeks planning permission in principle for the change of use of the site to a motor vehicle repair garage premises.

The Applicants' supporting statement advises that the proposed workshop is required to re-accommodate, and allow for the expansion of, its existing general vehicle body repair business. The latter is currently operating from premises at Sunnyside Farm, Macbiehill, and serves the general public. It is advised that these existing premises - a converted farm shed - are increasingly no longer fit-for-purpose, and in future, may no longer be available to the Applicants. It is advised that the business' re-accommodation in purpose-built premises is now urgent to secure the business' future and facilitate its growth and development.

The site is within the Applicants' own ownership, within their agricultural holding at Spylaw, which, it is advised, has not been farmed commercially since the 1970s. It is not anticipated that there would be a need for any new residential property because the Applicants would continue to reside at their home, 'Dunrig', at Spylaw, 150m to the southeast. In the event of approval, they are agreeable to the business premises site being tied to their existing home as a single planning unit.

It is advised that the business' rural location is integral to the business' operation and success, in being centrally located relative to its existing customer base (which is advised to include West Linton and Peebles) and to its intended target areas (South Lanarkshire and Midlothian). Re-location of the vehicle repair business to the site would allow it to continue to offer convenience to its existing and intended customers, who would otherwise have to travel to Edinburgh for similar services, particularly for vehicle body repair work. Since there is a concern to continue to serve an existing and established customer base, which has been developed over the past seven years, it is advised that the business' options are restricted, but beyond a concern to remain centrally located relative to their customers, no further details are given within the supporting statement in support of re-location to this particular site. It is simply advised that the site is seen to fulfil the business' concern to be re-accommodated in a way that would allow it to expand and improve its facilities while continuing to serve and grow its customer base within the local and surrounding area.

Beyond the supporting statement, no business case has been provided to substantiate the business' position in financial and/or functional terms; no planning statement been provided to account for how the proposal would meet planning policy (or justify being made the subject of an exceptional planning approval); and no account has been given of the detail of any site selection considerations that have informed the business' identification of the application site as being the most appropriate way for it to be re-accommodated in planning terms.

## PLANNING PRINCIPLE

The proposed use of the site is Class 5 industrial use.

The site is agricultural land, out with the Development Boundary, which is not allocated for industrial use, or indeed for any other use.

The key policy in terms of the assessment of this proposal is Adopted Local Plan Policy D1 - Business, Tourism and Leisure Development in the Countryside. As such, there is a requirement that the Council be satisfied that there is an economic and/or operational need for this particular countryside location; that the business cannot reasonably be accommodated within the Development Boundary; and that its operation would not have any unacceptable impacts upon the amenity and/or environment of the surrounding area.

A workshop for general motor vehicle repairs has no inherent requirement to be sited and operated in the countryside. Further, the Applicants have not advised, or otherwise provided any evidence of, any operation need for this specific business to be sited and operated from the site. Accordingly, it is considered that the proposal is clearly contrary to Adopted Local Plan Policy D1 and should be refused unless material considerations dictate otherwise.

The Applicants have provided a supporting statement but it does not engage at all with planning policy or with the planning implications of their proposal. Instead, it largely describes the business' aspirations in very general terms, and only considers how these (such as they are defined) would be best served in locational and economic terms by re-location to the application site. However, all of this advice is unqualified by any detailed financial or functional business case, or indeed by any evidence of the business' concern or efforts to secure premises that would be more acceptable in planning terms than the development of a remote rural greenfield site.

It is noted that the Applicants own an agricultural holding, including the site itself, but the supporting case is clear that the car repair business is entirely separate from any farm business that the Applicants might run from their home at Spylaw. Moreover, the business' current operation from another site entirely, is a clear indication that the two concerns are entirely separate and perfectly capable of independent operation. The proposal to re-locate the car repair garage business is therefore not reasonably associated with any essential operational requirements of any agricultural business or any business with any inherent need to be located in a rural area.

In summary, the Applicant's supporting case does not provide any advice or demonstrate any case that might reasonably be seen to override the need to determine this application in accordance with the requirements of Policy D1. Accordingly, it is considered that the application should be refused as being contrary in principle to Policy D1 since there are no overriding reasons to support any contrary decision.

## DESIGN AND LANDSCAPE



In the event of approval, the Applicants would require to submit a detailed design as the subject of at least one AMC application. This would be an opportunity to assess the specific design and landscape treatments required, to ensure most acceptable accommodation of this proposal in the landscape. However, there is a concern at this stage, to establish whether or not the siting and/or operation of a general vehicle repair workshop and yard, would in principle, have any unacceptable landscape and visual impacts.

There would be potential for any workshop building to have the general form and general appearance of an agricultural building, but notwithstanding this, the appearance and operation of a vehicle repair garage building in this location would not be sympathetic to the rural character of the site and its wider landscape setting, introducing the incongruous appearance of a substantial number of parked non-agricultural vehicles, awaiting service or collection, or potentially being stored for ancillary car sales.

Further, and notwithstanding the potential to introduce new, and reinforce existing, screen planting around the site, such an appearance would be out-of-keeping with the environment and amenity of what is currently a greenfield site, remote from any buildings or development. Ultimately as a premises operating in the service of the general public, it would be unlikely that the business, or at least its operation, would be discreetly accommodated in this location. In addition to advertisement and directional signage, there may be a concern to be readily visible from the public road, even perhaps for the display of vehicles for sale, all of which would be out-of-keeping with what is currently open agricultural land, adjacent to a quiet country road.

Notwithstanding the potential for the building's design and for screen planting to mitigate the impact, it is considered that the development's landscape and visual impacts would be unacceptable; particularly since the site, although gently sloping, is higher in the landscape than most of its immediate surroundings, making it potentially visible from the wider area.

#### ACCESS AND PARKING

The Applicants' vehicle repair business currently operates from Sunnyside Farm at Macbiehill (Unit 1). This appears to be the use that was approved by Planning Consent 08/00242/FUL (Partial change of use from business Class 4 to vehicle body repair workshop).

Notwithstanding that the Planning Authority may have previously supported and approved the operation of the Applicants' business at another rural site, the current proposal can only be assessed on its own planning merits within the prevailing planning policy context. The previous approval relates to another site entirely, and has no direct relevance to the planning assessment of the current proposal. It has not in itself established any justification in principle for the business to be re-accommodated at another rural site, including the application site.

Notwithstanding this, the Roads Planning Section is supportive (exceptionally, it recognises) of the principle of the current proposal. This is on the basis that the Applicants currently operate their existing car repair business from a rural location and that the business' re-location to another rural site within the vicinity in Roads' terms at least, might be considered a 'like-for-like' replacement. Roads Planning is content that subject to certain design and construction requirements being met, the application site could be made appropriately accessible. These specific requirements are set out in Roads' consultation response.

While it is reasonable that approval of the current planning application would not change the fact that the Applicants themselves currently operate a general vehicle repair business from a rural location, it is nonetheless also material that approval of the current application would potentially release the Applicant's existing premises for use by another industrial business. This would therefore be liable to result in a net addition of one new industrial premises within the surrounding countryside, thereby contributing to a proliferation of industrial sites within this rural locality.

Since the Applicants' business is apparently leasing its current site, there would additionally be no planning or legal mechanism to secure a 'like-for-like' replacement of the business premises (e.g. requiring the existing premises to revert to agricultural use when it is vacated). In any case, if the Applicants are operating from an established industrial site, as seems to be the case, there would be no planning need or reason to seek to control the future use of this other site. The latter would remain capable of use by a successor industrial business once the Applicants had vacated it. Contrary to Roads' conclusion then, the proposed new business premises is therefore only reasonably viewed as being an entirely new and

additional industrial premises liable to operate alongside the Applicants' existing industrial site. Any roads concerns with respect to operations from the existing site are therefore liable to prevail beyond the period of the Applicants' use of the same, and the wider impacts upon the local road network would only be increased by approval of the current proposal, as a new and additional industrial site in the countryside.

Roads' use of the term 'like-for-like' is also questionable in a context where the Applicants' current site of business operations is apparently accommodated within a converted farm building, whereas the current proposal is for a new building on a greenfield agricultural site, which currently has no road access. In these circumstances, it is unclear how the proposal, or its impacts, are reasonably characterised as being equivalent, since the proposal is liable to be more intrusive in terms of its impacts upon the environment and amenity of the surrounding area.

Ultimately, and regardless of Roads' consideration, the fact of the Applicants' existing operation at another rural site in the area does not reasonably allow the assessment of the planning merits of their current proposal to be so comprehensively set aside. Any proposed re-location of the business from the existing premises to a completely new rural site is only appropriately assessed against the full requirements of Policy D1 with respect to the justification for the proposed site. Accordingly, the above noted assessment in terms of Adopted Local Plan Policy D1, is maintained in full.

Notwithstanding Roads' own assessment with respect to the principle of this proposal, consideration does still need to be given within the assessment of the roads implications of this application, to the potential for members of the public to deliver and recover their vehicles from the site. Due to the site's remoteness, this is something that would rarely, if ever, be achievable on foot, and/or by public transport, for the majority of its customers and visitors, as might be the case were the premises to be located within the Development Boundary. This would be a proposal that would have an inherent (and likely total) reliance on private vehicular transport for customer access. Given the remoteness of the site, operation from this location would also be liable to generate trips of substantially longer duration than operation from a site within the Development Boundary. (For the avoidance of doubt, it is not material to the assessment of this current application that similar considerations are liable to be applicable to the current operation of the business. This would only have been relevant had the Applicants proposed to replace their existing business premises on its existing site, or on one in the very near vicinity of the latter).

The only benefit in access terms relating to the current proposal, would be to the Applicants themselves, and owing to their dwelling being in close proximity to their work. However, it is considered that this personal convenience would not reasonably offset the wider transport impacts of the proposal's operation since the majority of customers and visitors, not to mention delivery vehicles, would require to make long detours specifically to access this site, including along long sections of narrower country roads. Roads Planning it is noted, has positive regard to less trips needing to be made by the Applicants themselves to access their place of work, but this is not considered to outweigh the larger disbenefits that the operation of the site would have upon the local road network.

In summary, it is not agreed with Roads that the particular circumstances of the Applicants' business are such in planning terms, as to justify the setting aside of any planning (or for that matter, any Roads) considerations with respect to the principle of this proposal that would normally apply to its planning assessment. On the contrary, and taking account of the potential addition of another industrial site into the locality without this need having first been properly substantiated in planning terms, it is considered that the proposal's impacts upon the local road network would be unacceptable. However, this point is more reasonably considered to be subsumed within the reason for refusal already identified above with respect to the principle of this proposal. It is reasonably recognised that Roads has not specifically advised of any concern that the local road network could not acceptably accommodate operation of the proposed business from the application site.

## ENVIRONMENT AND AMENITY

No advice is given by the Applicant as to how any new business premises building would be used (or re-used) were the business not to succeed, and no business case has been provided to describe the viability or otherwise of the existing business. Accordingly if the proposed building were built, it is uncertain if or how it might be reused. This risks the site becoming an eyesore, but it also makes it liable to be made available for general industrial site, which depending on future uses, might be liable to accommodate industrial uses with potentially even greater impacts upon the rural environment and its amenity than the current proposal. The

site at the proposed distance of remove from the Applicant's property would also be readily capable of independent use, and therefore if established, would potentially be available for a wide variety of industrial and business uses.

Even if the use or disposal of the site were to be regulated by planning condition (as Economic Development suggests) or by a legal agreement (as the Applicants anticipate), it still needs to be considered whether or not the site is an appropriate location for a general industrial site in the longer-term. Even with planning conditions or legal agreements in place, there would inevitably be pressures in the longer-term, if not sooner, to remove or vary planning conditions and legal burdens to release the site for other uses, or users, particularly if it were to be the case that the premises were no longer required to service the Applicants' own business and the property were otherwise only liable to become an eyesore if left in situ, unmaintained. In other words, there is a risk that any specific arrangement that might be made to accommodate the Applicants' particular circumstances would inevitably only deliver a longer-term issue with respect to the future use and disposal of any business premises so located, particularly given the potential for the site to be operated independently of the Applicants' dwelling, and be capable of being significantly expanded, all of which would make it susceptible to interest by businesses of types and scales beyond any that might realistically be expected to operate from the owners' dwellinghouse.

The Applicants have provided additional information in direct response to the concerns of Environmental Health with respect to potential noise nuisance concerns identified by that consultee, principally by advising as to the type of equipment and machinery that would be in operation. However, given that the application is for Planning Permission in Principle, were it to be supported, appropriate information could be considered at the time of the AMC application. The latter would also be an occasion to incorporate any mitigation measures liable to be required to ensure noise impacts could be appropriately minimised. Since the site would be at some remove from the nearest residential properties, including the Applicants' own home, which is the nearest, there would be no concerns in principle that the Applicants would be able to identify appropriate noise mitigation measures within their detailed proposal.

Had there not been an objection in principle to this proposal, it would have been appropriate to investigate the potential for the site to be served by an appropriate water supply, although again the context of a PPP proposal, there would still be potential for this to be addressed within a subsequent AMC application.

## CONCLUSION

The proposal is contrary in principle to the Council's business in the countryside policy and would have unacceptable impacts upon the environment and amenity of the site and surrounding area, including landscape and visual impacts and impacts upon the local road network. It is therefore considered that it is contrary to Adopted Local Plan Policies D1 and G1, and should be refused on this basis.

## REASON FOR DECISION :

It is considered that the proposal should be refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposal does not comply in principle with Adopted Local Plan Policy D1 in that the proposal would more reasonably be accommodated within the Development Boundary of a settlement rather than in this particular location. Further, the Applicant has not demonstrated any overriding economic and/or operational need for this particular countryside location;
2. Taking account of the greenfield nature of the site and lack of existing screening available within the surrounding area, the proposal does not comply with Adopted Local Plan Policies D1 and G1 in that the operation of the business, including the storage of general vehicles at the site, would be unsympathetic to the rural character of the site and surrounding area, and would have an unacceptably detrimental landscape and visual impact upon the appearance of the site and its environs.

**Recommendation:** Refused



- 1 The proposal does not comply in principle with Adopted Local Plan Policy D1 in that the proposal would more reasonably be accommodated within the Development Boundary of a settlement rather than in this particular location. Further, the Applicant has not demonstrated any overriding economic and/or operational need for this particular countryside location.
- 2 Taking account of the greenfield nature of the site and lack of existing screening available within the surrounding area, the proposal does not comply with Adopted Local Plan Policies D1 and G1 in that the operation of the business, including the storage of general vehicles at the site, would be unsympathetic to the rural character of the site and surrounding area, and would have an unacceptably detrimental landscape and visual impact upon the appearance of the site and its environs.

**“Photographs taken in connection with the determination of the application and any other associated documentation form part of the Report of Handling”.**



# Cunningham Haldane & Co Ltd

## CHARTERED ACCOUNTANT



**The Mark of Quality**

Scottish Borders Council  
Planning Department  
Newtown St Boswells  
Melrose  
TD6 0SA

Manortoun, Manor, Peebles, EH45 9JN  
Registered number SC244272

Phone: 01721-740306  
e-mail: Haldanes1@aol.com

23 August 2016

Dear Sir,

**G S Chapman Ltd - Planning Application to erect a workshop at Dunrig, Spylaw Farm.**

I write in my capacity as accountant to G S Chapman Ltd in support of the company's planning application for the erection of a vehicle repair workshop at Dunrig, Spylaw Farm, West Linton.

I have been the accountant for G S Chapman Ltd since the company was incorporated in March 2012, and prior to that was accountant for Mr Graeme Chapman, director and sole-owner of G S Chapman Ltd, from the outset of his sole trader vehicle body-repair business in 2008 prior to incorporating that business as G S Chapman Ltd in 2012. I have therefore been involved with this business from its very beginning and have watched it grow into the established and successful business that it is today.

As I have come to know Mr Graeme Chapman I find him to be a very honest and hard working family man who is committed to the success of the vehicle body-repair business he has created out of nothing. I can vouch for the high standard of workmanship and customer service provided by G S Chapman Ltd and for the company's perpetually full order book. As far as is possible to predict, I have no doubts that Mr Chapman intends to continue in this business throughout his working career and is entirely genuine in the longevity of his intention to employ the proposed workshop at Dunrig for his vehicle body-repair business with no ulterior intentions for any other planned use of this building.

I can also vouch for the short comings in the company's existing premises which are, quite frankly, not fit for purpose, and it is testament to Mr Chapman's commitment to his business that he has persevered to build a successful company from this unsatisfactory site. Notwithstanding the deficiencies of the company's existing premises which inhibit the recruitment of additional staff, prevent any further growth of the business and cause Mr Chapman to have to work in winter temperatures that most would not tolerate, it is my understanding that there are serious concerns for the security of the company's tenure at these premises pending a foreseeable change of ownership of the building.

I understand also that G S Chapman Ltd has explored and exhausted all other options to locate an affordable alternative location for the business prior to submitting the application to build a workshop at Dunrig.

To assist you in determining the merits of the company's planning application it is important to clarify the nature of G S Chapman Ltd's business in order to dismiss any misunderstanding or preconceptions of the company's trade.

The services offered by G S Chapman Ltd are distinctly different from those of a general vehicle service garage where a vehicle owner would typically go to have their car serviced and MOT'd, to have tyres & exhausts fitted or to trade-in and purchase a new vehicle. G S Chapman Ltd is not an MOT station and the company does not buy & sell motor vehicles. Neither does the company provide general vehicle servicing. Rather, it is a vehicle body-repair and paint-shop business with a particular specialisation in the renovation of vintage Land Rovers.

The volume of customer vehicles through the company's workshop averages around five vehicles per week and the number of customer vehicles parked outside the workshop at any given time is very small. The proposed new workshop would house most of these customer vehicles indoors, minimising the visual impact of the business in its proposed rural location. The company has only one business vehicle which is currently a Land Rover and is likely to remain so. Typical of the understated style in which Mr Chapman chooses to run his business, this business vehicle has no livery markings and, other than having immaculate paintwork, is indistinguishable from a regular farm vehicle. It would therefore not look out of place parked outside the proposed new workshop.

As a well established business, G S Chapman Ltd has no need, and no desire, for advertising signage. Nor does the business require directional signage as the low volume of customer throughput and personal customer service enables verbal directions to be given to all new customers. In any event, the company's web site would provide all the directions required to locate the proposed new site.

Given the close proximity of the proposed workshop to Mr Chapman's house and the facility to store customer vehicles inside the workshop, the security risks associated with the custody of customer vehicles will be minimal, thus eliminating any need for unsightly perimeter security fencing. Indeed, for the very reason of its close proximity to Mr Chapman's family home there is an increased desire on Mr Chapman's part for the proposed workshop to sit well in its rural location and to remain devoid of any commercial trappings that might detract from the agricultural appearance intended for the workshop.

I first met Graeme Chapman several years before I became his accountant when he had the unenviable role as treasurer of his local Young Farmer's group. His integrity was evident then and I have never doubted it over the years. His roots are in the countryside and with a young family of his own now growing up on the same farm that he did, I believe Graeme to be a sincere and honest guardian of our rural heritage. With the greatest of respect for the planning constraints required to maintain this rural heritage I therefore have no hesitation in supporting the planning application submitted by G S Chapman Ltd or in verifying the importance of this application to the future growth and economic viability of the company.

Yours faithfully,



Linda Haldane CA

# R. A. COX (Garage Equipment)

61 BELWOOD ROAD  
MILTON BRIDGE, PENICUIK  
MIDLOTHIAN EH26 0QN

Telephone/Fax 01968 673567  
Mobile 07831 370 640  
Email Racoxge@aol.com

Vehicle Lift Specialists  
Repairs, Services & Sales  
Air Line Installations

Monday 22<sup>nd</sup> August 2016

To whom it may concern,

Since 2010, we have been carrying out bi-annual maintenance and repairs on the 2 post vehicle lift for G.S. Chapman Ltd at Unit 1, Sunnyside, Macbiehill, West Linton, EH46 7AZ.

It is of our opinion that the state of the building has been and continues to be detrimental to the life span and condition of the vehicle lift. There is a leak in the roof causing damp in the control box, and this has also caused corrosion to the base frame. There has been occasions throughout the winter when the cold has caused the lift to stick while lifting a vehicle (this is caused by thickening of the grease on the main screws, due to the extremely low temperature). The shed is also situated on a slope which makes it difficult to get the lifting arms under the vehicles. The fact the building entrance is situated in an exposed area, subject to the prevailing winds is also likely to cause dust to be blown around and get stuck to the main screws causing excessive and premature load nut wear.

It is our opinion that whilst the building is not dangerous, it is poorly suited to house and operate an electro-mechanical vehicle lift and other workshop equipment.

Yours sincerely



Andrew Cox  
Partner

G.S. Chapman  
Unit 1  
Sunnyside  
Macbiehill  
West Linton  
EH46 7AZ

Bank Details Sort Code 80 09 33 Account No. 00276589

Partners: R. A. Cox · K. C. Cox

V.A.T. Registration No. 416 0838 62



