



Robin N Thomson
Cakemuir Cottage
Nenthorn
Kelso, TD5 7RY
Sunday 1st November 2021

Scottish Borders Council,
Clerk to the Local Review Body at Council Headquarters,
Newtown St Boswells,
Melrose, TD6 0SA

Dear Madam/Sir,

I would like to submit the following regarding the planning review 21/00029/RREF.

Effects of allowing this appeal, please see attached plan.

In the original Local plan, Nenthorn Village was a defined village and Cakemuir was a separate building group. Nenthorn village is clearly demarked by the wooded area that bounds White Horse Field.

Applications 21/01000 and 21/00999 are clearly additions to the Cakemuir Building Group, and not to Nenthorn Village.

While I understand that individual applications can only be judged on their merits, a review should take into account the wider implications of the possible planning consent.

If the Local Review Body allow this appeal, and grants planning permission for applications 21/00999 (Plot 1) and 21/01000 (Plot 2) then Scottish Borders Council would be unable to refuse an application for Plot 3, directly opposite Cakemuir House.

The applicant has indicated the area encompassed by the brown lozenge and 'Residential' (See 5.11 Figure 5 and 5.22 Figure 10), so permissions for Plots 4 and 5 would follow.

Bearing in mind the SBC has previously granted planning permission 09/00230, then Plot 6, 7 and 8 would naturally follow.

As Plot 1 and 2 and separated from the Cakemuir Building group by a minor road, it also follows that permission for residential development must be granted for Area One, which is the much more logical area for the development of Nenthorn. And possibly Area Two. Allowing these permissions will have significant repercussions.

The applicant has linked these applications with a planning consent that he already has for four houses to the north of the Old School in Nenthorn 07/01848/OUT. He has offered to substitute two of those four consents for the two current applications. This offer raises various questions, such as does he intent to offer up the other two consents for two more? The consent 07/01848/OUT contains a requirement (para 4) for the provision of a play area prior to the development. If these applications are linked, should not this provision be carried over to the new applications? or is this just a scheme to avoid having to provide a play area for the children in Nenthorn? Why, if the applicant has permission to build four houses does he not carry out that project rather than substituting two houses at a less suitable location, better still, why not apply to build houses on the numerous suitable sites at Gerrick Farm.