

## Grounds of Appeal Statement

**Appeal against the delegated refusal of planning permission for the proposed erection of timber storage and processing facility with new access junction, yard area, landscaping, tree planting, SUDs and associated works and planning permission in principle for associated dwellinghouse with office for the timber processing facility**

**Land South West of West Loch Farmhouse, Peebles**

**Planning Application Reference: 22/00933/FUL**

**On behalf of Mr Richard Spray, Pentland Biomass**

---

### Introduction & Overview

1. This Statement has been prepared by Chartered Town Planning Consultants, John Handley Associates Ltd on behalf of the applicant and site owner, Mr Richard Spray of Pentland Biomass. It provides the applicant's grounds of appeal against the delegated refusal of the planning application by the Council's Planning Officer which was issued on 6<sup>th</sup> October 2022.
2. As we will demonstrate in this Appeal Statement – and the accompanying Legal Opinion prepared by Mr Neil Collar, Planning Lawyer of Brodies Solicitors – the Planning Officer has completely misunderstood the scale, nature and type of development being proposed, and by doing so, has misinterpreted the relevant planning policies applicable to this development.
3. Had the Planning Officer undertaken a correct assessment of the proposals, a positive determination could have been made in accordance with relevant planning policy, allowing planning permission to be granted, subject to appropriate conditions.
4. We would therefore invite the Local Review Body (the “LRB”) to make an informed assessment of the proposals and the relevant planning policies, which will, in our opinion, allow the LRB to grant planning permission for the proposals.
5. This Grounds of Appeal Statement therefore focuses on the following key points which will allow the LRB to overturn the Planning Officer's decision, and grant planning permission for the proposals:
  - (1) The Planning Officer's failure to discuss the proposals with the applicant prior to determining the application;**
  - (2) The Planning Officer's misunderstanding of the scale and nature of the proposed development;**
  - (3) The Planning Officer's failure to correctly interpret the relevant planning policies for this particular scale and type of development; and**
  - (4) The Planning Officer's failure to request additional supporting information which would have allowed a positive decision to be reached, controlled by relevant conditions.**

### **Planning Officer's failure to discuss the application prior to refusal**

6. It is accepted that the proposals are relatively unusual and contain a variety of different elements. However, and despite numerous and repeated requests by the applicant and his agent via email, phone calls and letter, the Planning Officer chose not to contact the applicant or his agent prior to issuing his delegated refusal of the application.
7. The applicant also had no opportunity to discuss the proposals with the Planning Officer prior to the submission of the planning application as the Council's Pre-Application Service was suspended.
8. In our opinion, if the Planning Officer had responded to the applicant's repeated requests to discuss the proposals prior to determination, this would have clarified the scale and nature of the proposals and would have allowed a positive determination to be reached.
9. In this respect, it is notable that the only consultee to respond to the applicant's requests to discuss the proposals was the Council's Roads Planning Officer who revised his initial response following dialogue and correspondence with the applicant's agent, including the submission of additional information. After receiving clarification from the applicant, the Council's Roads Planning Officer did not recommend refusal of the planning application, but suggested that conditions could be imposed to address any required mitigation measures (see **Appeal Document PB01**).
10. In contrast, and for reasons unknown, the Planning Officer chose not to respond to the applicant's agent until the day after the application had been refused, and proceeded to refuse the application with no discussion or negotiation whatsoever.
11. If the Planning Officer had discussed the proposals with the applicant, it is our opinion that a proper and informed assessment of the proposals could have been reached, controlled by way of appropriate planning conditions.
12. Unfortunately, the Planning Officer chose not to engage with the applicant and proceeded to refuse the application for a number of reasons. None of which we accept or agree with, and we have addressed each reason later in this Statement.

### **Requested Appeal Procedure**

13. In view of the Planning Officer's misunderstanding of the proposals and his failure to correctly assess the relevant planning policies, both of which are significant and fundamental shortcomings, we would request that this appeal is considered by way of a Hearing and a Site Visit.
14. As the application proposals involve the relocation of an existing timber storage yard which is located at Loanhead in Midlothian, we would also suggest that it would be beneficial for the LRB to visit the existing yard to see how this is operated. This, in our opinion, would address all of the Planning Officer's misconceptions about the scale and nature of the proposals.

15. An accompanied visit of the application site and the existing Loanhead site was offered to the Planning Officer but, as noted above, he chose not to engage in any dialogue with the applicant.
16. Due to the clear misunderstanding by the Planning Officer, we therefore consider it important that the LRB visits the sites (existing and proposed) and hears directly from the applicant prior to making a determination of this application. This will, in our opinion, allow the LRB to gain a proper understanding of the proposals, and the very clear, compelling and material planning considerations that support this planning application.
17. By following this procedure, the LRB would have the opportunity to properly consider and assess the clear evidence that allows this application to be approved in accordance with the relevant policies of the adopted Local Development Plan.
18. The remainder of the information provided below confirms why, based on a proper understanding of the proposed development and the correct assessment of the relevant planning policy, planning permission can, and should be granted.

#### **Overview of Proposed Development**

19. A detailed Supporting Planning Statement was submitted with the planning application and provides a detailed review of the proposals and relevant planning policies. We have not repeated this information in this Grounds of Appeal Statement, but would direct the LRB to the Supporting Planning Statement (“SPS”) and the accompanying Design Statement which explains the proposals in considerable detail, including a full assessment of the application against relevant planning policy at section 9 of the SPS.
20. Section 2 of the SPS provides background information on the applicant and their existing timber storage yard at Loanhead, Midlothian, and section 3 explains why the existing timber yard requires to be relocated to make way for a new road by-pass.
21. Photographs of the existing yard are provided in the SPS and are also included as **Appeal Document PB02**. These photographs confirm the nature and scale of the existing operations. The SPS also confirms that the applicant is a forestry and timber processing business and part of the horticultural business, Pentland Plants.
22. Photographs of the chipping equipment are also provided at section 2 of the SPS and are included as **Appeal Document PB03**.
23. These photographs, and the information provided in the SPS, confirm that the existing operation is quite clearly a forestry related business, and is not an industrial facility.

24. The SPS also confirms that the existing timber yard at Loanhead has been in operation for over 12 years and is not located within a defined settlement, but is situated within the Countryside and the Edinburgh Green Belt. It is quite clearly a use that is appropriate in a rural, countryside location.
25. Sections 3 and 4 of the SPS explains why the timber yard requires to be relocated and summarises the site search exercise undertaken by the applicant and the reasons why this new site at Westloch Farm was selected. The principle reasons being:
1. Scottish Borders Council supports forestry related enterprises and considers these to be an important part of the Scottish Borders economy.
  2. Scottish Borders LDP Policy ED7 explicitly supports timber processing facilities in countryside locations, such as the application site.
  3. The application site is located within the 1,000 hectare Westloch Forest Estate which has been the subject of a recent restocking and replanting programme as a commercial conifer forest.
  4. The application site benefits from its direct access to the A703 which is an Approved Route for Timber Transportation and is linked to the A703 by a public road which is also classified as a Consultation Route for timber transport.
  5. A new forest access route has been constructed immediately to the west of the application site.
  6. The site clearly benefits from existing, direct access to approved timber transport routes and is located in an area noted for its timber production and timber processing facilities.
  7. The majority of the company's sources of timber are located within the Scottish Borders and an accessible location close to existing timber stocks was an important consideration from a sustainability perspective and to reduce haulage costs.
  8. The majority of the staff employed by the Biomass company also live in the Scottish Borders area and the selection of this particular site offered further advantages in terms of a reduction in staff commuting distances and travel costs.
26. The Design Statement and section 7 of the SPS describes the proposed development and confirms that the majority of the site will be used as open storage for felled timber; and the proposed buildings involve two small scale, agricultural sheds and a temporary portacabin building. These are not large scale industrial buildings, but are agricultural sheds, which are common throughout the countryside and are entirely appropriate in a rural location such as the application site.
27. The agricultural design, scale and style of the buildings are confirmed in the submitted drawings.
28. It should also be noted that this type, scale and size of building would fall within the definition of permitted development under either Part 6 or Part 7 of *The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Scotland) Order 1992* and does not, on its own, require planning permission in this particular location.
29. This is not a large scale industrial facility.

### **Addressing the Planning Officer's Reasons for Refusal**

30. In his Report of Handling, the Planning Officer describes the proposal as an *"industrial development"* and considers that it is *"not necessarily one which would be appropriate to the rural character of the area"*.
31. Neither of these statements are correct.
32. As we have explained above (and set out in some considerable detail in the SPS) this proposal is for a timber processing facility. It is not an industrial development. It is also small scale. The buildings on the site are agricultural buildings which are so small in scale that they fall within the scope of permitted development, and would not require planning permission in their own right.
33. The Planning Officer has clearly misunderstood the type and scale of development being proposed.
34. Had he taken up the applicant's offer of a site visit/meeting/phone call, this misunderstanding could have been avoided and the planning application approved. Unfortunately he didn't and he proceeded to refuse the application for six reasons. These are reviewed below.

### **Reason for Refusal 1 – Policy ED7**

35. The first reason for refusal states that: *"The development would be contrary to policy ED7 of the Local Development Plan 2016 in that the applicant has not demonstrated any overriding economic and/or operational need for the proposed Class 5 and Class 6 business operation to be located in this particular countryside location. This conflict with the development plan is not overridden by other material considerations"*.
36. This is not correct. There is no requirement for this particular proposal to demonstrate any overriding economic or operational need to be located in a countryside location. The Planning Officer has quite clearly misinterpreted the terms of Policy ED7.
37. Paragraph 1.5 on page 49 of the LDP and Policy ED7 (criteria a) confirms that proposals for business development in the countryside will be approved and rural diversification initiatives will be encouraged provided that the development is to be used directly for agricultural, horticultural or forestry operations.
38. As this proposal is to be used directly for forestry operations it can be supported by Policy ED7 criteria a. There is no requirement to demonstrate an economic or operational need for this type of development.
39. A highlighted copy of Policy ED7 and the preceding paragraphs is submitted as **Appeal Document PB04**. This confirms the relevant parts of this Policy.

40. To provide further comfort to the LRB on this fundamental point, the applicant has obtained a written legal opinion from Neil Collar, a Partner and Planning Law specialist at Brodies Solicitors. Mr Collar is one of the leading planning law specialists in Scotland. He is also the author of the highly successful book "*Planning*" which is considered to be the most practical and complete analysis of planning law in Scotland. Mr Collar also regularly advises the Scottish Government and trains Councillors on planning matters. He is an acknowledged expert in Scottish Planning Law.
41. Mr Collar's opinion is submitted as **Appeal Document PB05**. It confirms that the Planning Officer has misinterpreted Policy ED7. The correct assessment of Policy ED7 is set out in Mr Collar's opinion and this confirms that the application proposals can, in fact, be supported by Policy ED7.
42. On this basis, the first reason for refusal is not valid or appropriate. The application can be supported by Policy ED7.
43. If the LRB has any remaining concerns about the proposed use of the site, or its future use, we can confirm that the applicant would be happy to agree to a Condition or a Legal Agreement restricting the use of the facility to timber storage with ancillary timber processing. This would ensure that the site could not be used for class 5 industrial or class 6 storage and distribution uses.
44. The applicant would also be happy to accept a condition that requires all timber to be sourced from the Scottish Borders area.

#### **Reason for Refusal 2 – Noise Impact**

45. The second reason for refusal states that: "*The proposed development would be contrary to policy HD3 of the Local Development Plan 2016 in that the applicant has not provided any information in relation to how noise generated by the proposal would impact on residential amenity within the locality. This conflict with the development plan is not overridden by other material considerations*".
46. The Planning Officer is correct to state that the applicant has not provided a noise impact assessment of the proposed development, but this is because we were not asked to provide such an assessment.
47. If the Planning Officer had requested this prior to his refusal of the application, the requested noise assessment would have been provided. The applicant was, however, given no opportunity by the Planning Officer to submit such an assessment.
48. In his Report of Handling, the Planning Officer also makes reference to a recent planning application adjacent to the applicant's existing timber yard at Loanhead, and suggests that this confirms that the operation cannot be supported for noise and amenity reasons. This conclusion is not, however, correct; and we can advise the LRB that it was the applicant who submitted information relating to the planning application adjacent to the existing Loanhead facility and this is referenced in the SPS.

49. What this information actually confirms is that Midlothian Council has approved the phased development of over 300 houses on a site adjacent to the applicant's existing timber yard.
50. It also explains that Midlothian Council have imposed a condition on the planning permission for the new residential development which requires the preparation of a noise assessment by the housing developer, not the timber yard operator. The reason for this condition is to protect the timber yard, not the residential development. This is known as "the agent of change principle".
51. We would also highlight that Midlothian Council has previously approved an earlier phase of housing on a site closer to the applicant's existing Loanhead site. This includes the development of over 30 new houses within 110 metres of the existing timber yard which have now been built and are occupied. Midlothian Council did not require any noise assessment or impose any noise conditions on that development.
52. The proximity of this newly constructed housing in relation to the existing timber yard is confirmed in the photographs and plan submitted as **Appeal Document PB06**. This confirms that the proposed timber yard operation can successfully coexist next to existing housing without giving rise to any noise or amenity concerns.
53. The Planning Officer's reference to noise concerns at the Loanhead site is therefore not correct or competent. It is misleading and inaccurate, and is based on incorrect information.
54. Had the Planning Officer discussed this issue with the applicant prior to refusing the application, we would have made him aware of this information and clarified this matter. The Officer unfortunately chose instead to proceed directly to a delegated refusal without any dialogue or discussion.
55. To provide the LRB with further comfort on this particular point the applicant has instructed noise consultants, The Airshed, to undertake a detailed noise assessment of the application site and the proposed development. Due to recent weather conditions and the holiday period, the completion of this Noise Assessment has been delayed but will be submitted in support of this appeal as soon as it has been completed.
56. The undertaking of this Noise Assessment will confirm that the application proposals will not adversely impact existing residential amenity, and by doing so, will confirm that the application can be approved in compliance with LDP Policy HD3.
57. On this basis, the second reason for refusal is not valid or appropriate.

### **Reason for Refusal 3 – Landscape Impact**

58. The third reason for refusal states that: *“The development would be contrary to policy PMD2 of the Local Development Plan 2016 in that the proposed bunds would not be appropriate to the landscape setting of the site. The development would not, therefore, be compatible with or respect the character of the surrounding area. These conflicts with the development plan are not overridden by other material considerations”.*
59. As set out in the submitted Design Statement and the SPS, the topography of the site will be altered through a cut and fill process, to provide a level site area, allowing for safe storage of timber and to provide suitable locations for the buildings. The surplus earth will be utilised to create mounds to the east, south and south west boundaries, which also helps to reduce the visual impact of the yard. The mounds will be planted with a mixture of evergreen and deciduous trees to improve the aesthetics, offer further screening and to encourage greater biodiversity. To the west and north of the site there will be new wildlife hedgerows planted, consisting of a mixture hawthorn, blackthorn and elder, again to improve the visual impact and to provide a natural habitat for nesting birds and small mammals.
60. The landscaped bunds have therefore been included as an integral part of the proposals to improve the landscape setting of the development and to provide greater biodiversity through the inclusion of native species and new wildlife habitats. We do not therefore agree that the inclusion of this feature will adversely impact the landscape setting of the site or the local area. Quite the opposite.
61. The third reason for refusal is not therefore valid or appropriate.
62. Should the LRB consider it necessary to remove this particular element, this can be achieved and could be controlled by way of a condition on the planning permission. But we would question why the removal of the landscaped bunds would be desirable.

### **Reason for Refusal 4 – Proposed Dwellinghouse/Office**

63. The fourth reason for refusal states that: *“The proposed dwellinghouse does not comply in principle with policy HD2 of the Local Development Plan 2016 in that it would not meet any direct operational requirement of an agricultural, horticultural, forestry or other enterprise which is itself appropriate to the countryside. No overriding case for the development as proposed has been substantiated. This conflict with the development plan is not overridden by other material considerations”.*
64. As we have explained above, the Planning Officer has taken the view that the timber processing facility cannot be supported by Policy ED7 and by association the proposed dwellinghouse cannot be supported by the corresponding Policy HD2. This conclusion is, however, based on the Planning Officer’s incorrect assessment of the main timber yard element of the proposals, and as we have demonstrated above (and supported by the legal opinion of Neil Collar) the proposals can be supported by Policy ED7.



65. Mr Collar also confirms in his legal opinion that on the basis that Policy ED7 has been interpreted incorrectly by the Planning Officer, it follows that there is scope, too, for reassessment of the planning application – specifically the proposed dwellinghouse – in terms of policy HD2.
66. This means that the proposed dwellinghouse meets the requirements of Policy HD2 criteria (f) economic requirement, as it is a direct operational requirement of the proposed forestry enterprise which is itself appropriate to the countryside. It is also required for a worker directly employed in the enterprise and the presence of that worker on-site is essential to the safe and efficient operation of the forestry enterprise.
67. The planning application can therefore be supported by criteria f of Policy HD2. The fourth reason for refusal is not therefore valid or appropriate.
68. We would also wish to highlight to the LRB, and as we noted in the SPS, that the primary purpose of this planning application is to secure detailed planning permission for the new timber storage and processing facility on the site, to allow the relocation of the existing facility from its current Loanhead base.
69. A plot for the erection of a new house and permanent office/staff accommodation has also been included and this part of the site would provide a new house for the manager of the new timber yard operation as well as permanent office and staff accommodation. It would in effect become the new base for the Pentland Biomass operation following the closure of the Loanhead timber yard, and would provide on-site management and security of the new facility which is considered necessary given the expensive (£1M+) equipment that will be stored on site.
70. At this stage, it is only planning permission in principle that is being sought for that element, with all detailed design, access and siting matters for the proposed house and permanent office/staff accommodation to be reserved for future approval. This reflects the proposed phasing and delivery of the new timber yard facility and the anticipation that it will take time for the new timber storage area to be fully operational following the closure of the current facility at Loanhead.
71. For this reason, the applicant would be happy to accept a condition on any grant of planning permission restricting the occupation of the proposed house and permanent office/staff accommodation until the main timber yard development has become fully operational. This approach will ensure that the new house is directly linked to the forestry enterprise.
72. If it would give the LRB further comfort we can confirm that the applicant would also be happy to control the delivery and future occupation of the proposed house/office building by way of a condition or a suitable legal agreement to ensure that it is directly linked to the timber processing facility at all times.
73. This approach would allow the planning application to be supported by criteria f of Policy HD2.

### **Reason for Refusal 5 – Impact on Trees**

74. The fifth reason for refusal states that: *“The development would be contrary to policy EP13 in that no account has been taken of trees immediately adjacent the site. The applicant has failed to prove that the development would not have an adverse effect on trees which are an important landscape feature. No overriding case for the development as proposed has been substantiated”.*
75. As we confirmed in the submitted SPS, the application site contains no trees or landscape features and has been used as rough grazing land. There will therefore be no adverse impact on any existing trees as there are none on site.
76. As confirmed in the Design Statement, substantial new tree planting is being provided as a key element of the development, with the proposed landscaping areas to be populated with local species of trees and shrubs to create an attractive boundary which will also enhance the landscape setting and biodiversity of the site.
77. Unfortunately, the Planning Officer has failed to take this feature into account in his Report of Handling and has instead raised concerns about the potential impact of the landscaped bund on the existing trees which lie outwith the application site.
78. To confirm that this will not be an issue, the applicant has instructed Arbor Vitae Arboriculture Ltd to undertake a detailed tree survey and Arboricultural Assessment of the proposed development. These documents are submitted as **Appeal Documents PB07** and **PB08** and confirm that there are no trees on the site and that the application proposals would not require the removal of any adjacent trees.
79. The report also provides a series of recommendations to ensure that all adjacent trees can be protected and safeguarded and we can confirm that the applicant would be happy to agree to a suitable condition requiring the proposed development to be implemented in accordance with the recommendations set out in the submitted Arboricultural Assessment.
80. This approach allows the application proposals to meet the requirements of LDP Policy EP13. The fifth reason for refusal is not therefore valid or appropriate.

### **Reason for Refusal 6 – Ecological Impact**

81. The sixth and final reason for refusal states that: *“The development would be contrary to policies EP1, EP2 and EP3 of the Local Development Plan 2016 in that the applicant has failed to prove that the development would not have an adverse effect on protected species which may be present on the site. These conflicts with the development plan are not overridden by other material considerations.”*

82. However, and as explained in the SPS, the application site contains no trees or landscape features and due to its use as grazing land has limited ecological interest. It is not subject to any landscape, environmental or ecological designations and is not located within or close to any Sensitive Areas.
83. As such, there will be no adverse impact on any protected species and a range of ecological enhancements will be provided as an integral part of the development. This includes the provision of a substantial landscape framework which will be populated with local species of trees and shrubs to provide a range of ecological enhancements including new wildlife hedgerows, consisting of a mixture hawthorn, blackthorn and elder, to improve the visual impact and provide a natural habitat for nesting birds and small mammals. The application proposals therefore meet the requirements of LDP Policies EP1, EP2 and EP3.
84. To provide the LRB with further comfort on this particular matter, the applicant has instructed local ecologists, David Dodds Associates to undertake an ecological appraisal of the site. Due to recent weather conditions and the holiday period, the completion of this ecological assessment has been delayed but this will be submitted in support of this appeal as soon as it has been completed. The undertaking of this assessment will confirm that the application proposals will not have an adverse effect on any protected species, and will in fact, enhance the biodiversity of the site and the local area.
85. On this basis, the sixth reason for refusal is not valid or appropriate.
86. For the reasons set out above, we have therefore confirmed that all six reasons for refusal are not valid or appropriate grounds for refusing this planning application.

### **Summary & Conclusion**

87. For the reasons set out in this Statement and the accompanying Appeal Documents, including the Legal Opinion of Mr Neil Collar of Brodies Solicitors, we have established that the Planning Officer has clearly misunderstood the application proposals and misinterpreted the key planning policies.
88. These errors have led him to incorrectly assess the application proposals as being contrary to LDP Policies ED7 and HD2 when in fact the application can be supported by both policies.
89. We have also established that the Planning Officer failed to discuss the application with the applicant or his agent, and chose instead to proceed to a very early, and in our opinion, a rushed delegated refusal rather than seek any clarification from the applicant or request the submission of additional information.
90. Had he done so, the applicant would have submitted the required assessments of noise, trees and ecology matters which would have allowed the Planning Officer to address these matters positively rather than negatively.

91. We would therefore urge the LRB to reassess this planning application against the information set out above and in the accompanying appeal documents, including the legal opinion submitted by Mr Collar.
92. This will allow the LRB to assess the proposals correctly and positively, subject to conditions controlling the following matters:
1. Restricting the use of the site to timber storage with ancillary timber processing; and removing all permitted development rights to ensure that the site cannot be used for class 5 industrial or class 6 storage and distribution uses in the future.
  2. Requiring all timber to be sourced from the Scottish Borders area.
  3. Restricting the delivery and occupation of the proposed dwellinghouse/office to ensure that it is only delivered after the main timber storage operations have been established on site; and restricting the occupation of the dwellinghouse/office to occupants directly associated with the main timber storage operation.
  4. Requiring the applicant to agree suitable mitigation measures with the Council's Roads Planning Officer, such as suitable passing places or signage on the adjoining public road, and implementing the agreed measures prior to occupation of the site.
  5. Requiring the development to be implemented on site in accordance with the recommendations of the submitted arboricultural assessment prepared by Arbor Vitae Arboriculture Ltd.
  6. Requiring the development to be implemented in accordance with the recommendations of the submitted ecological assessment prepared by David Dodds Associates (to follow).
  7. Requiring the development to be implemented in accordance with the recommendations of the submitted noise impact assessment prepared by The Airshed (to follow).
93. In our opinion, the granting of a conditional planning permission can therefore be made which would allow all concerns raised by the Planning Officer to be appropriately and suitably controlled.
94. The application proposals can therefore be considered to accord with the relevant provisions of the Development Plan, and in particular LDP Policies ED7 and HD2.
95. We would therefore respectfully request on behalf of the applicant that the LRB reviews the Planning Officer's delegated refusal and upholds this appeal and grants planning permission for the proposed development, subject to the suggested conditions.

96. As noted above, we would welcome the opportunity to present oral evidence to the LRB in advance of its determination of this application and would suggest that accompanied site visits to the proposed and existing sites would be also be beneficial.
97. We also reserve the right to provide a further written response to any submitted public representations; any updated consultation responses; and any comments on this Grounds of Appeal Statement made by the Planning Officer.
98. We can also confirm that the Noise Impact Assessment and Ecological Appraisal are currently being completed and will be submitted in support of this appeal as soon as these are available.

**List of Appeal Documents:**

- PB01:** SBC Roads Planning Officer's updated response; email dated 4<sup>th</sup> October 2022
- PB02:** Photographs of existing timber yard at Loanhead
- PB03:** Photographs of Chipping Machines used at Loanhead
- PB04:** LDP Policy ED7 (highlighted)
- PB05:** Legal opinion from Mr Neil Collar, Partner and Planning Law specialist, Brodies Solicitors
- PB06:** Photographs showing proximity of housing adjacent to existing timber yard at Loanhead
- PB07:** Arboricultural Assessment prepared by Arbor Vitae Arboriculture Ltd
- PB08:** Tree Protection Plan prepared by Arbor Vitae Arboriculture Ltd
- PB09:** Noise Impact Assessment prepared by The Airshed **(TO FOLLOW)**
- PB10:** Ecology Appraisal prepared by David Dodds Associates **(TO FOLLOW)**

John Handley  
BSc (Hons), MRTPI  
Director  
John Handley Associates Ltd  
Chartered Town Planning Consultants  
Edinburgh