

[REDACTED]

---

From: localreview  
Sent: 21 February 2023 15:34  
To: Planning Appeals  
Subject: FW: FURTHER OBJECTIONS / SUBMISSION - LOCAL REVIEW PROCEDURE 23/00001/RREF ON REFUSAL OF PLANNING APPLICATION 22/00933/FUL

Hi Laura

E-mail with picture as discussed.

Fiona

Fiona Henderson  
Democratic Services Officer  
Democratic Services  
Resources  
Council Headquarters  
NEWTOWN ST BOSWELLS TD6 0SA  
📞 DDI : 01835 826502  
✉️ [fhenderson@scotborders.gov.uk](mailto:fhenderson@scotborders.gov.uk)

---

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: 15 February 2023 12:52  
To: localreview <localreview@scotborders.gov.uk>  
Subject: FURTHER OBJECTIONS / SUBMISSION - LOCAL REVIEW PROCEDURE 23/00001/RREF ON REFUSAL OF PLANNING APPLICATION 22/00933/FUL

**CAUTION: External Email**

FURTHER OBJECTIONS / SUBMISSION – LOCAL REVIEW PROCEDURE 23/00001/RREF ON REFUSAL OF PLANNING APPLICATION 22/00933/FUL  
TIMBER STORAGE AND PROCESSING FACILITY – LAND TO THE WEST OF WEST LOCH FARMHOUSE PEEBLES

Further to our original objections to the above Planning Application, you have given us until 17<sup>th</sup> February 2023 to submit any objections or comments for consideration at the upcoming Local Review Procedure Meeting.

Following the applicant's appeal submission and late submission of a Noise Study, we wish to submit the following further objections and comments:-

1. The application proposal is without doubt an “industrial process” and should not be permitted to be re-located from the existing storage and processing yard near Loanhead, to this beautiful and tranquil country location near West Loch Farm – it will be completely alien to this rural environment.  
Yes, the felling of trees and removal from forests is a “forestry” activity (obvious) but from this point onwards in the process, when the lumber is removed to a central storage and processing yard, the noisy and dirty industrial process starts.
2. The existing storage and processing yard near Loanhead is huge – see aerial photo courtesy of Bing maps below.



The existing yard is approximately 15000sq.m / 3.7acres.

The application site (outlined in red) is stated at 1.98ha / 4.90acres so already considerably larger from the outset.

The application map also shows two further large areas of land (outlined in blue) in the ownership or control of the applicant – clearly future long-term expansion is being catered for here and if the original proposals is allowed to become established, it may become an even larger misfit and bad neighbour to this beautiful rural community.

3. The only access to the site is via an unclassified roadway but it is very narrow and steep in places and even with the addition of new passing places it is clearly unsuitable for large haulage vehicles - such as can be seen on the applicant's own web site.  
Also, the frequency, type and size of deliveries to and from the site can never be properly policed, so attempting to condition any proposal by stating delivery numbers is futile.
4. The recent legal and appeal submissions by the applicant's team have been easily pulled apart and dismissed by others better qualified already so I won't double up here by repeating most of the facts. However, I would like to comment on the recent Noise Report submitted as follows –
  - The carefully crafted Noise Report clearly states that the (industrial) processes proposed here will generate lots of noise and that substantial mitigating measures will be required. This was and still is one of the biggest issues faced with the existing processing site at Loanhead.  
However 5m high perimeter bunding round the proposed site demonstrates the extent of the problem with the application proposals – this is clearly an extreme measure and will in itself, be alien to the beautiful area and the proposed residential cluster already approved for the derelict farm steading.
  - There is no realistic way of policing the adequacy or application of other mitigating measures (technical) proposed in the noise report - this will then be left to the neighbours to constantly complain (as at their existing site) when noise levels became unacceptable. This would be wholly unacceptable.
5. The applicant's appeal documents state (not verbatim) that, regardless of the merits of the timber "processing" parts of the application, the application for the addition of an a house should not have also been refused. This is not the case, because the approved application (17/01462/FUL) for the conversion of the old West Lock Farm Steading maxed out the permitted three new houses permitted in the cluster under the Policy.
6. Finally, the Planning Department have already supported and approved the development of a sustainable cluster of residential buildings immediately and in worryingly short distance of the appeal site, so permitting such a large, noisy, dirty and disruptive industrial storage and processing yard under this appeal could jeopardise the viability of this residential approval.

We would therefore respectfully request that this appeal be dismissed and for the refusal of the Planning Application to stand.

Please acknowledge receipt of this submission.

J & B Hamilton