

**REFUSED PLANNING APPLICATION: NOTICE OF REVIEW  
REF 23/0048/RREF**

**FURTHER REPRESENTATION**

I know that I may not introduce any new material, not already included in my existing representations. Rather, the purpose of this further representation to the Local Review Board is to reinforce my position with regard to the developer's Appeal and identify the priorities among the stated grounds for my unequivocal objection.

First, access to the site. There remain serious implications for both plant traffic and subsequent domestic traffic. The lane via which access is proposed is not a "road" as described and any move to make it such would have to involve serious damage to the mature beech hedges mentioned specifically in arboricultural annexes 13 J and 14 I. There would also be clear long-term implications for local residents' safety if the Appeal were to be upheld.

Second, the considerations with regard to local and wider amenity. The grounds for the recommended Refusal are that: it is contrary to policy 6 of the National Planning Framework 4 and policies EP10 and EP13 of the Scottish Borders Local Development Plan 2016 and SBC Supplementary Planning Guidance: Trees and Development 2020; it would result in an unacceptable loss of protected trees in a historic orchard of amenity value; it would thereby compromise the character and amenity of the local area and the integrity of the Dingleton Designed Landscape; it would prejudice the health and future of the remaining trees; and it has not demonstrated any public benefit that could outweigh the loss of habitat and amenity. No action has been offered in response to these contraindications. Furthermore, I would strongly restate my objection that the developed orchard site would be clearly visible from Eildon North Hill and Mid Hill, which form part of the Eildon and Leaderfoot National Scenic Area, would lie on the routes of the Southern Upland Way, Borders Abbeys Way and St Cuthbert's Way, and would therefore have a potentially negative visual impact on the impressions of visitors to this important part of the Central Borders.

Lastly, the appearance of the proposed house. So far we, its immediate neighbours, have had no indication at all of its size or design. Since all adjacent buildings (Ivanhoe, Woodstock, Lammermuir, Chiefswood Court, Dingleton Cottages) are constructed in uniform stone, assurance is needed that acceptance of the Appeal and consequent Permission in Principle would be accompanied by the opportunity for us and others who are less immediately adjacent but definitely neighbours to comment formally on the external appearance of the proposed house (number of storeys; height to roof peak; building materials; treatment of door and window frames; colour of render; and so on) especially given the vernacular pastiche of the same developer's Trimontium Heights.

To sum up, I totally support all six neighbours' objections other than my own (see 23/00492/PPP – OBJECTIONS), especially the very clear and cogently argued submission by Jonathan Leeming, and re-state in the strongest terms my unequivocal objection to the developer's Appeal, which offers no material change whatever to the existing Application in response to the Council's Refusal of Planning Permission.

**END**