
From: richard mackie [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 July 2023 18:58
To: Planning & Regulatory Services
Subject: objection to planning application 23/01007PPP
Attachments: image 1.png; image 2.jpg; image 3.jpg; image 4.jpg; image 5.jpg; image 6.jpg; image 7.jpg; image 8.jpg; image 9.jpg; image 10.jpg

Importance: High

CAUTION: External Email

Mos Eisley
Teviothead
Hawick
TD9 0LG
16.7.23

Dear Sir/Madam,

I refer to your letter dated 6.7.23 regarding planning application number 23/01007/PPP and the proposed development of land east of Mos Eisley.

I wish to object to the proposal for the following reasons and ask that the council take them into consideration and reject the application.

1. Water

The three existing properties are connected to the same private water supply. There is already concern that the windfarms will have a negative affect on our water supply due to the massive concrete bases required to hold them. There will be less ground water available for private supplies without the addition to a fourth property on the same supply.

The next supply over from us at Carlenrig ran dry only a couple of years ago. While we were fortunate enough not to, adding a fourth property at the proposed site will greatly increase the chances of this.

Has a survey been conducted to assess the suitability of another property with regards to the existing water supply and storage tanks? A survey should include an assessment of the existing springs, current water storage tanks and the negative affect the windfarms could have on the supply. While I see that Scottish Water has been consulted, the documents are 'unavailable at this time' to be viewed via the councils website

2. Not in keeping with existing buildings

While stated in the application a number of times that the existing three properties are 'rowed', It should be noted that while the existing three properties are adjacent, the domiciles however, very much are not (image 1.).

As can be seen in image 1, Beadles cottage sits significantly further back than the other two (and at a much lower elevation). As such, Beadle's cottage cannot be seen at all from either the dwellings at Mos Eisley or the Old School House or even from their respective grounds.

As also can be seen from image 1., The Old School House sits toward the front of the property and Mos Eisley to the rear of it's own. Neither Mos Eisley nor the Old School House have any windows at all facing one and other and these three houses, therefore, enjoy a significant degree of privacy from one and other.

At the closest point, the building of Mos Eisley is 15 metres away from The Old School House. The proposed plans show a dwelling significantly closer to Mos Eisley than this (image 2). The Old School House only just appears in image2 and it is clear that the proposed building will sit significantly closer to Mos Eisley than this. Adding a fourth dwelling directly adjacent to Mos Eisley is very much not in keeping with the current dwellings at this site. Mos Eisley would have a total of three windows and two glass windowed doors directly facing the

new property. One of which would be directly facing the new building and a balcony/balcony door directly overlooking it (image 3,4,5 and 6)

Also from the plans, the proposed building is significantly larger than the existing three. It certainly appears to be much larger than Mos Eisley which is currently the largest of the three buildings having formally been a school. The proposed building looks to be almost double the size of The Old School House and Beadle's cottage. It should be noted that the building at the West of The Old School House is a shed and not part of the house itself. Is there an estimated square footage of the proposed new building? And how does it compare to the existing three?

3. Overlooking

As can be seen from image 7, Mos Eisley has a balcony at the East side of the building. This balcony clearly overlooks the entirety of the proposed development. While the proposed building terminates prior to the balcony, should one be constructed, there will still be clear privacy issues for both buildings. There couldn't be a better example of one property overlooking another.

4. Light

While I note from the plans that the proposed property terminates about midway the length of Mos Eisley, a hedge row etc. at such close proximity to maintain privacy would have a large negative effect on the natural light coming in to Mos Eisley. It should be noted that image 3, 4, 5 and 6 were all taken while standing on the proposed site. This shows just how close a hedge row would be at the boundary on the proposed development. Any foliage extending above the existing wall will negatively affect the light coming into these windows and glass door.

Please note that the kitchen door (image 4), while not the front door, is the main entrance to Mos Eisley. This door and the surrounding windows are the largest that allow light to enter the kitchen. Image 5 is the only window into our utility room which would also be negatively affected. Image 3 is a living room window which will also be negatively affected not just by foliage, but by the proposed building itself.

It seems to me that should the proposal go ahead, residents of Mos Eisley will be left with the choice to either significantly lose light or significantly lose privacy.

5. Privacy

One of my biggest concerns regarding the proposed development is privacy. As you can see from image 8, Anyone stood on the rear of the proposed property will have a direct view up to the balcony of Mos Eisley. The access door to the balcony opens into the master bedroom of Mos Eisley. My wife and I choose to have this door open most of the time and leave it open through the night the year round.

Even if the proposed development has no windows directly facing Mos Eisley, anyone just standing on the site in the garden to the rear will have a clear view of the balcony and straight into my bedroom. Image 8 was also taken while standing on the proposed site. There is a clear view into the bedroom and you can clearly see one of my children sitting on my bed. Image 9 was taken from the back of the bedroom and shows a clear view through to the proposed site.

It would take a tree line of almost forty feet to maintain privacy to the bedroom which would obviously come with an even more unacceptable loss of light.

I consider a new property to be located here to be one of the grossest intrusions of privacy imaginable and I urge you to reject the proposal.

6. Rare/endangered species

I believe that the survey to check for rare and endangered species is inadequate. Prior to Mos Eisley being occupied, a section of wall on the boundary began to fall. Rather than repair it, the local farmer at the time

simply elected to move the field fence further back. This created a small space of 'no mans land' which has since bloomed with wild flowers (image 10)

This small area attracts a range of butterflies including the rare Scotch Argus which is only found in the Northern parts of England and Scotland. The proposed development on this site would remove this mini habitat altogether and obviously have a detrimental effect on this rare species.

While I, unfortunately, have no photographic evidence of this butterfly, I have seen it on numerous occasions in this area and I believe that, at the very least, a full survey of this area should be done again with this rare species in mind. The initial survey was clearly not adequate.


A potential solution

For all the reasons stated above, I believe the current development should not go ahead. However, I would like to express my interest in purchasing the proposed plot of land myself. This would be strictly for agricultural use and the intention would be to make the entire area a mini wildlife haven with particular attention given to the local bee and butterfly population.

My intention would be to fill the area with bee and butterfly friendly flora and also to add beehives. Please note, this would not be for commercial purposes. Any existing flora would remain completely untouched.

Provided the existing flora is allowed to remain and a full survey done to assess the suitability of the water supply, I would have no objection to a property development on the east boundary of the current proposed area. I feel that it would be sufficiently far enough away from Mos Eisley to address my other concerns.

If my purchasing the proposed plot is something you would consider, please don't hesitate to get in touch.
Kind regards,

Richard Mackie
Occupier
Mos Eisley
Teviothead
Hawick
TD9 0LG


Cc Watson McAteer – councillor Watson.McAteer@scotborders.gov.uk
Cc Tom Prescott – Head of Conservation for Butterfly Conservation Scotland
tprescott@butterfly-conservation.org
cc Fay Wilkinson Butterfly Conservation Scotland fay@ecosse.net
Cc John Lamont MP john.lamont.mp@parliament.uk

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows



Frostle Burn



A7

A7

A7

A7

A7

















