

[REDACTED]

---

From: Graeme Traill [REDACTED]  
Sent: 25 March 2024 12:26  
To: Planning & Regulatory Services  
Cc: help@savekingsmeadows.org.uk  
Subject: 24/00247/FUL Objection conditions 2 and 7. I also reference planning applications 24/00030/FUL and 24/00031/FUL to which this objection also applies.

CAUTION: External Email

Sent from my iPad

I am writing to you in relation to the above noted planning applications. Please note my objections as set out below.

These applications are, I would suggest, yet another expression of a well known and classic tactic to try to extend the timescale of planning permission whilst trying to avoid the closer scrutiny that develops over time, particularly in relation to environmental issues and policies, local and national.

This most recent attempt to, yet again, extend permission quotes Section 42, to imply that any representation relating to the principle of development would not be relevant. This point of view has been tested and shown to be incorrect. This new planning application can be reconsidered, in this case including the relationship to NPF4 (particularly NPF4 policy 1). There is a clear desire by the applicant to avoid addressing the stronger environmental protections afforded by NPF4. This application is, I believe, a frivolous attempt to achieve a fresh consent and it should be rejected.

With respect to planning application 24/00030/FUL the condition as stated makes perfect sense to any reader - lay or professional. It is not ambiguous and there is clearly no need to grant the application to modify the condition. It seems, yet again, to be a risible attempt to avoid scrutiny by SBC and the people of Peebles. It should be rejected or treated as a non-material change.

In a similar vein planning application 24/00031/FUL was included to ensure that the wider and precious woodland etc of this estate, which sits in a conservation area, is protected from piecemeal removal and destruction. The condition must be retained to assure that protection. This developer has shown, as demonstrated by previous planning applications, an apparent disregard for the protection of trees or their root protection areas. There is, I would suggest, very good reason to believe that other parts of the woodland within the estate could be at risk should the application be accepted. The application should be rejected.

It is now more than 8 years since the original outline approval was granted. Since that time things have changed dramatically on a global and local scale. There is a general acceptance that we are in the midst of a climate emergency. NPF4 was developed within this context and this has helped to guide policy production within local authorities, including SBC. This rapidly changing global, national and local context should guide our planning decisions.

We now seem to be stuck, with this proposed development, in a pattern of application, rejection by SBC with conditions set for compliance, little or nothing done re compliance, an increasingly amateur application attempt to extend the permission - repeated ad nauseam. This is bizarre and appears to demonstrate a lack of competence, and is incredibly wasteful of the resources of the SBC planning department. It needs to be stopped with all three applications being rejected.

Graeme Traill  
Apartment 3  
Kingsmeadows House  
Peebles

