

## Response ID ANON-7TG7-FA7Q-R

Submitted to **LDP2 - Main Issues Report**

Submitted on **2019-01-30 15:19:49**

### Data protection

#### About you

Are you responding as an: individual, organisation, or an agent acting on behalf of a client?

Individual

#### Individual

What is your name?

Individual name:

██████████

What is your address?

Address line 1:

██████████

Address line 2 :

██████████

Address line 3:

Town/City:

██████████

Post code:

██████████

What is your contact number?

Individual Phone No:

██████████

What is your email address?

Individual email:

████████████████████

### Vision aims and spatial strategy

#### Question 1

**Q1 Agree aims LDP2:**

Broadly yes.

However, the area infrastructure must match the needs of the increased population after development, BEFORE development takes place.

The plan must take account of change in age demography. The population is to increase by 1.5% over the next 10 years, but the increase in 75-74 age groups will be 6%, and the over 75 by 31%. How is SBC planning for this.

Current and estimated economic growth in the Borders relies heavily on tourism, including mountain biking. Building on open fields will surely ruin the scenic vista in Eshiels, Cardrona and Innerleithen, and will not enhance the rural development plan.

It is counter to SBC policy ED7 of encouraging tourism.

### Growing our economy

#### Question 2

**Q2:**

**Q2 upload:**

No file was uploaded

#### Question 3

**Settlement business allocated:**

SBC needs to be proactive in promoting development of business units in certain key areas :-

Particularly near the railway line to Edinburgh

Walkerburn

Near the proposed new railway station at Reston

**Upload Q3:**

No file was uploaded

**Question 4****Business Use Towns:****Upload Q4:**

No file was uploaded

**Question 5****Land delivery effectively:****Question 6****Agree?:**

I strongly disagree with proposals MESH1001 and MESH1002 proposed for Eshiels.

The proposals for the two sites exceed the number of houses/businesses for the whole of the rest of the Borders and are completely out of proportion. The proposals must be rejected for the following reasons:-Eshiels is a 'Special Landscape Area' (Nature Scotland). Totally out of character and contrary to SBC policy PMD4 and LPD2MIR para 3.6.Unwelcome urbanisation and reduction of biodiversity counter to policy EP3. Ribbon development contrary to Town and Country Planning Act(Scotland)1947. Increased traffic on busy A72 road. Removal of 26 acres of agricultural land counter to policy ED10. Risk of flooding due to development near to the floodplain and problems of sewage disposal from the sites. Additional carbon emissions as most homeowners will be commuters.This is counter to the overall SBC objective to be more sustainable by reducing car miles (LDP" MIR para2.15). Danger to school children walking on A72 (no school buses will be provided as the High School is under 3 miles from the school).

The proposals to build on these Eshiels sites make no sense on very many levels, and are contrary to many of SBC's own policies. They should be quashed.

**Upload Q6:**

No file was uploaded

**Planning for housing****Question 7****Housing agree?:**

I strongly disagree with the preferred options for additional housing sites. The proposals are much too concentrated on Peebles to the detriment of other places in the Borders, which need further development to expand business and jobs.

The infrastructure does not exist in Peebles to sustain the level of development proposed, and would ruin the nature of the town.

Particular problem areas would be:-

Inability of local schools to deal with much increased numbers of pupils.

Inability of the Medical Centre to deal with much increased number of patients.

Inability of the roads to cope with much increased traffic, and the problem of parking spaces in the town.

Inability of the existing sewage system to cope with such an increase in the population.

The need for an additional bridge over the Tweed to smooth traffic flow in the town.

The inability of a greater population to reach Borders General Hospital in the event of a blockage of the road at Dirt Pot Corner.

The infrastructure of Peebles would not cope with such a large increase in population.

Peebles is full.

**Upload Q7:**

No file was uploaded

**Question 8****Housing countryside:****Upload Q8:**

No file was uploaded

**Question 9****Agree removed housing :**

## Supporting our town centres

### Question 10

Core Activity Areas:

### Question 11

Berwickshire supermarket:

Upload Q11:

No file was uploaded

### Question 12

Develop contrib town:

## Delivering sustainability and climate change agenda

### Question 13

Support alternative option:

Yes but proposed development sites MESH1001 and MESH1002 will result in significantly more car miles as they are not adjacent to the town of Peebles and most people will commute to work in Edinburgh.

SBC could be more proactive by insisting on solar panels on south facing roofs, on more electric car charging points, and on more cycle paths and good public transport.

### Question 14

National park:

Upload Q14:

No file was uploaded

## Regeneration

### Question 15

Agree redevelopment:

Yes. Redevelopment of these sites is important for the future of the towns concerned. SBC needs to help these towns where unemployment is high. Development of business units here should be promoted strongly and given precedence over applications in areas such as Peebles which is already full, with a creaking infrastructure.

Upload Q15:

No file was uploaded

## Settlement Map

### Question 16

Oxnam settlement:

### Question 17

Core frontage Newcastleton:

## Planning policy issues

### Question 18

Agree amendments appendix3:

## Any other comments

### Question 19

Other main issues:

The MIR report concentrates far too much on development in Peebles. The MIR report would destroy Peebles, which would not function as a town without the roads, schools, and health facilities to support the proposals being made. The report makes no attempt to quantify the additional load on the existing infrastructure

if the various developments went ahead.

The report largely ignores the rest of the Scottish Borders, particularly the towns of Galashiels, Selkirk, Kelso and Eyemouth. These towns need the development, where Peebles does not.

The whole report needs a fundamental rethink to make it a lot less Peeblescentric, as with no increase in the infrastructure in Peebles, the proposals at present make no sense.

### **Landowner details**

**Have you submitted any site suggestions in this consultation?**

No

**If yes, please confirm the site and provide the landowner details (if known) for each site you have suggested.:**