

Response ID ANON-7TG7-FA1X-S

Submitted to **LDP2 - Main Issues Report**

Submitted on **2019-01-26 10:32:42**

Data protection

About you

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

██████████

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:

I broadly agree with the aims as listed under para 3.8 but would make the following comments:

- SBC need to ensure adequate infrastructure (roads, health centres and GPs, primary and secondary school places, electric car charge points) are provided for BEFORE future development takes place
- Greater emphasis needed on getting people out of their cars by providing adequate public transport, and cycle lanes independent of roads;
- A more proactive approach to house design e.g. insisting solar panels are placed on roofs of south facing new builds as a requirement. Such panels are NOT just 'eco-bling' but are an essential part of our sustainable lifestyle in the Borders and elsewhere;
- The opportunity to maximise and promote tourism will be destroyed by insensitive urbanisation and ribbon development such as the proposed multi-use development in rural areas like Eshiels.

Growing our economy

Question 2

Q2:

Q2 upload:

No file was uploaded

Question 3

Settlement business allocated:

- FAR greater emphasis should be made for industrial/business development around the new railway corridor. SBC needs to be really proactive at promoting this area. This really is where investment should be concentrated. Massive amounts of public money have been injected in the railway which seems to be acting as a new lifeline to Edinburgh. It is SBC's responsibility to capitalize on this investment by promoting commercial enterprises along this corridor;
- There is also a need for SBC to be far more proactive in promoting business and housing the Reston area. If this is going to be promoted as a station on the East Coast route people need houses to live in, and the area could become attractive for industry. Currently there are just 5 houses (AREST005) suggested at Reston; this is far too few.
- There is a need to allocate business and industrial land in the Eddleston and Walkerburn areas too. Eddleston is close to Edinburgh but good connection to Peebles and is on the bus route. Walkerburn is in vital need of investment and is not that far from Peebles which is desperately short of business development opportunities.

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?:

NO!

Strongly disagree with the two 'preferred options' as listed for Eshiels (MESH1001 and MESH1002). This is certainly not 'the right development in the right place' as the MIR plan seeks to achieve. The proposal of 240 (combined) business units and houses is wrong for a number of reasons in an area where there are currently only around 20 houses:

- Eshiels is currently within the Tweed Valley 'Special Landscape Area' and is therefore due special protection from insensitive development such as those proposed;
- It will swamp the existing community. It is not of an appropriate scale, will have a major landscape impact, and will prejudice the character of the area. The proposed developments are not appropriate and counter to PMD4 and LDP2 MIR para 3.6.
- It represents unwelcomed urbanisation of the countryside which will contribute to destroying the uniqueness of the Scottish Borders countryside and biodiversity counter to Policy EP3;
- It contributes to the ribbon development linking Peebles to Cardrona along the A72. Such development is a serious contravention of the Town and Country Planning Act (Scotland) 1947 ;
- It will most significantly remove a sense of countryside experience which will impact negatively on tourism (something SBC want to promote !) as people choose not to visit Glentress for walking and cycling due to the urbanisation. This is counter to Policy ED7;
- It will remove any dark-sky experience for visitors to the area;
- It will remove around 26 hectares of good quality agricultural land (which is against Policy ED10) and with commensurate impact on agricultural employment essential to the economy of the Scottish Borders.
- It will make each household less sustainable as more fossil-fuel miles have to be made in cars to Peebles shops and schools (2.5 miles away x 240 houses x 2 cars/house = easily upwards of 1,000 miles/day!!) and of course work (60%+ commuting to Edinburgh). This is quite counter to the overall SBC objective to be more sustainable by reducing car miles (LDP2 MIR para 2.15);
- Although the proportion of industrial units to houses is not specified, it is likely to be at least 25:75 adding 180 extra houses to the area. The existing infrastructure in and around Peebles can not stand this further strain. Schools, roads and health care facilities are already at stretching point. Developments like these should not even be contemplated until permanent schools are built (NOT extra porta cabins installed), and health centre facilities are expanded including employment of additional GPs and nurses.
- Traffic along the A72 to Peebles will increase many-fold. This will represent a real hazard (safety, noise, air quality) to High School pupils obliged to walk to school since the distance is less than 3 miles (2.8m) and so a school bus place will not be provided.
- Although the two proposed areas at Eshiels are not currently in the SEPA flood risk zone this will change drastically once 26 hectares of adjacent free-drained agricultural land is removed from the equation contributing to faster run-off, markedly increasing the rate at which rainwater falling on the proposed new development reaches the Tweed. SEPA would need to investigate with revised models.
- In addition to all the above there would have to be certain local infrastructure improvements if these developments were to go ahead (i) to the road lay-out on the A72 e.g. a new roundabout (ii) new sewage provision since all existing Eshiels houses currently have their own septic tanks (iii) new water pumping station to get the water up the hill - we often have low water pressure or even lose our water altogether. I hope these necessary improvements which should be paid for EXCLUSIVELY by the developers would be sufficient to make perusing the two developments at Eshiels prohibitively expensive.

Upload Q6:

No file was uploaded

Planning for housing

Question 7

Housing agree?:

No.

I do not agree with preferred options (i) APEEB056 and (ii) APEEB009.

Together these sites would add (i) 150 and (ii) an unspecified number but likely to be in the region of 300 new houses. The 'Long Term' proposals would add even more houses if they went ahead. These figures are in addition to other developments already either approved but not built, or currently seeking approval.

There is no way Peebles infrastructure can cope with these additional houses which has been considered in conjunction with the proposed developments at Eshiels (MESH1001 & MESH1002; 240 units). An additional 500-1000 houses without investment in permanent solutions to roads, schools and health care facilities defies logic. The impact on infrastructure of new development needs to be investigated objectively. A simple letter from the roads, health or education department stating that the infrastructure can absorb new houses and their occupants is not sufficient unless current levels and proposed new levels are properly quantified and compared; real numbers need to be provided.

Upload Q7:

No file was uploaded

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

No file was uploaded

Question 9**Agree removed housing :**

No.

I feel they should be left in and SBC should do a better job of promoting these areas to developers e.g. no cost of contribution to infrastructure in these areas whilst the cost elsewhere such as Peebles is significantly (e.g. x5) increased.

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:**

I do support this option but feel SBC should enter into the spirit more.

It should be promoting the use of solar panels which can make a large contribution towards domestic electricity demand.

Also better promotion of cycle routes, buses and electric-car charging units will reduce the number of fossil-fuel miles in the Scottish Borders.

Question 14**National park:**

If there is no obvious area (which I don't think there is), then there is no need for a NP within the Scottish Borders.

There must be UK or Scottish Government criteria against which to score areas suitable for a NP in a GIS type study. The fact that you haven't suggested any areas, and I can't think of any suggests a NP in the Borders is not required.

Upload Q14:

No file was uploaded

Regeneration**Question 15****Agree redevelopment:**

YES

Redevelopment of these sites is essential for the future of the towns mentioned. It is vital that these towns are re-energised. SBC needs to help these towns where unemployment is high and vision for future growth is lacking. Development of business units here should be promoted strongly and given precedence over other 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:

I need to emphasise again that the LDP2/MIR needs to be radically re-thought. As it stands the report is FAR TOO dependent on development in Peebles where around 2/3rds of all potential future development is envisaged. This would be wrong for Peebles and very wrong for the rest of the Borders which the report ignores. The report makes no attempt to quantify (i.e use numbers) the additional load on the existing infrastructure if the various developments went ahead. It will be immense and the CURRENT infrastructure is already creaking. When one takes into account additional Peebles-based developments currently making their way through the planning system - which are not included in the MIR report - then your plans will clearly destroy Peebles. It will not function as a town without improvements to roads, schools, health care facilities, car parks and electric car charging points the proposals being suggested would demand - and these improvement are just not quantified.

And why ignore the rest of the Scottish Borders which you clearly have done so far? Why have you not paid them due regard? Is it because you commissioned a GIS study for the "Western Rural Growth: Development Options Study" and then forgot about the rest of the Borders. A similar GIS study should have been carried out across all the areas of the Borders.

The whole report has become too Peebles-centric. The citizens of Galashiels, Selkirk, Kelso and Eyemouth etc. will be dismayed you have ignored the chance of developing their towns in a sensitive,sustainable manner .

I think the whole report needs a re-think without such ridiculous weight being placed on development in Peebles, especially without any regard for improving infrastructure.

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.: