

## Response ID ANON-7TG7-FA9J-K

Submitted to LDP2 - Main Issues Report  
Submitted on 2019-01-27 19:40:54

### 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:

Yes, on the whole.

However, there are several factors that SBC need to carefully consider:

- Housing design needs to take into consideration new technology such as electrical car charging points, wind and solar
- SBC policy ED7 of encouraging tourism - Building new houses beside growing tourist destinations such as Glentress will cause light pollution, and will have a negative impact on the customer experience of the tourist attraction
- Any anticipated population growth due to housing must surely have to be planned for with adequate levels of investment in supporting infrastructure & services

### Growing our economy

#### Question 2

Q2:

I have nothing to comment.

**Q2 upload:**

No file was uploaded

**Question 3****Settlement business allocated:**

Yes, definitely....in two specific areas:

1. We've recently seen substantial investment in the Borders Railway. Allocation of business units near to this would be sensible, given the travel requirements of employees and customers.
2. In towns and communities where employment is low following the demise of traditional Border industries such as the Woollen trade. An example of this is Walkerburn.

**Upload Q3:**

No file was uploaded

**Question 4****Business Use Towns:**

Not in a position to comment

**Upload Q4:**

No file was uploaded

**Question 5****Land delivery effectively:**

No comment

**Question 6****Agree?:**

No, I don't agree with proposals MESH1001 and MESH1002 for Eshiels for the following reasons:

1. The number of houses proposed is disproportionate to the total number of proposed houses planned for the whole of the Borders (as identified at the consultation meeting at the Burgh Hall in Peebles)
2. We have several (around 15) young school children along with elderly people in the community of Eshiels and increasing traffic and congestion on the A72 would be dangerous and irresponsible. It's already bad enough with cars speeding and overtaking on the straight between Glentress and Eshiels Recycling Centre.
3. The proposed dwellings will remove around 26 hectares of agricultural land - counter to Policy ED10
4. The land adjacent to the proposed dwellings is prone to flooding, and this has often encroached onto the A72 road. With rising water tables and wet weather, 26 hectares of tarmac'd land would need significant investment in drainage for the whole area.
5. Eshiels is a designated 'Special Landscape Area' (Nature Scotland)
6. The proposed plans are out of character for the setting of Eshiels. This is also goes against SBC policy PMD4 and LDP2 MIR para 3.6.
7. Negative impact on biodiversity in the area which is counter to Policy EP3
8. The proposed number of dwellings would have a detrimental impact on sewage processing at Eshiels Recycling Centre, along with the ability to process all waste from these dwellings
9. Developing Eshiels will blur the separation between Cardrona and Peebles. Surely this goes against the Town and Country Planning Act (Scotland) 1947
10. the majority of home owners within the new proposed dwellings will be commuters and this will have a substantial impact on the quality of the roads between Eshiels and Edinburgh, as well as increasing car miles (counter to SBC's objective to reduce car miles (LDP2 MIR para 2.15)
11. It's counter to Policy ED7. As I mentioned previously, Glentress is becoming a jewel in the crown for Scottish Mountain Biking, as well as being increasingly used for walking, running and camping. The proposed dwellings will have a substantially negative impact on the attractiveness of Glentress as a tourist destination, and being able to deliver a positive experience for customers.
12. There needs to be significant investment in Peebles High School before any significant expansions to the local population can be considered. In S1 alone this year the intake was 244 children (more than the total number of High School kids at Jedburgh). The capacity of the High School is now around 85% and rising fast.

13. Haylodge Health Centre is becoming more and more stretched, with growing waiting times for appointments and doctors struggling with processing an increasing number of patients (especially given the ageing population). It would take 500 new houses to justify increasing the health centre budget to recruit 1 additional GP (as confirmed by a senior Doctor on the evening of the recent consultation). The proposed dwellings would be completely irresponsible given this situation.

14. There is currently 1 ambulance covering the area. This again would be completely compromised with the proposed dwellings.

**Upload Q6:**

No file was uploaded

## Planning for housing

### Question 7

**Housing agree?:**

No.

For all the 14 reasons I mentioned in my answer to Question 6 in my response.

**Upload Q7:**

No file was uploaded

### Question 8

**Housing countryside:**

Nothing more to add.

**Upload Q8:**

No file was uploaded

### Question 9

**Agree removed housing :**

No.

I don't understand why you're proposing to remove them.

Again, Peebles is bursting at the seams. More consideration should be being given to other sites such as Eddlestone where there is local infrastructure in place (Primary School) which is UNDER-utilised.

## Supporting our town centres

### Question 10

**Core Activity Areas:**

No comment

### Question 11

**Berwickshire supermarket:**

Not in a position to comment

**Upload Q11:**

No file was uploaded

### Question 12

**Develp contrib town:**

No comment

## Delivering sustainability and climate change agenda

### Question 13

**Support alternative option:**

In principle yes, but the SBC could be more proactive as I have already mentioned:

- Utilising wind and solar power in housing design
- Greater provision to support an increasing availability of electric cars

- More investment in cycling paths and walkways
- Greater investment in electric powered public transport

#### Question 14

**National park:**

Yes, I support this.

Surely Glentress would be an ideal spot for this given the diverse wildlife, amazing scenery and access from Edinburgh.

**Upload Q14:**

No file was uploaded

### Regeneration

#### Question 15

**Agree redevelopment:**

Yes, definitely.

These towns need investment to increase the quality of life for existing and future inhabitants. Investment in business units would also help generate employment to sustain each ecosystem.

**Upload Q15:**

No file was uploaded

### Settlement Map

#### Question 16

**Oxnam settlement:**

No comment

#### Question 17

**Core frontage Newcastleton:**

No comment

### Planning policy issues

#### Question 18

**Agree amendments appendix3:**

No comment

### Any other comments

#### Question 19

**Other main issues:**

The key issue is that the plans are putting far too much emphasis on Peebles and the surrounding area.

I accept that more land needs to be allocated for housing. The Scottish Borders is a large area...4,732 Km2 to be exact.

There are other towns such as Hawick, Kelso, Selkirk and Eyemouth that also require foresight, to help them develop and become more sustainable in the years ahead.

Focussing on Peebles takes a disproportionate amount of resource away from these other border communities. That's not ethical or fair.

In terms of the current plans, these need to be completely rethought. The impact on Eshiels and Peebles would be disastrous and completely irresponsible, especially the impact on the local 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.:**