

Response ID ANON-7TG7-FA9G-G

Submitted to LDP2 - Main Issues Report

Submitted on 2019-01-28 11:54:46

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 generally agree with the main aims of the LDP2 but do not agree with many of the actual proposals,

I am a Peebles resident and fail to see how building hundreds of new homes in a town that does not have the infrastructure to cope with it will improve the area.

I have a young family and know from experience that currently most of the facilities are at capacity, even basic things like swimming lessons, cubs, brownies, biking lessons etc are near enough impossible to get your kids into without being on a 3 year waiting list.

Also with the introduction of the increased nursery hours from 2020 the nurseries will struggle to cope.

Peebles is a commuter town, with a big draw for tourism with the biking at Glentress. The landscape is a big draw for visitors, building a massive housing development on the doorstep to Glentress will diminish its appeal.

You mention improving the town centres, this needs to be a priority not an after thought. In order to keep tourists visiting our high streets need improving

Growing our economy

Question 2

Q2:

Q2 upload:

No file was uploaded

Question 3

Settlement business allocated:

I think it makes sense to concentrate business and industrial land to the settlements that have benefited from the new Railway, to make these areas prosper and become more appealing.

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 I do not agree with the proposals MESH1001 and MESH1002 for Eshiels,

This proposal completely goes against the idea of promoting tourism,

Placing a huge development at the entrance to Peebles will take away from the appeal of Peebles. Specifically in relation to Glentress, mountain biking is a sport that people travel long distances to enjoy. Speaking from experience as we used to travel from England to enjoy Glentress over 10 years ago. To travel from a city in order to enjoy being in the countryside will be considerably less appealing when Glentress is surrounded by a housing and business estate. Totally out of character for the area. This is counter to SBC policy PMD4 and LDP2 MIR para 3.6. Eshiels is designated by Nature Scotland as a 'Special Landscape Area' This specific area should be protected in order to encourage tourism.

Removal of 26 hectares of agricultural land counter to Policy ED10

Ribbon development connecting Peebles of Cardrona. Such development is a serious contravention of the Town and Country Planning Act (Scotland) 1947

Removal of 26 hectares of agricultural land counter to Policy ED1

Upload Q6:

No file was uploaded

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

No I do not agree,

Figures for proposals for Peebles seems to be disproportionate to the rest of the Borders.

Peebles is a commuter town (with out a new railway!) This will significantly increase the traffic on the roads.

Regarding Peebles (as I do not know the positions of the other towns) It is impractical to even propose additional developments without addressing the infrastructure of the town first.

Specifically relating to MESH1001 and MESH1002 proposed for Eshiels, This is an out of town location.

It is too far and dangerous (A72 is a very fast road 50 mph limit but drivers drive much faster than this) to walk with young children into Peebles. With such a significant amount of housing proposed this is counter to the overall SBC objective to be more sustainable by reducing car miles (LDP2 MIR para 2.15), especially as most new home owners will be commuters.

The area is just under the 3 miles that allows high school children free buses, so will again encourage a significant amount of cars up to the high school/ a risk of children walking along the busy A72 (50 min walk to high school)

Again, this location is too close to Glentress re detrimental to tourism.

On a personal level (which I am aware is rarely considered) Eshiels is a close community, it is a small hamlet of housing in the countryside with no street lighting polluting the sky. Despite all the practical considerations of this being an unsuitable site, 240 houses enveloping 20 houses will destroy a rare and special community.

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

Develp contrib town:

Delivering sustainability and climate change agenda

Question 13

Support alternative option:

SBC could be more proactive:

Insist on solar panels on south facing roofs

More electric car charging points

More cycle paths and good public transport

Question 14

National park:

Upload Q14:

No file was uploaded

Regeneration

Question 15

Agree redevelopment:

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:

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.: