

Response ID ANON-7TG7-FA25-Q

Submitted to LDP2 - Main Issues Report

Submitted on 2019-01-28 12:27:50

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:

Aims identified are difficult to disagree with.

However, the generality of language used is worrying as it allows for broad interpretations not necessarily properly quantified in the rest of the document. Are the aims hierarchical? ie 'Growing our Economy' preeminent? '

I would add:

1. Integrity of approach - planning committee really looks at impact on their suggested areas for industrial and housing development in reality rather than as a box ticking exercise having 'talked to' eg transport, education, health who have no real idea of what is happening on the ground but rely on sets of statistics
2. Ensuring equality of impact of aims of LDP2 across the borders
ie not being in the thrall of developers and going with what is best for them but unfair in particular areas either because they are ignoring any building or development for economic growth in some areas which would welcome and benefit whilst swamping other areas eg large number housing planning in a small number of places rather than an equitable divide
3. Effective joined up thinking ie working with a range of partners is not a stated aim although the inference is there and examples are mentioned throughout the document. What about , in addition, eg talking to Forestry Commission, Mountain Bike Centre etc looking at current planning eg 5 years against forward planning eg for 10 - 20 years eg railway corridor .

Growing our economy

Question 2

Q2:

I have not sufficient knowledge to be able to comment on this question

Q2 upload:

No file was uploaded

Question 3

Settlement business allocated:

1. As mentioned in the LDP2 - the railway corridor seems the obvious place to concentrate business and industrial development for common sense, environmental and transport link purposes. Housing could then follow to assist use of public transport, in tis instance the railway. It would help to know if the mooted extension of the railway is likely to happen as planning could then really be fit for the 21st century - and allow forward thinking.
2. Otherwise - assuming that infrastructure, roads etc allow, REALLY allow - then additional development next to eg Cavalry Park in Peebles for a LIMITED number of units would minimise impact elsewhere . There will be similar places - some already identified in other areas

Upload Q3:

No file was uploaded

Question 4

Business Use Towns:

No comment

Upload Q4:

No file was uploaded

Question 5

Land delivery effectively:

1. If there is land adjacent to current usage eg industrial estates, or areas which are specialist in nature eg the craft cottages at Abbotsford - then surely that should be investigated. Glentress could be a case in point - please see my point in answer to Q1. Tourism sites could host a small number of related industries or retail outlets in relevant places which could be beneficial to the attraction and minimise the visual downsides of industrial parks dotting the countryside whilst answering the need for economic development
2. As above for agricultural usage. Much of the land designated for industrial (and housing)development is agricultural. Is there scope for additional economic opportunities allied to existing farming development?

Question 6

Agree?:

1. I cannot think that a mixture of industry and housing cheek by jowl would be welcome - certainly to the householders.
2. Very suspicious where no indication of site capacity given eg Greenlaw (especially as Greenlaw appears later in the document for house building), Galashiels although it would appear to be a sensible use of such a site
3. Duns - far too big a suggested development
4. Eshiels MESH1001 and MESH1002 - far too big a suggested development in a badly chosen location
 - (i) The proposed mixed use sites at Eshiels would detract from the approach to Glentress and Peebles from the east. One of the delights of the eastern entrance to Peebles are the open spaces, fields, woodland etc on the north side of the road which is a plus for the town and a bonus for holiday makers and Glentress users. Why condemn Peebles to being another town with mass development on its outskirts.
 - (ii)The number of units suggested would swamp the existing hamlet and cause logistical problems. To quote from the document: "In essence this policy approach is to prevent a proliferation of houses which would have a cumulative detrimental impact on the Scottish Borders countryside. " So 350+ houses/ industrial units in an area which currently has something like 50 dwellings is OK? The visual, environmental impact plus infrastructure issues surely all has a detrimental effect on Eshiels and Peebles as a special scenic area and as a whole as a place to live and visit and spend one's money"!
 - (iii) Infrastrucure locally and towards and in Peebles could not cope with these proposals - and eg Boders General Hospital the other!
 - (iv) The introduction of light pollution for the first time and vastly extended fossil fuel pollution is a travesty given the nature of the current hamlet
 - (v) This is in the nature of extension of a type of ribbon development , certainly infill and is definitely overdevelopment as the proposals stand.

Short sighted in the extreme.

Upload Q6:

No file was uploaded

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

1. SESplan Proposed Plan HLR for Scottish Borders (2021/22 to 2030/31) identifies the need for 3,841 houses in the Borders . Equity and fairness suggests that these should be spread across the terrain to enable the additional housing to boost all areas. Concentration of eg 10%+ of the total in Eshiels plus the additional allocation to Peebles, Cardrona etc deprives other areas of life blood whilst putting too great a strain on the infrastructure, attractiveness and amenities of Peebles and environs. SESPlan itself says Peebles (read and its Environs) has had more than its fair share of development.

2. The concentration of so much housing in the Walkerburn to Peebles corridor goes against some of the stated aims and intentions elsewhere in this document "Whilst supporting such proposals which can help economic growth and local village services, this must be weighed up against matters such as the protection of the Scottish Borders countryside and sustainable travel principles. The Scottish Borders has outstanding scenic qualities within its landscape and planning policy seeks to protect it. " Please do!

"In essence this policy approach is to prevent a proliferation of houses which would have a cumulative detrimental impact on the Scottish Borders countryside. "

As stated earlier - So 350+ houses/ industrial units in an area which currently has something like 50 dwellings is OK? The visual, environmental impact plus infrastructure issues surely all has a detrimental effect on Eshiels and Peebles as a whole as a place to live and visit and spend one's money"!

3. Infrastructure issues include use of A72 and the need for traffic measure to allow right turns onto a main road for all the people in the new appallingly huge Eshiels if this madness goes ahead; consequent slowing of moving traffic; the knock on effect of not enough parking provision in Peebles as it stands so more double parking or going on to Straiton with the consequent negative effect to the vibrancy and economic health of Peebles' businesses; sewage - can the plant cope (assuming all these new houses are to be on mains water and sewage?); health - GP services are already woefully over subscribed if the length of time it takes to get an appointment is anything to go by and The Borders General is already overstretched in many specialisms ; education - High School overcrowding and issues are well known - primary services would become overstretched ; social care; policing - more people , more needs â■■■■...

Alternatives:

1. - Look at small scale improvements to small towns eg derelict buildings eg on outskirts of Hydro in Peebles, unused shops (unused for a significant time periods) and use powers to purchase and revamp for business, commercial or residential purposes. This stops 'urban sprawl' , improves the localities and utilises what can be eyesores and sad buildings. This may only net a few hundred of the required units but would save open fields being lost

2. - Biting the bullet and building a small new town somewhere on the Edinburgh Rd to the north of Eddleston. Most people in the Peebles area travel to Edinburgh for work and frequently for recreation. A properly planned new town with decent links and infrastructure would be an exciting project for developers and meet most of the needs in the MIR eg

"The Council's Local Housing Strategy 2017 to 2022 identifies a number of issues to be addressed, including availability of further affordable housing, provision of housing for the elderly, the poor accessibility of housing to allow younger people to remain in the Borders and the need for the supply of housing to reflect demand (i.e. the right housing in the right place). "

Start from scratch - do it properly and not attempt another piecemeal bodge.

3. Develop for the people of the Borders not for the pockets of the developers!

Upload Q7:

No file was uploaded

Question 8**Housing countryside:**

1. The wording very much depends on the definition of 'appropriate'

" whereby there must be the existence of a building group of at least 3 houses from which a proposal must be considered an appropriate addition."

How can 250 - 350 units in a hamlet of 50 odd houses be deemed 'appropriate'? Yet there it is as a preferred option vis a vis Eshiels!

2. I cannot see the sense in restricting possibilities of helping meet the housing quota by rejecting the alternative provision - especially given the provisos stated.

" provided it is considered the design is of an exceptionally high standard and other policy requirements relating to appropriate setting, design and materials are satisfied. "

Upload Q8:

No file was uploaded

Question 9**Agree removed housing :**

Agree with proposed removal from LPD

Also add

1. Peebles (p68 & p72) due to

a) huge contribution Peebles has already made to housing stock over the past few years

- b) lack of second bridge and hugely overstretched and inadequate infrastructure (transport, access, ingress, egress, parking, sewage facilities, health provision, education especially the High School which is at 95% capacity and been turned down for renewal for 15 years. NB The glib throwaway 'need for temporary classrooms' made at the public meeting shows a complete lack of awareness of what constitutes an effective education and education provision)
- c) the area identified near South Park would make better provision for light industrial units except for the existence of the reasons quoted above

2. Eshiels (MESH1001 MESH1002)p 35 &36) ALL THE ABOVE ISSUES are relevant to these proposed mixed development as any additional housing of this magnitude would have a deleterious effect on the character and working of not only Eshiels but Peebles:

(i)Eshiels' option is completely disproportionate to the overall requirements (3841) and in terms of Peebles itself especially as the Scottish Governments decision to mothball the second bridge has kiboshed north of river Tweed developments

Eshiels is on septic tank waste - - can the treatment plant cope with this amount of houses

(ii) Eshiels is a dark sky area - light pollution should be avoided at all cost including for those visitors to Glentress Wigwams looking for an unspoilt, unpolluted stay

(iii) Eshiels is the gateway to Peebles - this would be visually spoilt completely by a modern cramped housing estate - off putting to prospective visitors especially those thinking of staying at the three holiday cottages in Upper Eshiels and the B&B in Lower Eshiels . Rural Development Plan open vistas principle seems to be in opposition to this development.

(iii)Eshiels has no amenities. Residents go into Peebles and turn right to do so. Many people of working age who live in the Peebles area including Eshiels go to Edinburgh - turning right onto the A72. Another 400 ish cars mostly turning right at least once a day would be a nightmare even if there were lights/ a roundabout provided . Has a traffic survey been done? Has there been modelling of the increased usage vis a vis potential hotspots and accidents that would be created?

(iv)Eshiels' proposed development would seem to run counter to the following statement in the MIR ' this must be weighed up against matters such as the protection of the Scottish Borders countryside and sustainable travel principles. The Scottish Borders has outstanding scenic qualities within its landscape and planning policy seeks to protect it.'

And 'this policy approach is to prevent a proliferation of houses which would have a cumulative detrimental impact on the Scottish Borders countryside.'

Supporting our town centres

Question 10

Core Activity Areas:

1. Retain Core Activity Areas with the existing primary aim to promote retail activity but extend the remit to encourage other elements that would bring footfall - eg use of premises for entertainment, tourist information, joint ventures, destination experiences eg cookery school etc that would bring people in and hopefully improve the business of the retail units.

2. Do not remove the concept of Core Activity Areas

Question 11

Berwickshire supermarket:

Not qualified to comment on this issue

Upload Q11:

No file was uploaded

Question 12

Develp contrib town:

1. In principle - no, if the development is in excess of a particular amount of money. It is vital that developers give something back. The amount would have to be arrived at by experts!

However - for smaller development - perhaps eg there is one first floor and one ground floor ex cafe in Peebles that have gone out of business. Converting those to living accommodation would seem sensible, small scale and a contribution would not be necessary

Delivering sustainability and climate change agenda

Question 13

Support alternative option:

1. Preferred option supported and developers need to sign up to and actually deliver on low carbon construction, sustainable materials, their energy use and energy sources and that of whatever development they are building, noise nuisance both in construction and in the buildings themselves, ecological enhancement.

2. The dismissive use of the term 'eco bling' by a member of the planning team at a public consultation meeting does not augur well for how seriously the Borders Council and its Planning Team take this aspect of the planning 'agenda'! It would seem absolutely vital that best practice and beyond should take the Borders into the second half of the 21st century with as little detriment to the area and planet as possible. We should be thinking about future generations.

3. Planning permission should fully consider wider or future impacts in the widest sense eg will developments have recharging points for electric cars, ground source heat pumps - never mind solar panels eg as standard . Mentioning them but not insisting on them will mean they won't happen

Question 14

National park:

Yes

Two - one to the east and one to the west so coastal and hill country

Upload Q14:

No file was uploaded

Regeneration

Question 15

Agree redevelopment:

I do not know enough about these sites but the principle outlined seems sound.

Upload Q15:

No file was uploaded

Settlement Map

Question 16

Oxnam settlement:

Yes - as long as the people of Oxnam are agreed

Question 17

Core frontage Newcastleton:

No view on this

Planning policy issues

Question 18

Agree amendments appendix3:

Not qualified to judge - just hope that the principles of fairness and equality and consideration of impact both positive and negative and what is actually best for current residents are driving the decision making for the need for domestic and industrial development and not the other way round. The process should not be the driving force, people and the environment should.

Any other comments

Question 19

Other main issues:

1. Proposed development sites and increased use of cars - specific transport studies - eg town sites more environmentally friendly whereas rural sites increase fossil fuel miles. Environmental damage caused by increase in number of vehicles; inadequate road systems; prejudice to highway safety. Have PROPER surveys been done?

(When considering MESH1001, MESH1002 and Peebles generally - this pertains. A72 is already 50 mph and any traffic calming measures eg roundabout/ lights which would be necessary for traffic 'flow' (or not) when dealing with MESH1001, 1002 will be prejudicial to ease of transit, safety, access west)

2. Other considerations regarding the strain on infrastructure need to be taken seriously and not pooh poohed eg transport issues, health, education, water, electricity, gas, sewage, movement and delivery.

(Please read points made re transport, parking, health and social care, education elsewhere in this document with specific reference to MESH1001, MESH1002 and Peebles generally, All of the above will suffer more than acceptable strain and issues were the development to go ahead. They are already at breaking point)

3. Environmental issues, sustainability and climate change merit a chapter in the LDP2. Previous developments do not seem to have been carried out to these criteria. Now is the time to change that and ensure developers answer this need. Please read points made about environmental issues, sustainability and climate change earlier in the document. This is not a bonus add on - it is vital to the health and well being of people in the area and the planet as a whole.

3. Destruction of character of areas by the introduction of housing estates into existing small settlements; visual damage to the landscape; conflict with the character of the area; loss of open spaces thus hurting the tourist industry which is vital to the Borders; the loss of agricultural land which may become very important given Brexit are all vitally important to be considered when deciding on development sites.

(In terms of MESH1001, MESH1002 and Peebles generally, the above pertains. Glentress and the lodges, bikers and walkers will be impacted upon negatively by large housing estates literally over the fence, The impact on Peebles as a tourist destination will be negative as the independent villages/ hamlets of Walkerburn, Innerleithen, Cardrona, Eshiels and Peebles - no doubt eventually continuing to Eddleston - become indistinguishable one from the other and 'urban sprawl' is the result. Why would anyone have Eshiels or Peebles as a holiday destination under those circumstances?
' To prevent a proliferation of houses which would have a cumulative detrimental impact on the Scottish Borders countryside; (to quote LPD2) is a basic planning duty and consideration) .

4. Specific plans within LDP2 eg Provision for sheltered accommodation for the elderly are just not there - clearly a HUGE need given the demographics and figures stated in the document or are the over 65s of no interest to SBC? Very little in the LDP2 about this. Might also then free up other housing stock to bring in younger householders and families which would contribute to increased vibrancy, economic footfall across the demographic range and assist the viability of town centres.

(This is especially true of Peebles and its environs and whilst the attempt to bring in a younger demographic is laudable - not at the expense of the older! Perhaps some more creative thinking that throwing up yet another housing estate or four is not - could arrive at an over arching solution rather than same old, same old..)

5. Flooding issues mentioned frequently and given climate change - need to be taken much more seriously and looking forward rather than just 5/10 years!

6. Please look again at the railway and possibly extended railway corridor as prime development for all sort of good reasons!

Landowner details

Have you submitted any site suggestions in this consultation?

Yes

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

In general in and around Peebles