

Response ID ANON-7TG7-FA42-P

Submitted to LDP2 - Main Issues Report

Submitted on 2019-01-31 13:09:16

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:

no comment

Growing our economy

Question 2

Q2:

no comment

Q2 upload:

No file was uploaded

Question 3

Settlement business allocated:

no comment

Upload Q3:

No file was uploaded

Question 4**Business Use Towns:**

no comment

Upload Q4:

No file was uploaded

Question 5**Land delivery effectively:**

no comment

Question 6**Agree?:**

No I strongly disagree for the following reasons:

1. The proposal is totally out of character and size in comparison to the immediate local area and existing settlement. This is counter to SBC policy PMD4 and LDP2 MIR para 3.6.
2. This proposal starts the ball rolling for the development of a housing corridor between Peebles and Cardrona and ultimately Innerleithen which is contrary to Town and Country Planning Act (Scotland) 1947
3. The impact on the surrounding recreational area of Glentress and surrounding countryside on outdoor activities will be adversely effect. This appears to be is counter to Policy ED7
4. There will be a significant impact with traffic volumes on local main road A72 which has recently had a lower speed restriction put in force to improve safety on this road
5. There will be a direct loss of current agricultural land which I believe is counter to Policy ED10
6. Local sewage utility and flooding risk would be a major concern
7. The location of the site will mean the majority of housing if not all will be heavily reliant on private vehicles which does not make this proposal a more sustainable in accordance with LDP2 MIR para 2.15
8. The significant numbers of houses in this development where school aged children reside will increase the risk of accidents in their daily commute to school as there is no special provision to protect them or separate them from vehicles travelling at speed on the main road.

Upload Q6:

No file was uploaded

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

No

It is a fact from studying the proposed figures for housing development in the plan that across the Scottish Borders area Peebles is being loaded with housing disproportionately. The current infrastructure will not sustain this level of development and as been quoted in the local press and social media Peebles is full. It is my opinion that this plan has been constructed with the Housing Developers / Builders in mind knowing where the houses will sell in the short but no consideration given to the unsustainable nature of this plan.

Upload Q7:

No file was uploaded

Question 8**Housing countryside:**

No comment

Upload Q8:

No file was uploaded

Question 9**Agree removed housing :**

No comment

Supporting our town centres**Question 10**

Core Activity Areas:

No comment

Question 11**Berwickshire supermarket:**

No 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:**

No comment

Question 14**National park:**

No comment

Upload Q14:

No file was uploaded

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

No comment

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:**

I attended the Peebles Public Consultation evening back in Dec'18 and would like to follow up on 2 points raised.

Firstly, it was stated by the SBC presenter that there was no issue with the available capacity at the local health centres to accommodate the increased headcount in the locality. It was stated that communication had taken place between SBC and local health board and they had confirmed this. I would like to be

advised what questions were asked by whom and with whom and what answers were received and the dates of these communications.

Secondly, it was also stated by the SBC presenter that there was no issue with the available capacity at the local schools to accommodate the increased headcount in the locality. It was stated that communication had taken place between SBC and local education board and they had confirmed this. I would like to be advised what questions were asked by whom and with whom and what answers were received and the dates of these communications. This is contrary to SBC's own reports published in 2018 on capacity at schools in the Scottish Borders.

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.: