

Response ID ANON-7TG7-FA92-U

Submitted to **LDP2 - Main Issues Report**

Submitted on **2019-01-28 22:23:48**

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:

The aims of the LDP2 are hard to challenge in principle but the chosen housing proposals to satisfy expected demand seem excessively focussed on Peebles, rather than developing towns along the new Borders Railway.

It is almost as if major housing developers have pushed for housebuilding where profit is maximised, without considering the capacity of existing infrastructure: health services, schools, commuter route congestion etc

Growing our economy

Question 2

Q2:

I do not see the argument for changing policy has been strongly made

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?:**

Why do all the preferred & alternative options for mixed use land actually have codicils stating "site must accommodate an element of business land" as if the designated areas are otherwise anticipating blanket residential development ?

Seems disingenuous.

Mixed use designation sites that realistically will be almost entirely housing create heavy loads on schools, surgeries and road occupancy.

What assessments of business / industrial land have been made to support the site designations ? I note that unlike town centre occupation rates, there are no statistics for existing business/industrial land vacancy rates across the Borders

Upload Q6:

No file was uploaded

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

The preferred options are unsatisfactory.

Section 5.7 of the plan claims that developers wish to build in the vicinity of Peebles to satisfy demand... this is disingenuous as the demand mentioned is for maximising profit by the developers, rather than building the right housing for the people who need it, where residents can access employment.

The proposals for MESH1001 and MESH1002 seem particularly impractical, urbanising the countryside where no services exist, consequently burdening the overstretched infrastructure of Peebles. These proposals seem particularly foolish in their destruction of visual amenity near Tweeddale's biggest tourist draw, Glentress.

These developments also contradict the promotion of sustainable travel principles espoused in Section 5.8. Development along the A72 will encourage more private car mileage, where development along the Borders railway would increase returns on the millions in public expenditure on that public transport

Upload Q7:

No file was uploaded

Question 8**Housing countryside:**

Allowing solitary home developments in the countryside will not alleviate housing need, because isolated properties are not going to be sheltered housing, first-time buyer housing or shared-occupancy properties.... this is just a way to permit developers to create high-profit large houses in the most desirable locations.

Upload Q8:

No file was uploaded

Question 9**Agree removed housing :**

If existing allocations were defined in the past but have not yet been developed, it indicates that commercially-minded developers see no value in the locations even if SBC previously identified housing need.

How explicit a justification for building social housing on the sites do you need ?

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**Develop contrib town:**

Given SBC's historic poor efficiency in collecting / enforcing Developer Contributions & obligations, I do not think that reducing that requirement is a good idea.

Delivering sustainability and climate change agenda**Question 13****Support alternative option:**

No comment

Question 14**National park:**

The proposal doesn't seem justified

Upload Q14:

No file was uploaded

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

Proposed sites seem sensible

Upload Q15:

No file was uploaded

Settlement Map**Question 16****Oxnam settlement:**

No comment

Question 17**Core frontage Newcastleton:**

SBC failed to regulate window replacement within the Core Frontage area in the past, so now it is proposed to remove the Core Frontage area designation. Daft idea.

Planning policy issues**Question 18****Agree amendments appendix3:**

No comment

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.: