

Response ID ANON-7TG7-FA46-T

Submitted to LDP2 - Main Issues Report

Submitted on 2019-01-31 16:46:34

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 aims of growth and creation of sustainable communities and growing the Scottish Borders economy in a sustainable way.

Clearly it is important to ensure that the infrastructure is in place in advance to meet an increased population ;

How is the SBC planning to deal with the changing Borders demographic i.e. an ageing profile?;

As a family we are considering the purchase of an electric car but need confidence that there will be sufficient electric-car charging points. We need a more pro-active approach to environmentally sustainable house design e.g. solar panels, heat pumps rather than fossil fuels etc. .

We are keen montain bikers and the economic growth from tourism relating to mountain biking in the Tweed Valley and in particular around Glentress & Innerleithen is impressive. Housing and commercial development immediately surrounding Glentress should be considered carefully as we do not want biking tourists feeling they are no longer "in the countryside".

Building on the open fields, and ruining the scenic vista's in Eshiels, Cardrona and Innerleithen would damage the rural development plan? It is counter to SBC policy ED7 of encouraging tourism.

The SBC Spatial Strategy Staes "... success of outdoor recreational facilities at Glentress has helped tourism" and "The Scottish Borders has outstanding scenic qualities within its landscape and planning policy seeks to protect it." This doesn't seem to be the case!

We don't want to kill the goose that lays the golden eggs!

Growing our economy

Question 2

Q2:

I generally believe that it is vital to attract businesses to the Borders, rather than seeing an outflow of revenues / wealth north up to Edinburgh. As such, I think it is correct to identify "High Amenity Business" locations for Class 4 uses. It is important we should also be encouraging industrial and storage distribution uses, albeit the latter provides fewer employment opportunities. Each major settlement in the Borders should have the potential to attract business and growth. Clearly, it is sensible for these to be focused in and around the infrastructure, including Tweedbank. Where possible these should be on brownfield rather than Greenfield sites.

Option 2

Would seem sensible.

Q2 upload:

No file was uploaded

Question 3**Settlement business allocated:****Upload Q3:**

No file was uploaded

Question 4**Business Use Towns:****Upload Q4:**

No file was uploaded

Question 5**Land delivery effectively:**

It is one thing allocating business and industrial land. However, if the development of this land is not viable, then SBC / Scottish Enterprise Borders / Business Gateway Scottish Borders need to intervene / assist.

Developers and investors will only commit capital where they can see a sensible economic return. Subsidies, rental guarantees and grants should be considered in the usual way.

Question 6**Agree?:**

Following on from my comments in Question 1, I note that there are mixed use proposals in and around Glentress (MESH1001 and MESHIE002) which, while being headed Mixed Use appear to be housing developments, with an "element" of business land. It would appear that the number of units (240) for these Preferred Options is greater than for the whole of the rest of the Borders. This is out of proportion!

Eshiels is designated by Nature Scotland as a "Special Landscape Area", and the development of the sites would have a massive hit on the economic development of the Glentress area as a draw for walking and mountain biking tourists. This would damage the local economy and is counter to Policy ED7.

Eshiels Steading is a small-scale settlement and the development proposed is totally out of proportion. It would be out of character for the area and is counter to SBC Policy PMD4 and LDP2 in MIR Para 3.6. The loss of 26 acre of agricultural land is counter to Policy ED10.

In terms of infrastructure, this would create more traffic on the already busy A72, and could create problems in relation to sewage disposal, and is likely to increase flooding risk for the houses and fields below the A72, due to 27 acres of developed/tarmacked land close to the floodplain.

It is likely that most new arrivals within any development will be commuters into Edinburgh, with there being a leak of economic spending. More cars means more carbon emissions, which is against the SBC objective to be more sustainable by reducing car miles (LDP2 MIR Para 2.15)

Any schoolchildren living in the development will have a 3 mile walk along a very busy road to Peebles High School. Would additional school buses be provided? There is the danger of coalescence if any development in Peebles is connected to Eshiels, which in turn is connected to Cardrona. This contravenes the Town & Country Planning Act (Scotland) 1947.

There would be a reduction of biodiversity in the area, which would be contrary to Policy EP3.

This urbanisation would be most unwelcome in this rural community.

Any development in the immediate area of Glentress should be tourist related, rather than aimed at small businesses which should be located on brownfield sites.

Upload Q6:

No file was uploaded

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

As Peebles is of commuting distance of Edinburgh, it is no surprise that there is greater demand for housing in and around the town. However, I do not agree that additional housing sites should be focused on the Peebles area, as the current infrastructure would not support more housing ie sewage, medical, roads, schools – with reference also being made to an additional bridge over the Tweed. Further development should only be approved once the existing infrastructure has been improved in advance of any new development.

Upload Q7:

No file was uploaded

Question 8**Housing countryside:**

I agree with the Preferred Option.

Upload Q8:

No file was uploaded

Question 9**Agree removed housing :**

I do not agree with existing housing locations being removed from the LDP, if there is current or anticipated demand, then these should remain.

Supporting our town centres**Question 10****Core Activity Areas:**

I agree with the Preferred Option.

Question 11**Berwickshire supermarket:****Upload Q11:**

No file was uploaded

Question 12**Develop contrib town:**

If it makes the difference to development proposals being viable and therefore actually happening then the Contributions should be removed.

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

SBC should be more proactive in creating sustainable traffic patterns by way of cycle paths and good public transport. Solar panels, together with more efficient heating systems (heat pumps - air, ground or water), should be promoted. More electric car charging points are required.

Developments, which simply create commuter villages for those travelling will result in more car miles. I have already referenced the sites in Eshiels.

Question 14**National park:**

If it would help tourism.

Upload Q14:

No file was uploaded

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

Ongoing regeneration of Borders towns is essential. SBC should continue to help those towns where unemployment is high and where a vision for future growth is lacking.

New development business units may have to be supply-led, but clearly more rural locations in the Borders must be supported. Areas which are already fully developed, such as Peebles, should not be overloaded with further development.

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:

As mentioned, the MRI report appears to be focused on development in and around Peebles; the report does not qualify the additional load, which would be placed upon the local infrastructure in and around Peebles, if the various developments proposed went ahead.

The MIR proposals will destroy Peebles. It will not function as a town without the roads, schools and health facilities to support the proposals being made.

If the Tweed Valley is over developed it will lose its attraction to visiting bikers, walkers and other tourists.

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.: