

## Response ID ANON-7TG7-FA43-Q

Submitted to LDP2 - Main Issues Report

Submitted on 2019-01-31 14:02:08

### 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:

Agree mostly. Feel SBC must take some steps to:

- Make sure that the infrastructure matches the increased population any development brings to the area before the development takes place.

- In the main the existing and anticipated economic growth is based on tourism which includes mountain biking, hill walking and other outdoor pursuits . How can building on the fields, and ruining the scenic/rural views in Eshiels, Cardrona and Innerleithen enhance the plan for rural development? This is counter to SBC policy ED7 of encouraging tourism.

- Take a more forward thinking and pro-active approach to environmentally sustainable housing design.

- How is SBC planning taking into account the change in age demographic? The population is set to increase by 1.5% over the next 10 year period...but the 65-74 and 75+ age groups is 6% and 31%.

### Growing our economy

#### Question 2

Q2:

**Q2 upload:**

No file was uploaded

**Question 3****Settlement business allocated:**

SBC needs to be more proactive in planning the revitalisation of certain areas within the Borders. It needs to promote development of business units in key areas such as

- Alongside the railway line in the Galashiels area. This is MOST important.
- Eddleston and Walkerburn area;
- Reston - Where the new railway station has been proposed

**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 proposals MESH1001 and MESH1002 proposed for Eshiels, Peebles.

The number of houses/businesses suggested for these two 'preferred sites' on its own is greater than the 'preferred sites' for the rest of the Scottish Borders. I feel this is shockingly and totally disproportionate.

There are several reasons why this proposal is NOT OK:

- Eshiels has been designated a 'Special Landscape Area' by Nature Scotland
- It would be totally out of character for the area. This is in opposition to SBC policy PMD4 and LDP2 MIR para 3.6.
- It would be completely out of scale compared to the existing settlements/housing.
- The urbanisation and reduction of biodiversity in the area would be completely unwelcome. It is in opposition to Policy EP3.
- This development would be in effect 'Ribbon Development', connecting Peebles and Cardrona, which is in contravention to the Town and Country Planning Act (Scotland) 1974.
- It would have a detrimental economic impact on the Glentworth area which is the main tourist destination. e.g. mountain biking, walking, go ape... This is counter to policy ED7.
- The A72 would be even more congested by heavy traffic.
- Counter to Policy ED10 by removing 26 hectares of agricultural land.
- The development of 26 hectares of land adjacent to the floodplain would increase the risk of flooding to homes/buildings/fields below the A72.
- Problem of removal of sewage from the sites.
- Carbon emission increase - as most house owners will be commuters. This is in opposition to the overall SBC objective to reduce car miles and increase sustainable lifestyles/living. LDP2 MIR para 2.15.
- As the site is less than 3 miles from the High School children will need to walk along a very busy road as no school buses are provided.
- The businesses based in small units e.g. Calvary Park, whilst making a contribution, are a tiny %. Peebles has in essence become a distant suburb of Edinburgh. Trying to address/improve this by suggesting mixed use development and urbanisation in Eshiels is nonsensical.

**Upload Q6:**

No file was uploaded

## Planning for housing

### Question 7

#### Housing agree?:

NO! I do not agree with the preferred options for additional housing sites.

The numbers proposed for 'new housing' in the Peebles area are completely out of proportion to the rest of the Borders. The report seems too Peebles focussed.

The infrastructure of Peebles, as it is, cannot support more housing:

- Schools
- Roads
- Medical centre
- Sewage
- Addition Bridge over the Tweed.

Peebles is full.

Further development should only be considered once existing infrastructure has been improved to deal with proposed potential developments.

#### Upload Q7:

No file was uploaded

### Question 8

#### Housing countryside:

#### Upload Q8:

No file was uploaded

### Question 9

#### Agree removed housing :

I do not agree with the proposed existing housing allocations to be removed from the LDP. Why remove these while proposing more in Peebles?

## Supporting our town centres

### Question 10

#### Core Activity Areas:

### Question 11

#### Berwickshire supermarket:

#### Upload Q11:

No file was uploaded

### Question 12

#### Develop contrib town:

## Delivering sustainability and climate change agenda

### Question 13

#### Support alternative option:

Yes I support this but the Proposed development sites MESH1001 and MESH1002 are not adjacent to the town, which will mean more car miles, plus most will commute to Edinburgh for work. This means passing through Peebles en-route, more cars on heavily used roads. More car miles.

### Question 14

#### National park:

#### Upload Q14:

No file was uploaded

## Regeneration

### Question 15

#### Agree redevelopment:

Yes, I agree. It is essential for the future of the towns mentioned that redevelopment takes place. However, development of business units should be promoted

and given precedence in areas where rejuvenation is in more need e.g. unemployment high, future growth plans lacking. Peebles is already busy/full and the infrastructure challenged.

**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:**

- The MIR report is way too focussed on development in Peebles.

- This heavy focus would be bad for Peebles and also ignore the rest of the Borders.

- The report is too Peebles-centric. It ignores the rest of the Scottish Borders. Those living in Galashiels, Kelso, Eyemouth and Selkirk etc will be disappointed to be ignored in this manner, having their chance of sensitive and sustainable development removed.

- The report has made no attempt to appraise the increased pressure on the current infrastructure if the proposed developments went forward.

- The MIR proposals will damage/break Peebles. The town simply will not be able to function without the health facilities, roads and schools to support the increased population of the proposals.

- The report needs a total overhaul. The weight being placed on Peebles as the primary development area must be changed. The current infrastructure cannot cope.

**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.:**