

Response ID ANON-7TG7-FAFH-X

Submitted to LDP2 - Main Issues Report

Submitted on 2019-01-31 19:20:25

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, I don't think it takes into account the key economic drivers for the local economy, namely tourism, nor the requirement for genuine low cost housing. The LDP2 seems to be driven by a desire to satisfy developers drive to higher profits rather than exercising any power to drive a broader vision.

Growing our economy

Question 2

Q2:

Broadly agree.

Q2 upload:

No file was uploaded

Question 3

Settlement business allocated:

Yes, and I think these should be aligned to the need to investment and economic growth rather than somewhat randomly allocated. In the Tweedale area there is a need for small business and LBG investment in Innerleithen and Walkerburn rather than stretching the already fragile infrastructure in Peebles to the point

where it is detrimental to local business.

Looking further afield, surely it makes sense to focus larger initiatives around the Borders railway and the A7 and A68 rather than taxing a transport network that is already creaking at the seams in the Peebles area.

Upload Q3:

No file was uploaded

Question 4

Business Use Towns:

Upload Q4:

No file was uploaded

Question 5

Land delivery effectively:

I would suggest better local engagement. While I really appreciate that the planning office are trying, and are stretched for resource, local advertising campaigns (fliers in supermarkets and local shops) and speaking to communities (churches, youth leaders, community leaders) is more likely to deliver suggestions of land that is supported by the community.

Question 6

Agree?:

The proposals for MESH1001 and MESH1002 are completely out of all sense of proportion, looking to deliver the largest number of houses of the whole plan, in a hamlet that is not even identified as a settlement.

The impact on the landscape and tourism in the Eshiels and Glentress area would be catastrophic and irreversible. Development of this scale and in this area would form a visual corridor which would have a significant impact on the landscape value for tourism - right next to one of the Scottish Borders biggest tourist attractions, Glentress Forest.

Furthermore the Forestry Commission do not appear to have been consulted at the appropriate level as to the impact of the proposed development on the use of the new Forest Lodges, on major events where the Forestry Commission uses these fields for additional parking, nor has it been considered the impact on parking more generally - in reduced appeal of Glentress generally if the development goes ahead, and more specifically the loss of revenue for the Forestry Commission of cars parking in the new development in preference to the paid car parks, nor any provision to mitigate the impact of this on the residents of the proposed developments.

Further considerations are the archaeological impact of new infrastructure on the local scheduled monuments, environment impact on local populations of osprey, [REDACTED] and potential impact on trees under preservation orders.

No consideration seems to have been given to infrastructure requirements or the physical ability to deliver it in regard to re-routing of the A72, drainage, relocation of the existing septic tanks. Other infrastructure issues including the lack of a safe footpath between Eshiels and Peebles, the impact on school transport, the number of cars that would join the A72 at a new junction travelling towards Peebles and therefore crossing the carriageway, the lack of suitable broadband infrastructure, and the susceptibility of these fields to flooding from the hills (I suggest you visit the fields near the roads at some point in the next few weeks - they are currently under 2 ft of water!).

Finally, the A72 is at capacity during rush hour, with a steady stream of nose to tail traffic heading in to Edinburgh. Building more houses in this area is simply increasing the number of commuters and would be of more benefit to Edinburgh than to the Borders, while bringing a high cost of environmental impact both in loss of biodiversity and in increased carbon emissions. It has already been identified in other referenced documents that Peebles has born a disproportionate burden of the commuter diaspora from Edinburgh. Surely there are better ways of investing in the Borders.

Upload Q6:

No file was uploaded

Planning for housing

Question 7

Housing agree?:

No. The burden falls too heavily in the Peebles area at the expense both of other areas in need of strategic direction and at the expense of the "sense of place" of the existing settlement.

The proposal at MESH1001 and MESH1002 is wholly disproportionate to the size of the small settlement which currently exists and to the landscape setting in the Tweed Valley Special Landscape Area (SLA).

Fundamental infrastructure issues have not been taken into account (drainage and EXISTING flooding, sewerage, broadband, traffic volume, relocation of current septic system), nor have environment issues been addressed (special landscape area, biodiversity, endangered species).

Upload Q7:

No file was uploaded

Question 8**Housing countryside:****Upload Q8:**

No file was uploaded

Question 9**Agree removed housing :**

While I understand that these sites are being removed primarily because of lack of landowner support, I would like to understand why more sites are being added which have the same issues (MESH1001 and MESH1002).

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

Broadly agree with the preferred options for Core Activity Areas - would like to see this expanded to include sports and leisure uses more generally.

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

No file was uploaded

Question 12**Develop contrib town:**

I think this question is very site dependent rather than for more general consideration and as such should remain under the remit of the planners on a case by case basis.

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

Proposals for sites MESH1001 and MESH1002 would have a substantial environmental impact as they will undoubtedly be primarily commuter properties with 1 or more cars per property heading towards Edinburgh on a daily basis. Add to this the distance from the high school and lack of pupil transportation or safe walking network. This is compounded by the lack of suitable broadband infrastructure in the area making home-working unsustainable for commuters in the Eshiels area.

in regard to the question "Are there any other matters relating to sustainability and climate change adaptation which should be addressed?" - I would suggest planners don't derogatorily refer to solar panels as "eco bling" when addressing community meetings.

Question 14**National park:**

Yes, absolutely, let's protect the Tweed Valley and further improve the tourist draw of the area! Specifically, there is interest both nationally and globally in Dark Skies (i.e. a lack of light pollution from streetlights). Places like Glentworth Forest could benefit from this in the same way as the areas in Northumberland to the West of Alnwick have.

Upload Q14:

No file was uploaded

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

Yes, there are areas of the Borders in desperate need of regeneration and investment. There is huge opportunity for planners to drive a win-win agreement with developers and other investors by appropriately channeling the land available for 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:

The Peebles area (and Eshiels MESH1001 and MESH1002 in particular) bears FAR too big a burden in the LDP2, despite other documents recognising that this has been the case for too long and the commuter issue of the A703.

Other areas of the Borders NEED this investment, while further developing in the Peebles area would be STRONGLY to the detriment of Peebles amenity and tourism value.

The infrastructure around Peebles cannot stand the burden, while the investment (sunk cost!) in infrastructure of the Borders Railway goes to waste.

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.: