

Response ID ANON-7TG7-FASW-T

Submitted to LDP2 - Main Issues Report

Submitted on 2019-01-06 10:40:31

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:

Yes

Growing our economy

Question 2

Q2:

No.

I believe sites should be available to all use categories (with the possible exception of class1). This would allow the development of ancillary business around Class 4 users.

A prime example of this is Calvary park in Peebles, which lay undeveloped for many years but is now home to many thriving businesses.

Q2 upload:

No file was uploaded

Question 3

Settlement business allocated:

I can see no allocation of additional business sites in Peebles or Western Tweeddale as a whole. This is an absolute must otherwise the town will suffer further from the "commuter" factor - which cannot be good in terms of sustainability.

Land at Whitehaugh, South Park (SPEEB08) or Chaplehill (APEEB056)

Upload Q3:

No file was uploaded

Question 4**Business Use Towns:**

No

Upload Q4:

No file was uploaded

Question 5**Land delivery effectively:**

Reduce Use Class restriction

Question 6**Agree?:**

In general yes, but the transport infrastructure needs to be in place if businesses are to be encouraged to move into the area

Upload Q6:

No file was uploaded

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

No all. I comment only on the Peebles and surrounding area sites but in general the whole reports seem heavily weighted to providing housing in Peebles and the surrounding areas.

While I can understand the desirability of people to live in this area and therefore the marketability from a developer's viewpoint the major problem is ever increasing congestion as commuters flood to Edinburgh on a daily basis. This route must be improved in a major way if it is to take extra traffic. On this vein I question why there is not much more emphasis on housing development in Galashiels and the route along the Borders Railway??

MESH1001 - Agree with this option

MESH1002 - Disagree - the southern part of this site is owned and used by the Forestry Commission as overflow parking for major events - Loss of this area would result in loss of events and the knock of loss of income to the local economy and, more importantly, loss of reputation of Tweed Valley as the Mountain Biking capital of Scotland.

MINNE003 - Agree with this option.

SCARD002 - Disagree - while this may have the advantage of being a large flat site it is highly visible. It is also home to the Peebles Agricultural Show and I understand that there are further plans for the land owners (Forestry Commission) to expand its use for events. Consequently this site is invaluable as a major event arena for the area.

SPEEB008 - Agree but needs improved transport links. Would suit a mix of business and housing use.

APEEB05 - Agreed but will require improved transport infrastructure.

AEDDL008 - Agreed

AEDDL009 - Agreed

AEDDL001 - Agreed

SPEEB009 - Agreed

I question why the land on the opposite side of the main road from AEDDL001 has not been considered.

Upload Q7:

No file was uploaded

Question 8**Housing countryside:**

No

I Agree with the alternative proposal which would provide much more scope for those living and working in the countryside to remain in a similar environment when they retire.

I also question why new "small settlements" are not supported.

Upload Q8:

No file was uploaded

Question 9**Agree removed housing :**

These allocations (where not already developed or duplicating allocations in the new plan)) should be retained.

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

Yes, but no undertakers in core areas!

Less charity shops would be good but I accept that they are better than an empty shop.

Question 11**Berwickshire supermarket:**

N/A

Upload Q11:

No file was uploaded

Question 12**Develop contrib town:**

Yes, provided the developments are for retail purposes.

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

Yes, however more needs to be done to recognise the benefit that developer contributions bring to local communities. An "unspoilt" landscape is no use to a community that is in dire need of investment.

Question 14**National park:**

No

Upload Q14:

No file was uploaded

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

Yes

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:

Yes

Any other comments

Question 19

Other main issues:

Transport links, transport links and transport links!

Landowner details

Have you submitted any site suggestions in this consultation?

Yes

If yes, please confirm the site and provide the landowner details (if known) for each site you have suggested.:

Yes, site to the North of Eddleston on left hand side of A703 - [REDACTED], [REDACTED], Eddleston