

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Mon, 18 Jan 2021 10:38:42

To:

Subject: Representations regarding LDP2

Sensitivity: Normal

Attachments: scottish Borders Draft LDP Representations, january 2021.docx;

Archived: 18 January 2021 15:01:00

CAUTION: External Email

Good morning,

I tried to upload my response this morning direct to the site but don't think that it succeeded! So I'm emailing instead and ask that this be used (if anything did get uploaded please ignore!)

Many thanks,

Iain

Representations regarding Proposed Local Development Plan.

| <u>Section</u> | <u>Page</u> | <u>Para</u> | <u>Draft LDP2 Text.</u> | <u>Representation</u> | <u>Proposed change</u> |
|---------------------|-------------|--------------|---|---|--|
| VOLUME 1 | | | | | |
| Foreword | 5 | | “Scottish Borders Council is committed to sustainable economic growth, so the Plan promotes the low carbon agenda and looks at how we can adapt to climate change.” | I could not find specific targets being set to meet this policy. | Please insert targets or ensure that these are included in another publicly available document for review. |
| 2 | 14 | 2.14 to 2.18 | This section is entitled “INFRASTRUCTURE, TRANSPORT AND SUSTAINABILITY” | Almost nothing is actually said here about <i>the sustainability of existing infrastructure</i> such as parks, play facilities, toilets, tourist offices. | Provide a policy which commits to sustain ALL infrastructure. |
| 2 | 14 | 2.14 | “There is a continuing need to upgrade the main road network across the Region”. | In Peebles, many local roads are in a worse condition than main roads. The upgrade of these roads must also be addressed. | Policy must address upgrade to local roads in disrepair. These should be identified and included in the LDP as are main roads. Examples to be included are: Rosetta Road and Caledonian Road in Peebles. |

| <u>Section</u> | <u>Page</u> | <u>Para</u> | <u>Draft LDP2 Text.</u> | <u>Representation</u> | <u>Proposed change</u> |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|---|---|--|
| 3 | 16 | 3.8 | “A strategic green network priority area will connect settlements in the Central Borders with Peebles and Innerleithen in the west.” | I was unable to find specific information included in the Plan concerning this area to be created. | Add detail of this plan and funding to be provided to deliver it. |
| 4 | 22 | 4.12 | “However, potential flood risk and the need for a second bridge over the River Tweed prior to any new housing land allocations being released on the south side of the River Tweed, limit options at this point in time.” | Two other caveats should be included pertinent to any new housing land allocations being released on the south side of Peebles: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The capacity of Caledonian Road to handle additional traffic¹ • The roundabout at the Old Parish being at capacity. | Include these caveats in this policy paragraph and in the detailed plan. |
| 5 | 24 | 5.4 | “Distribution of available land is important and there is a recognised need to allocate further business and industrial land within the Peebles area in particular” | There does not appear to be specific evidence provided of this need. | Further land allocation for business and industrial use should only proceed after a clear demonstration of both need and compliance with all other policies. |

¹ As well as the heavy volume of traffic on this road, it needs to be remembered that there is a point where Caledonian Road does not meet the DMRB width requirement

| <u>Section</u> | <u>Page</u> | <u>Para</u> | <u>Draft LDP2 Text.</u> | <u>Representation</u> | <u>Proposed change</u> |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|---|--|---|
| 5 | 24 | 5.6 | “Due to the ongoing uncertainty as to when or indeed if a new bridge will be built, any proposals identified to the southern side of the town can only be longer term options.” | The commitment that no further allocation of land for business and/or industrial development on the south side of Peebles will be made until there is a new bridge is not as strongly expressed here as in para 4.12 regarding housing development. Also, additional caveats require to be added. | State as policy that no further allocation of land for business and/or industrial development on the south side of Peebles will be made until there is a new bridge as strongly as in para 4.12 regarding housing development. Please add the additional caveats requested in my representation against para 4.12 above. |
| 5 | 25 | 5.8 | | There ought to be a regeneration project for Peebles. | Add a regeneration project for Peebles. |
| HD3 | 95 | | | There have been occasions when residents have felt that factors impacting the protection of residential amenity have been inadequately considered and taken into account. Policy should include an obligation upon the council both to undertake a survey of resident opinions (within a generous area reach of any proposed development) and to provide a point by point response to each concern raised. | Add an obligation, such as is described in the Representation, into HD3 |

| <u>Section</u> | <u>Page</u> | <u>Para</u> | <u>Draft LDP2 Text.</u> | <u>Representation</u> | <u>Proposed change</u> |
|---------------------|-------------|-------------|---|---|---|
| IS2 | 151 | 1.6 | | Developers should be liable for compensation to existing residents where damage to property or loss of amenity is involved. | Add a sub-clause j to provide for this |
| IS4 | 156 | | | No mention is made of the obligation to improve the state of current roads in disrepair. | Add an obligation. |
| IS8 | 161 | 1.1 | “This policy is intended to discourage development from taking place in areas which are, or may become, subject to flood risk.” | Development needs also to be discouraged where it may have a consequential flooding impact elsewhere in the water table. | Amend to read: ““This policy is intended to discourage development from taking place in areas which are, or may become, subject to flood risk or where such development could have a consequential flood impact elsewhere.” |
| VOLUME 2 | | | | | |
| PEEBLES | 467 | | “It is the Council’s opinion that Tweed Bridge does not have the capacity to serve any new development in the town, over and above the sites allocated in the Plan” | This is more than “ <i>opinion</i> ”. It is policy as stated in Volume 1 - Policies, section 4.12 page 22. | Replace the word “opinion” with the word “policy” |

| <u>Section</u> | <u>Page</u> | <u>Para</u> | <u>Draft LDP2 Text.</u> | <u>Representation</u> | <u>Proposed change</u> |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------------|---|--|
| | 471 | zEL204 | | <p>Development on this site has not commenced. Due to potential traffic impact and safety concerns any development on this site should now be put on hold pending the provision of a second bridge. Whilst it may be considered that development of this site would only generate additional light traffic, this cannot be guaranteed and the situation is now so serious that ANY additional traffic flow should be stopped.</p> | <p>Insert a provision as stated in the Representation.</p> |

Iain A. GIBSON
JANUARY 2021.