

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 08 January 2019 11:25

To: Site Administrator <scotborders@mail1.citizenspace.com>

Subject: Re: Consultation response received - Response ID: ANON-7TG7-FAYE-E

Dear sirs,

The required format of the response to the consultation is very difficult to complete and requires a detailed knowledge of the original report which in many ways is beyond the ability and knowledge of most citizens. I am aware of people who are considering employing professional planners to advise and guide them in completing their responses. This cannot be right?

I simply wished to record my objections to the proposal to develop a number of fields at Eshiels to provide 240 houses together with commercial accommodation. I object to this proposal in a number of respects.....

It represents an urbanisation of the countryside It represents ribbon development and an intrusion into what should be green belt This number of houses will put a strain on existing infrastructure ie schools and health services which are already strained. No doubt the proposed development at Eshiels will also place a massive strain on the existing drainage infrastructure.

This number of houses will place an unacceptable strain on the road network between Peebles and Edinburgh. Focus development along the new borders railway instead.

It is too easy to respond to the demand of developers who will always wish to focus their housbuilding activities around Peebles rather than Galashiels and Hawick.....for profit reasons only! The current plan represents an over concentration of house building in the vicinity of Peebles which has been the pattern for many years now. It represents ready council tax income for the Council but cannot be justified in planning terms. The danger is that the beautiful Tweed valley is being spoilt for profit motives. The lovely town of Peebles is being spoilt for similar motives.

I trust these few remarks will be taken into account by Councillors when decisions are being made about the future of Peebles and Peebleshire.

Yours faithfully

[REDACTED]

Response ID ANON-7TG7-FAYE-E

Submitted to LDP2 - Main Issues Report

Submitted on 2019-01-05 11:11:12

Data protection

About you

Are you responding as an: individual, organisation, or an agent acting on behalf of a client?

Individual

Individual

What is your name?

Individual name:

[REDACTED]

What is your address?

Address line 1:

[REDACTED]

Address line 2 :

Address line 3:

Town/City:

[REDACTED]

Post code:

[REDACTED]

What is your contact number?

Individual Phone No:

[REDACTED]

What is your email address?

Individual email:

[REDACTED]

Vision aims and spatial strategy

Question 1

Q1 Agree aims LDP2:

Not sure

Growing our economy

Question 2

Q2:

Yes. I do not think the urbanisation of Eshiels can be described as high amenity. The proposals for Eshiels appear to lead to a ribbon development linking Peebles to Cardrona.

Q2 upload:

No file was uploaded

Question 3

Settlement business allocated:

The main justification for the expenditure on the Borders Railway was the development of Galshiesl, Tweedbank and other settlements along the route. However the main thrust of the new proposals for housing and commercial development appear to be around Peebles and district. I can appreciate that people want to come to live in Peebles and developers certainly want to develop in Peebles rather than Galshiesl. However surely the local authority has a duty to direct

development to where the infrastructure can support further growth ie Galashiels. The road to Edinburgh from Peebles is already crowded at rush hour.....more houses will mean more commuters to Edinburgh and hence more cars. The schools and health facilities are also working at ,animus capacity at the current time and further expansion appears not to be imminent.

Upload Q3:

No file was uploaded

Question 4

Business Use Towns:

No knowledge of these places

Upload Q4:

No file was uploaded

Question 5

Land delivery effectively:

SBC is currently marketing the former yard in the centre of Galshiels at Ân1 million. Why not clean up this polluted site and offer it for housing and compatible commercial use .

Question 6

Agree?:

The development at Cavalry Park in Peebles appears to be successful. It is close to new housing but not mixed in with it. I do not approve of the proposal for mixed use development at Eshiels nearPeebles.

Upload Q6:

No file was uploaded

Planning for housing

Question 7

Housing agree?:

Develop brown field sites before building in the countryside. I object strongly to the proposals for Eshiels. The Council have already done its level best to ruin the beautiful Tweed valley with the development of Cardrona with its ugly hotel building. Please no more inappropriate development in the countryside. Authorities used to value green belt land. SBC appears not to value the countryside around Peebles with its current development at Kittle Gary and its proposals for Eshiels. Do not let developers loose in our beautiful countryside. They are only interested in profit. I sometimes think SBC is only interested in Peebles for its council tax income!

Upload Q7:

No file was uploaded

Question 8

Housing countryside:

Develop town sites first.....such as the March Street mill site in Peebles and the former council yard in Galashiels.

Upload Q8:

No file was uploaded

Question 9

Agree removed housing :

No comment

Supporting our town centres

Question 10

Core Activity Areas:

SBC should be proactive al developing the site in its possession in Galashiels instead of trying to market it for maximum profit. Set an example of creative urban development rather than leave it to developers to come forward with proposals which have already done much to spoil the centre of Galashiels.

Question 11

Berwickshire supermarket:

No knowledge of this town

Upload Q11:

No file was uploaded

Question 12**Develop contrib town:**

Developer contributions should never be removed. It is too much of a soft option for developers and only serves to reduce their profit margins. Income is desperately needed to improve infrastructure and developer contributions should make a significant contribution.

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

Development in the countryside with street lighting and additional car commuters have an adverse effect on climate change.

Question 14**National park:**

Yes. Do not overlook the beauty of the Tweed Valley and the adjacent Southern Uplands. Make sure SBC does not spoil the very thing that people value!

Upload Q14:

No file was uploaded

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

I agree

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:**

Not sure of the details of this proposal.

Any other comments**Question 19****Other main issues:**

Not aware of the details

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.: