

## Response ID ANON-7TG7-FA4J-E

Submitted to LDP2 - Main Issues Report

Submitted on 2019-01-30 18:42:25

### 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:

I agree with the LDP in general terms and recognise why the plan is required.

However, I have concerns that additional development such as housing will lead to an increase in local populations which will place unsustainable demands on local facilities, services and infrastructure. All too often development takes place which is not matched by necessary increases / improvements in service / infrastructural capacity - roads / footpaths, transport services, medical and other social / community services, car parking etc. Essentially, this additional provision should be in place before development takes place or should, at least, be simultaneous.

### Growing our economy

#### Question 2

Q2:

No view.

Q2 upload:

No file was uploaded

#### Question 3

**Settlement business allocated:**

There are many towns and settlements within the SBC area which are in need of regeneration and redevelopment - for example parts of Hawick, Galashiels and Walkerburn where there are redundant buildings which could be redeveloped before they deteriorate to an extent that they should be demolished. There appear to be brownfield sites which should be earmarked for development before greenfield sites are used.

As a result of the obvious success of the Borders railway, the rail corridor should be an absolute priority for mutually supportive industrial, commercial and residential development

**Upload Q3:**

No file was uploaded

**Question 4****Business Use Towns:**

No view.

**Upload Q4:**

No file was uploaded

**Question 5****Land delivery effectively:**

Cooperation between the Council, the proposed South of Scotland economic development agency, site owners, developers and potential investors.

**Question 6****Agree?:**

I have concerns about and do not agree at all with MESH1001 and MESH1002 as proposed for Eshiels. The intensity of development of housing and business premises on the two 'preferred' sites is excessive and equates to more than is proposed for 'preferred' sites in the remainder of the SBC area.

Moreover:

- Eshiels is a designated special landscape area. Additional development as proposed will result in the urbanisation of an, essentially, rural area;
- The scale of proposed development is excessive in relation to existing development and is out of character with the area;
- The proposed uses are inconsistent with and are potentially damaging to the type and nature of tourism development taking place at Glentress and the expectations of the visitors who are and will in future be attracted to it;
- There will be resultant and excessive demands placed on an already busy and dangerous section of the A72;
- There will be resultant and potentially unsupportable demands placed on existing services, amenities and infrastructure in / around Peebles - such as parking, school capacity, medical services, treatment of sewage;
- The development will result in the loss of agricultural land and may lead to flooding of areas to the south of the A72;

There are inconsistencies between the proposals and existing SBC policies.

**Upload Q6:**

No file was uploaded

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

I disagree with the preferred options for additional housing. Reasons being that the proposals are disproportionate with current settlements and are significant in scale when compared with what is proposed for other communities and settlements within the SBC area. The current provision of amenities, facilities, infrastructure and public / social services in Peebles is insufficient to cope with the scale of what is proposed.

**Upload Q7:**

No file was uploaded

**Question 8****Housing countryside:**

No View.

**Upload Q8:**

No file was uploaded

**Question 9****Agree removed housing :**

I do not see the rationale for removing currently proposed housing allocations from the LDP ..... especially if this results in significant and inappropriate housing development in other locations.

**Supporting our town centres**

## Question 10

### Core Activity Areas:

No view

## Question 11

### Berwickshire supermarket:

No view.

### Upload Q11:

No file was uploaded

## Question 12

### Develp contrib town:

No view

## Delivering sustainability and climate change agenda

## Question 13

### Support alternative option:

No view.

## Question 14

### National park:

No view.

### Upload Q14:

No file was uploaded

## Regeneration

## Question 15

### Agree redevelopment:

Generally agree. Refer to response at question 3.

### Upload Q15:

No file was uploaded

## Settlement Map

## Question 16

### Oxnam settlement:

No view.

## Question 17

### Core frontage Newcastleton:

No view.

## Planning policy issues

## Question 18

### Agree amendments appendix3:

No view.

## Any other comments

## Question 19

### Other main issues:

The LDP appears to have an undue and unwarranted focus on Peebles and its immediate environs at the expense of other towns and settlements in the SBC area which have capacity to accept more development and which, if not developed, may suffer economic and social decline. The capacity of facilities, services

and infrastructure in and around Peebles are already under pressure and are unlikely to be able to cope with the demands of already proposed development and population increase not taken into account in the MIR. There should be much greater focus on encouraging development along the Borders Railway corridor.

### **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.:**