

# Response ID ANON-7TG7-FA4K-F

Submitted to **LDP2 - Main Issues Report**  
Submitted on **2019-01-31 14:10:01**

## Data protection

### About you

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

Organisation

### Organisation

If you are responding as a representative of a group or organisation, please provide details below:

Organisation:

[REDACTED]

Name:

[REDACTED]

Job title:

[REDACTED]

Address line 1:

[REDACTED]

Address line 2:

[REDACTED]

Address line 3:

Town/city:

[REDACTED]

Postcode:

[REDACTED]

Contact number:

[REDACTED]

Email address:

[REDACTED]

## Vision aims and spatial strategy

### Question 1

**Q1 Agree aims LDP2:**

Yes, completely agree. Especially on the requirement for improved transport links and digital connectivity in the more rural areas. These are essential for existing businesses to flourish and for new businesses to start up.

## Growing our economy

### Question 2

**Q2:**

**Q2 upload:**

No file was uploaded

### Question 3

**Settlement business allocated:**

**Upload Q3:**

No file was uploaded

#### Question 4

##### Business Use Towns:

##### Upload Q4:

No file was uploaded

#### Question 5

##### Land delivery effectively:

#### Question 6

##### Agree?:

##### Upload Q6:

No file was uploaded

### Planning for housing

#### Question 7

##### Housing agree?:

##### Upload Q7:

No file was uploaded

#### Question 8

##### Housing countryside:

We would support the alternative proposal. Many businesses report the requirement to demonstrate an economic requirement for an individual new-build as a barrier to planning and feel the need for this should be removed.

##### Upload Q8:

No file was uploaded

#### Question 9

##### Agree removed housing :

### Supporting our town centres

#### Question 10

##### Core Activity Areas:

#### Question 11

##### Berwickshire supermarket:

##### Upload Q11:

No file was uploaded

#### Question 12

##### Develp contrib town:

### Delivering sustainability and climate change agenda

#### Question 13

##### Support alternative option:

Yes, fully support this and [REDACTED] would welcome involvement in discussions relating to any change in policy. Agriculture and associated land uses already do and can continue to play a huge role in positive climate change adaption.

#### Question 14

##### National park:

No, [REDACTED] does not support the designation of a National Park within the Scottish Borders. This decision was not taken lightly and is based on extensive consultation with our membership in the Borders. No members have come forward in support of the proposals, however many have demonstrated a strong

opposition.

The Borders is one of the most beautiful parts of the country and this has evolved over time. Part of the area's beauty comes from the peacefulness. Putting too much emphasis on tourism could end up destroying what we already have now.

There are concerns over the cost of setting up and running the park - with already stretched public funds, this could pose a major challenge. If the main objective is to encourage tourism, the money would be better spend supporting existing bodies already promoting tourism. It was also suggested that infrastructure and activities to attract tourists should be in place before any designation.

Regulatory restrictions for the likes of planning is another key concern for rural businesses. Another layer of bureaucracy on what is already a well regulated area would only increase costs with no additional gain. Farmers already have limited freedom over the way they farm and manage their land so to add another level of restrictions would be damaging.

The campaign is recognized locally as another method of reducing the chance of onshore wind energy production on a blanket basis. Without putting any additional money into the agricultural industry, and questionable amounts into the wider economy, we cannot support these proposals.

We previously held a panel night for [REDACTED] members with speakers including the main campaigners plus a farmer from each of Loch Lomond and the Trossachs and Cairngorms National Park, one of which had positive experience and the other negative. An exit poll revealed that no farmer was in favour of the proposals and, given the comments I have received from members since asking for responses to this consultation, that has not changed.

The future prosperity of agriculture in Scotland as a whole is under threat from a wide range of issues. If financial support for the rural economy is to move to a more environmental bias post-Brexit and additional income can be gained by farmers by being in a National Park, then we could look at the proposal more positively. But not at this time.

**Upload Q14:**

No file was uploaded

**Regeneration**

**Question 15**

**Agree redevelopment:**

**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:**

**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.:**