

## Response ID ANON-7TG7-FA2C-5

Submitted to LDP2 - Main Issues Report

Submitted on 2019-01-19 18:26:41

### 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. In principal.

### Growing our economy

#### Question 2

Q2:

No comment

Q2 upload:

No file was uploaded

#### Question 3

Settlement business allocated:

No comment

**Upload Q3:**

No file was uploaded

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

No comment

**Upload Q4:**

No file was uploaded

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

No comment

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

No comment

**Upload Q6:**

No file was uploaded

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

We do not agree.

ADARN005:

Setting of the listed building of Darnlee is totally compromised. Visual amenity and character of the entrance to the village would be severely degraded. The whole character of the area will be changed.

10 houses plus auxiliary parking constitutes a severe over-development of a restricted 0.8 HA site. A perfect example of over-development and visual degradation is what you have allowed to happen on the site of Darnick Green at the south-east end of Darnick adjacent to Chiefswood Road - houses jammed in 'cheek-by-jowl' and abutting closely on the road adjacent to the site.

10 houses of the high value likely to be proposed by developers at Darnlee will undoubtedly generate 20 plus cars. These will exacerbate problems on a road system already hazardous - viz. junction on to B6394 with the opposite developments of Abbotsford Terrace and Heiton Park.

Any access on to Broomilees Road is a total nonsense. Zero traffic will not head west along single-track roads towards Abbotsford. It will all arrive at the junction with Abbotsford Road where there are even more hazardous site-lines to both south and north due to a combination of bends in the road and parked cars.

We do not agree with

AGALA029:

The proposal to build 45 houses on 7.3 HA at Netherbarns opposite to Abbotsford House is ridiculous. Abbotsford is the most successful tourist attraction in the Borders - a real success story - why are you threatening to spoil the tourist experience of this wonderful house and its gardens by building modern houses immediately opposite on the banks of the Tweed?

The renovation of Abbotsford has involved the expenditure of millions of pounds. The whole project has involved the dedication of many experts and the commitment and time of large numbers of enthusiastic volunteers.

When visitors are being conducted through the house, one of the high points of the tour is the view out of the bow window of the dining room looking across the Tweed because, just before his death, Scott had his bed moved into the dining room so that he could see and hear his beloved Tweed river. This was the last view he looked at.

It will be extremely disappointing for visitors to look across the river at a suburban sprawl.

What the thousands of visitors to Abbotsford want to see is the view that Scott saw that was such an inspiration to his writing.

It is impossible to hide 45 houses simply by 'reinforcing existing planting' along the south-eastern boundary of the site.

The river Tweed Special Area of Conservation deals not only with wildlife but must also encompass landscape interests.

The Scottish Planning Policy document (23 June 2014) Policy Principal 29 clearly states that there is a duty - 'protecting, enhancing and promoting access to natural heritage including green infrastructure, landscape and the wider environment'. Also avoiding over-development and protecting the amenity of new AND EXISTING development.

No housing developments must ever be permitted to destroy this national and international treasure that is Abbotsford House.

**Upload Q7:**

No file was uploaded

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

**Upload Q8:**

No file was uploaded

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

Please remove AGALA 029 and place a permanent moratorium on any future building on this site.

Please also remove ADARN 005 permanently from these plans as it is an unsuitable site for building totally overshadowing what is, in effect, a medieval village.

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

Yes we agree with the preferred option.

In the larger towns core activity could be more focussed to a smaller area.

**Question 11****Berwickshire supermarket:**

No opinion

**Upload Q11:**

No file was uploaded

**Question 12****Develp contrib town:**

No.

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

Yes we support the preferred option.

Insulation standards mandated for all buildings must be significantly raised. The inclusion of solar cells must be the default expectation. Heat-pump technology must be preferred over carbon-based heating.

Policies must be developed in order to achieve these ends.

**Question 14****National park:**

Yes we support the National Park proposal.

We do not have the expertise to advise on the most suitable general area.

**Upload Q14:**

No file was uploaded

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

No comment

**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:**

PMD4:

The problem is trying to squeeze modern developments, both domestic and industrial, into historic town layouts while balancing this against the need to maintain the individual historic character of each settlement.

The existing policy has reached its limits since the developments proposed impose an unacceptable burden on the infrastructure of settlements that served the purposes of past times.

There is a need for a new policy to maintain the best of all the historic town cores but to develop for the future outwith these restricted spaces.

**Any other comments**

**Question 19**

**Other main issues:**

No.

**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.:**