

Response ID ANON-7TG7-FA91-T

Submitted to LDP2 - Main Issues Report
Submitted on 2019-01-27 20:14:46

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

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:

I agree that the alternative proposal is the way forward. The current 'housing group' policy is too restrictive and can lead to very unsightly developments. An example is Huntlywood, between Earlston and Gordon. Not only is the development on a very dangerous bend, but there is a motley group of old and new housing apparently at random.

I also agree that appropriate setting, design and materials are extremely important, but not only for individual houses outwith building groups but equally so in a housing group.

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:

Question 14

National park:

I have read the feasibility study commissioned by supporters of the idea of a National Park. Using the figures therein of Â£1million to set up and Â£2million

annually to run, I cannot support the proposal without evidence of real benefit to the Borders as a whole.

The fact that there appears to be no consensus within the NP supporters as to the boundaries of the NP makes the proposal difficult to assess.

I note at Appendix 4 of the feasibility study, page122, that there are apparently no SSI or NSA within SBC area. That is clearly wrong and perhaps demonstrates a lack of research by the authors, or perhaps is intended to mislead the reader. I live in an NSA!

I do not believe a National Park designation is either necessary or beneficial to the Scottish Borders. Additional costs aside, there will inevitably be added bureaucracy and conflict will arise between the interests of the NP and the interests of the rest of the Region. I do not accept the argument that the whole region will reap benefit from a proportion being designated a National Park.

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.: