

Response ID ANON-7TG7-FA32-N

Submitted to **LDP2 - Main Issues Report**
Submitted on **2019-01-28 21:26:17**

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:

Some of them but not all of them.

There needs to be a more holistic approach which considers the bigger picture - particularly with regard to the infrastructure within the area - which frankly is currently underfunded and already wholly inadequate for the current population without the further development planned under the LDP2.

I am also very concerned that the Borders countryside, which is revered as an area of natural beauty, could be ruined by some of the proposals outlined within this plan. There are a number of examples of rural areas which will be blighted by proposed mass development, thus threatening the visitor footfall in the future.

Growing our economy

Question 2

Q2:

Q2 upload:

No file was uploaded

Question 3

Settlement business allocated:

I think there should be a focus on the areas in and around Galashiels or along the route of the new railway. . The vast majority of people who will be housed in new development projects will likely be forced to work outside the area, most likely in Edinburgh, so maximum use should be made of the new railway service between Edinburgh and Tweedbank.

The road links between the Borders and Edinburgh are barely fit for purpose (with average commuting times between Peebles and Edinburgh having increased by almost 50% at peak times over the last five years).

It is therefore ill-conceived, in our view, to consider even further development in Eshiels and Peebles when the local infrastructure is already unable to cope i.e. inadequate school facilities, doctors appointments, and transport links to the capital.

Upload Q3:

No file was uploaded

Question 4**Business Use Towns:**

We have no knowledge of this area

Upload Q4:

No file was uploaded

Question 5**Land delivery effectively:**

We have no specific comment to make on this topic

Question 6**Agree?:**

My response to this question applies to both this question and the next question Question 7.

I think the preferred options of Eshiels 1 and 2 for mixed use are flawed given that Peebles and the surrounding area are already grossly overdeveloped without adequate consideration to the negative ramifications for the town's residents.

I fear this small rural community may be permanently scarred by this proposal:

1. The scale of the proposed mixed use development is totally disproportionate to the developments proposed elsewhere in the Borders
2. Eshiels is an area of natural beauty which attracts a huge number of visitors of day trippers and tourists - particularly to Glentworth biking area The proposed large scale developments are totally out of character with the surrounding countryside and will spoil the visitor experience to the area. Any developments should be appropriate to the immediate environment and therefore be only on a small scale e.g. small groups or individual properties in keeping with the surroundings.
3. Of the people likely to live in the 200+ residential properties proposed for the area, it is highly unlikely that many of the adults would be employed in the Peebles area and highly likely that they would be commuting to Edinburgh and surrounding areas. The commute between Peebles and Edinburgh is already barely tolerable for most commuters working normal working hours, and to further increase the level of traffic on these roads without massive improvements to the capacity of these roads WILL cause huge problems and increase the risk of serious injury or loss of life for everyday commuters. In my view, the focus of the LDP is targeting the wrong transport corridors and proposing a higher level of carbon emissions which is contrary to the council's objective of increased sustainability and reduced carbon road miles
5. There is insufficient regard for the needs of the children that may live in the area. Schools will be unable to cope with their new increased intakes, with the High School already acknowledged as operating at capacity and no new school being considered until after 2030 . We are selling our children and grand-children short and our education standards will continue to decline if class sizes continue to increase and resources, including the number of available trained teachers, continue to slide.
6. There will need to be massive changes to the roads, accesses, junctions etc in the immediate area of Eshiels to cope with the number of people requiring access to the A72 main road from the new development. This is already a very busy and highly dangerous road
7. To the uninitiated, such as myself, there appears to be no logic whatsoever for this area being labelled a preferred site. On what possible logical basis could it be defined as preferred? It is, as if, three fields in the middle of nowhere were selected totally at random for no rhyme nor reason.

Upload Q6:

No file was uploaded

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

Please see my answers to Question 6 as they equally apply to this question.

Upload Q7:

No file was uploaded

Question 8

Housing countryside:

Personally, I am a believer in and supporter of small scale and individual developments in the countryside, that are in keeping with the surrounding area, without affecting the balance and harmony of the area or community.

I am not in favour of large scale developments in rural environments that are wholly out of character and completely change the values and cultures of small longstanding communities.

Upload Q8:

No file was uploaded

Question 9

Agree removed housing :

We cannot support the removal of housing allocations from one area if it increases the pressure on mass development in our area. We want to see a fairer spread of development so that areas that have avoided development in the previous LDP may be considered for development this time around ahead of areas such as Peebles that have already taken their share of development over the last 10 years.

Supporting our town centres

Question 10

Core Activity Areas:

No comment

Question 11

Berwickshire supermarket:

Not familiar with this area therefore cannot comment.

Upload Q11:

No file was uploaded

Question 12

Develp contrib town:

Cannot comment

Delivering sustainability and climate change agenda

Question 13

Support alternative option:

In general, Yes - but we fail to see how the two preferred Eshiels options comply as they are in the countryside and will lead to increased traffic and increased road miles to and from work.

We agree, however, that sustainability must be encouraged in as many ways as possible

Question 14

National park:

We support the designation of a National Park within the Scottish Borders but find it difficult to reconcile this concept with the proposals to proceed with large scale developments in the countryside such as those proposed under MESH 1001 and MESH 1002

Upload Q14:

No file was uploaded

Regeneration

Question 15

Agree redevelopment:

Yes we do.

We support the regeneration of previously proud Borders towns in need of a lift, ahead of the development and possible scarring of successful and bustling towns.

We are surprised that Galashiels is not included as it should be the undisputed main town of the Borders and yet remains downbeat, and unwelcoming to visitors. There is nothing we would like more than to see Galashiels be regenerated into a town of which every Borderer should be proud. Peebles residents should want to visit and shop in Galashiels not Edinburgh but that is not going to happen whilst it lacks the energy and drive that further investment might provide.

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:

No comment

Any other comments

Question 19

Other main issues:

I have expressed my feelings elsewhere in this questionnaire.

In summary, I feel that there has been, and continues to be, too much focus on expanding Peebles to the point that it risks losing its identity and appeal as a bustling Borders town.

Residents already complain that the town is over developed and unable to cope with the demands of an ever increasing population, particularly with regard to schools, healthcare, and road infrastructure.

Some of the joys and advantages of living in this area are being eroded and the appeal of the town is less than it was. We need to catch up - we need to improve our facilities, resources and infrastructure to cope with what we already have without further compounding the problem. I would therefore encourage the council to consider areas that need inward investment before any further major development in Tweeddale. Elsewhere in the Borders

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.: