

Response ID ANON-7TG7-FA9P-S

Submitted to LDP2 - Main Issues Report

Submitted on 2019-01-28 00:59:53

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:

I agree with the preferred option. The current 4 categories are difficult to differentiate and proving difficult to enforce at present. Businesses come and then develop and move on and successor occupants of specific premises may have different business vision and objectives.

Q2 upload:

No file was uploaded

Question 3

Settlement business allocated:

No opinion. Beyond the issues you highlight in Tweeddale.

In the event of a disastrous Brexit the pressures for repurposing current agricultural land may force change to the policies on business developments / land allocation in rural areas.

Upload Q3:

No file was uploaded

Question 4

Business Use Towns:

No opinion.

Upload Q4:

No file was uploaded

Question 5

Land delivery effectively:

Compulsory purchase - but this would need to be initiated by a relevant Economic development body such as South of Scotland Enterprise who would then need to access Council compulsory purchase powers.

Question 6

Agree?:

I strongly oppose the designation of mixed use without there being a change to the powers of the planning authority to force the inclusion of business developments. The track record - in Tweeddale, which I know - of SBC getting sensible and relevant business development on mixed use sites is poor.... the housing developers are in practice not interested in this use of land and seem, to me, to go to a lot of trouble to work round the requirements.

In respect of specific sites MESH001 and MESH002 are overdevelopment in the vicinity of Eshiels. It is inconceivable that when the Council has gone to such trouble to work with Forest Enterprise to attract Forest Holidays to a "get away from it all" development into a site above these proposed sites that SBC should now suggest housing over such a vast area - let alone mixed use or business sites. In addition MESH001 and/or MESH002 would blanket that area with development.

MINNE003 could be a very attractive site for housing due to its south facing outlook. I doubt it is appropriate for business, But there is a need for business sites in Innerleithen... why not look on the southern half of Traquair Road for suitable sites in the vicinity of the cemetery and of the Data Store facility which is itself a business development and leave MINNE003 for Housing (see remarks on housing below).

SCARD002 epitomizes the problem with mixed use. There is still a site behind Horsbrugh Cottages on the access to the MacDonald Hotel that is designated for business use and never developed. Why to we need more designation in SCARD002? If this is designated for mixed use without powers of compel the business developments then it will just end up as housing.

SPEEB008 - albeit longer term again epitomizes the problem of mixed use. There is a site already identified for business use at South Parks on the west of the current business estate. But whilst it is apparently offered for sale this has not been taken up (perhaps because business use is of little commercial interest). The Northern section of SPEEB008 - adjacent to the current South Parks business site - should be designated for business use only. BUT SBC WILL NEED TO SOLVE THE ROADS PROBLEM in respect of commercial/industrial vehicles getting along Caledonian Road.

The larger Southern section of SPEEB008 adjacent to Edderston Road and Edderston Ridge could be designated for housing only if at all - but see remarks on housing below.

Upload Q6:

No file was uploaded

Planning for housing

Question 7

Housing agree?:

I fundamentally disagree with the approach which has been taken in this particular MIR to the identification of sites and I stated this in the debate on this MIR at the Council meeting in August 2018.

You correctly reproduce the key data from the current SESPlan and I agree with the data on completions. But your own figures then show that there is VERY LITTLE need to identify new sites at this time. You have a need of 348 sites per year and a requirement to maintain a 5 year effective supply. You have a massive figure of 8586 currently identified sites in LDPs of which 3469 are designated "effective". This begs two questions 1) why is the effective figure so low at 40% of the total and what actions are you taking to increase that percentage? and... 2) When you have nearly 10 years effective supply and need only 5+ why are you looking for more sites? The current oversupply is more than enough to accommodate the problems of getting sites available in the right places in a rural area.

There are 3 problems with the unfortunate policy you are following 1) Such a massive oversupply of sites over the requirement risks development taking place in locations that are not the 1st preference of the Council. 2) As I stated at the Council meeting on 30 August 2018 the issuing of an MIR with hundreds of more sites included in the options risks stirring up unnecessary anxiety amongst the Borders population. This is exactly what is now happening in respect of the proposals around Peebles. When you yourself state (para 5.13) that finding new land for housing remains one of the most challenging and contentious processes - why are you identifying so many potential new sites? and 3) The resultant fuss about sites diverts focus from the real needs which are the now chronic underinvestment in

services and infrastructure to meet existing housing and those sites - schools, roads, medical facilities are the top priorities... the provision of these should be the Main Issues - not more housing sites.

Your own paper states twice (paras 3.3 & 5.12) that there is unlikely to be significant requirement for new sites. I think it is most unfortunate that you have put in so much work to identify new sites - that may well not be need for many, many years.

As regards specific sites I offer limited comment:-

AGALA029 - the inclusion of this site given the repeated proposals and appeals and dismissal and arguments and debates that have resulted in it being deleted from previous plans seems to me to be a perverse and indeed provocative proposal It should be deleted

ASELK 040 - Whilst I think it is very important to identify sites in or around Selkirk - because many in the town would support growth in order to bring new vitality to the community, ASELK040 is at too much risk of flooding. I recognize that considerable flood protection work has been done and that embankments surround this site these only protect against a FORECAST frequency of massive flooding - there is a significant residual risk and this site is the most southerly site that would be first impacted by over flooding of the Ettrick. This should be deleted.

APEEB056 - I don't think there is need to identify more sites in Peebles but if any were to be identified this is the best option as it is on the North - Edinburgh (there is significant possibility of interest in Peebles as a place to live for residents who migh commute north) side of the town. See the next two....

AEDDL008/009 - Development of the community of Eddleston which is easily accessible from Peebles, and to the North makes much more sense. Cardrona has taken some development pressure off Peebles for the last 20 years; Eddleston might do the same. I have no view on which of these two sites is preferable. But both have a pleasant South/South Easterly aspect.

SEDL001 - might make a better Business site than for housing. It is low and flat and actually on the A703

Upload Q7:

No file was uploaded

Question 8

Housing countryside:

I agree with the preferred option of retaining the current policies for Housing in the Countryside. We need to avoid a plethora of individual houses dotted on every corner. There are problems of services (not just water, electricity, broadband, waste - but care of the elderly and infirm) and of despoiling of the landscape

Upload Q8:

No file was uploaded

Question 9

Agree removed housing :

Yes

Supporting our town centres

Question 10

Core Activity Areas:

Yes

Question 11

Berwickshire supermarket:

No

Upload Q11:

No file was uploaded

Question 12

Develp contrib town:

Yes

Delivering sustainability and climate change agenda

Question 13

Support alternative option:

No

Question 14

National park:

National Parks in Scotland are intended to protect the environment. ... for example a primary driver behind the Loch Lomond & Trossachs Nat Park was to cope with the influx of visitors - day-trippers - coming into the area from the adjacent conurbations.

The supporters of a Borders National Park are advocating more tourism - which is a laudable objective. But that is a development and not a protection objective. It is not clear to me what the proponents of a National Park in the Borders are trying or might be to protect. A dilemma then pivots around the area for a National Park... its area if there is a legitimate need for and role for a Park to develop tourism, would be different for that objective from the area of a Park that was designated to afford protection to all or some of the environment or natural habitats.

The supporters of a National Park may be confused about their (differing) objectives and hence confused about the area such a body might cover.

I think it is very helpful that you have included this question in the MIR consultation.

Upload Q14:

No file was uploaded

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

Yes

Upload Q15:

No file was uploaded

Settlement Map**Question 16****Oxnam settlement:**

I have no opinion.

Question 17**Core frontage Newcastleton:**

Yes

Planning policy issues**Question 18****Agree amendments appendix3:**

Agree with suggestions in Appendix 3

Any other comments**Question 19****Other main issues:**

This interactive consultation was easy to steer my way through... well done to whoever designed it!

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.: