

Response ID ANON-7TG7-FAFC-S

Submitted to LDP2 - Main Issues Report
Submitted on 2019-01-31 15:54:08

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:

Broadly, yes, but there seems to be little ambition in terms of developing the conservation of Borders landscapes in order to capitalise on initiatives based on the commercial value of this great asset.

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:

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:

The Ironside Farrar Landscape Capacity and Cumulative Impact Study 2016 gives much-needed and welcome clarity on the capacity of the landscape to accommodate wind turbines. The protections afforded to residential amenity in terms of exposure to Noise, shadow-flicker, separation distances from turbines etc were formulated when wind turbines of 75m in height were considered to be the norm and these protections should now be revised. Consent is being given for turbines twice that height located within 1,700 metres of peoples' homes, and the Council is clearly aware that applications for much larger turbines may be submitted in future. Separation distances between dwellings and wind turbines should be re-calibrated in proportion to the increasing size of turbines.

Given the amount of renewable energy generation capacity already existing in Scotland it is difficult to justify the destruction of high-quality landscapes in order to provide more and more electricity which may never be used. Constraint payments to wind farms in the Borders already run at ££ millions a year. SBC should always maintain the primacy of landscape constraints and residential amenity over any claim by developers that they need to construct increasingly large turbines to turn a profit.

Question 14

National park:

Yes, I do support the designation of a National Park in the Scottish Borders. It seems to be a very simple and cheap way to raise the pitifully low profile of the Borders as a recreational and tourism destination. The Borders landscapes are of exceptionally high quality, the cultural distinctiveness of the Common Ridings surely equal events like the Palio in Siena, yet it seems the Borders is content to slumber quietly without drawing attention to any of its amazing riches. It would not take much to develop the brand. Last summer I was driving in France and passed a sign by the side of the road; 'You are entering the Regional Park of the Dordogne'. I don't know how much it cost to make the sign and put it up, maybe less than €1,000, but I was instantly aware that I was suddenly in a special, better quality landscape. National Park designation would undoubtedly give a massive boost to the Borders economy by attracting interest, increasing visitor-spend and creating jobs. The infrastructure already exists and would benefit from further development. There is huge potential. My question is how else could you possibly achieve this at such low cost and with so little effort?

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.: