

Response ID ANON-7TG7-FAFU-B

Submitted to LDP2 - Main Issues Report

Submitted on 2019-01-31 17:32:46

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:

They are generally fine.

Growing our economy

Question 2

Q2:

No comment

Q2 upload:

No file was uploaded

Question 3

Settlement business allocated:

There needs to be a Cavalry Park 2 though not necessarily conterminous. A site needs to be identified and the capital investment made by Council/ Enterprise in purchase and site servicing and serviced plots sold to recover investment. It is 25 years since the bold decision was made on Calvary Park.

Upload Q3:

No file was uploaded

Question 4**Business Use Towns:**

No comment

Upload Q4:

No file was uploaded

Question 5**Land delivery effectively:**

The Planning Bill has identified that the planning implementation on black and green infrastructure needs to be improved and that is a real challenge given the current set up.

Sites for employment as opposed to mixed use needs to be backed up by resources and skills to address market failure. Planning as a facilitator. See Q3.

Question 6**Agree?:**

Market led developers prefer certainty and I am not convinced that Mixed Use allocations deliver what is stated on the tin.

Upload Q6:

No file was uploaded

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

Do not agree with Chapelhill Farm. As your notes show this prominent site has been resisted for 15 years and for good reason. There is a good defensible boundary next to Miller development.

Upload Q7:

No file was uploaded

Question 8**Housing countryside:**

No comment

Upload Q8:

No file was uploaded

Question 9**Agree removed housing :**

No comment

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

Emphasis should be on uses which encourage people to come together and new Activity policy recognises this. There are however too many commercial units and some pruning with conversion to residential is required though this requires understanding the subtlety of how different streets perform different functions and implementation is so difficult given current set up.

Question 11**Berwickshire supermarket:**

No comment

Upload Q11:

No file was uploaded

Question 12

Develop contrib town:

Good starting point. It is all about viability and grant incentives are likely to be part of the equation.

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

Glad to see some reference to using the LUS pilot as this is a start to developing an ecosystems approach to assist decision making. The big omission is a place making tool at a settlement as opposed to a site level. Some sustainability policies such as carrying capacity have yet to be embedded into the planning system.

Question 14**National park:**

Not as proposed. Difficult to draw a boundary owing to quality within most of Scottish Borders.

Upload Q14:

No file was uploaded

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

The town with significant heritage assets that needs attention and has not been benefitted from a CARS type Scheme is Coldstream.

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:**

There are markers for LUS but I am still concerned about the ability to genuinely appraise quality of place and quality of life at a settlement level.

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

The planning and cross fertilisation of monies for green infrastructure needs stronger expression. If Eddleston and Eshiels become de facto remote suburbs of Peebles the connecting links to encourage modal transfer needs to be put in before any more large allocations. At Duns, whilst safeguarding the Duns Scotus Way and the wetland are fine, given all the conterminous allocations there is a need for advance project planning in green infrastructure through an integrated SUDS to maximise biodiversity benefits. These are just two examples re green infrastructure.

Your text has already made a reference to the Community Planning partnership, but there needs to be far better asset management planning re education, health and business development there is a public perception that is not joined up and in Peebles all we get is housing!, with Peebles taking a disproportionate hit. Even the modest LDP2 allocations of 348 units, seem skewed towards Peebles with 150/70 SHIP despite 3 growth areas.

I attended a drop in session and despite healthy dialogue the officers listened and responded with grace and professionalism.

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.: