

Response ID ANON-7TG7-FANN-C

Submitted to LDP2 - Main Issues Report

Submitted on 2019-01-13 12:22:03

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:

Para 3.10 of the MIR highlights the main population areas and states that these are the primary areas for growth. These must be the focus of activity and provide the revenue source for ongoing development as opposed to development in Peebles, where any development would contradict the Authorities aim of a sustainable, environmentally protective plan by forcing the increased number of residents to use cars to drive to Edinburgh for employment.

Development in Galashiels and Tweedbank would be supporting the Borders Railway and satisfy environmental and economic development in those areas.

Growing our economy

Question 2

Q2:

Q2 upload:

No file was uploaded

Question 3

Settlement business allocated:

Business and industrial development must be focused in areas with suitable transport and communication capability. These are identified as being Galashiels,

Tweedbank, primarily and secondarily Hawick and Jedburgh. Again the authority should focus on these areas and develop them as they have the greatest need and potential and not in other speculative areas which will yield minimal benefits.

Upload Q3:

No file was uploaded

Question 4

Business Use Towns:

None

Upload Q4:

No file was uploaded

Question 5

Land delivery effectively:

see answer to Q3 above

Question 6

Agree?:

The provision of mixed use development reflects the poorest option of all with it being the least attractive and economically effective in all cases and should not be progressed.

Upload Q6:

No file was uploaded

Planning for housing

Question 7

Housing agree?:

No I do not agree. The two sites identified as MESH1001 and MESH1002 do not align with the overall aims of the development strategy because the aims set out by the Council regarding sustainability and climate change seeks to increase commercial woodlands whereas development of these sites would reduce this aspect. It would also mean residents must drive to work in Edinburgh adding to traffic congestion and pollution. Clearly a retrograde step. Current local infrastructure is unable to cope with existing demand adding to that demand without first increasing capacity is short sighted and foolhardy. Local schools both primary and secondary are at maximum capacity, dental services are full, GP services are oversubscribed and unable to increase capacity. Fire, Police and Ambulance services are stretched beyond the provision of an effect service. Car parking facilities within Peebles cannot cope with the current population so the addition of at least 500 additional car users is impossible to meet - with no capacity for expansion available. From the two sites proposed there is no surface water or foul water drainage facilities and again the existing capacity at the Scottish water sewage treatment works at Eshiels is already being exceeded with extremely limited opportunity for expansion. The option for "reed bed" treatment and disposal into the River Tweed is not viable due to constraints from SEPA around pollution of the River and subsequent further loss of high value tourist salmon fishing and environmental damage.

The two proposed sites do not align with the Councils vision to ensue the economic development opportunities of the Borders Railway corridor are maximised hence they contradict that vision and should be removed.

Upload Q7:

No file was uploaded

Question 8

Housing countryside:

See answer above in Q7

Upload Q8:

No file was uploaded

Question 9

Agree removed housing :

See answer to Q7

Supporting our town centres

Question 10

Core Activity Areas:

Question 11

Berwickshire supermarket:

Upload Q11:

No file was uploaded

Question 12

Develop contrib town:

No,

Delivering sustainability and climate change agenda

Question 13

Support alternative option:

All developments should be supporting the drive to minimise the impact upon climate change hence the Borders Railway corridor must have priority when considering any development. Development outside of that corridor should be stopped or severely curtailed .

Question 14

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:

No.

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.: