

Response ID ANON-7TG7-FAXQ-S

Submitted to LDP2 - Main Issues Report

Submitted on 2019-01-23 13:39:02

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:

The stated vision in part states that people should afford a home near where they work.

This scale of this plan suggests economic development on a scale highly unlikely to be achieved in Borders. SME development in mixed usage developments will not bring the employment opportunities local to home for current population never mind the aspirations of addition 3800 households

In the main the current and anticipated economic growth is rooted in tourism including mountain biking, how can building on the open fields, and ruining the scenic vista's in Eshiels, Cardrona and Innerleithen enhance the rural development plan [insert reference

No mention in this document about the demographics shifts... and aging populations needs, the current LDP states need for 50 extra supported housing units, no mention of a projection in this MIR

Environmentally sustainable housing designs should be a given in any new build wherever the location.

Growing our economy

Question 2

Q2:

Yes

Q2 upload:

No file was uploaded

Question 3

Settlement business allocated:

Galashiels, for two reasons - rail and bus hub, the town albiet in a phase of redevelopment needs great investment.
Reston planning very limited for a railway stop

Equally, Hawick there is much greater potential for new land for industry and housing
economic investment in job creation would make a clear case for increased housing stock

Upload Q3:

No file was uploaded

Question 4

Business Use Towns:

No Cannot make an informed comment

Upload Q4:

No file was uploaded

Question 5

Land delivery effectively:

avoid one size fits all categorisation
retain option 3

Question 6

Agree?:

With regard to preferred option sites in Peebles and Eshiels, I do not agree because of the following points.

- 1 whilst more housing is planned for Peebles in current plan never mind this MIR, the lack of suitable industrial sites for business development mean no improvement in local employment.
- 2 SME's springing up in small units like at Calvary park whilst make a contribution, numerically they are insignificant . We have become a dormitory suburb of Edinburgh
Try to ameliorate this now buy suggesting a mixed use conurbation in Eshiels is absurd.
3. The urbanisation, apart from bio diversity impact, will change he experience for 300,000 visitors to Glentress alone never mind the other mountain bike trails
Rural development plan talks of the importance of the open and sweeping scenic vistas
4. Ribbon development is prohibited this would essentially contravene the provisions made in the Town and Country Planning Act
5. drainage on the Eshiels 27 hectres from this proposed development may contribute negatively to the flow of the tweed

Upload Q6:

No file was uploaded

Planning for housing

Question 7

Housing agree?:

No I do not agree because of the Peebles local infrastructure, schools health social care roads etc
Infrastructure is already creaking, This MIR is too focused on Peebles and should be looking at developing in areas that need expansion and investment

Upload Q7:

Picture2.jpg was uploaded

Question 8

Housing countryside:

I would support the alternative option

Upload Q8:

No file was uploaded

Question 9

Agree removed housing :

No view

Supporting our town centres

Question 10

Core Activity Areas:

Agree with preferred option

Question 11

Berwickshire supermarket:

Cannot make an informed comment

Upload Q11:

No file was uploaded

Question 12

Develp contrib town:

No

Delivering sustainability and climate change agenda

Question 13

Support alternative option:

Yes

Question 14

National park:

no

Upload Q14:

No file was uploaded

Regeneration

Question 15

Agree redevelopment:

Galashiels

Upload Q15:

No file was uploaded

Settlement Map

Question 16

Oxnam settlement:

Could / should Eshiels seek to be a settlement boundary especially if the plan goes ahead ?

Question 17

Core frontage Newcastleton:

Yes

Planning policy issues

Question 18

Agree amendments appendix3:

Any other comments

Question 19

Other main issues:

Having considered this plan very carefully and not withstanding the proximity of the proposed eshiels development to my home I would offer the following objective observations and pertinent questions.

The scaling of maps is not universal leading this is unhelpful and misrepresentative.

When is a town deemed overdeveloped in relation to its infrastructure.

No new Highschool for 13 years, car parking is already very problematic and that's with out houses currently in planning or construction, before consideration of the

xxx new proposed houses in your preferred sites. There is no consideration of this need

Health services for additional xx households [estimate xx people

Ribbon development

Volume proposed in Eshiels is out of character with the area and overbearing on the current properties

in relation to Eshiels & Horsborough

increased volume of traffic on an already busy road

Rural Development and impact on scenic vistas important to tourism, dark sky[environmental impact] etc

Why is 30% of proposed/ preferred housing units required in this plan in the Peebles and Eshiels area when the geographical span of Scottish Borders is so great. Walkerburn, Galashiels and Hawick still require investment and regeneration and the latter have brown field sites.

The population density of the Eshiels development alone has 30 households per hectre.

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.:

GLENTRESS

GLENTRESS
VISITOR CENTRE

FOREST LODGES

ESHIELS

Linn Burn

A72

Linn Burn

ESHIELS MILL

