

Response ID ANON-7TG7-FAZM-Q

Submitted to **LDP2 - Main Issues Report**

Submitted on **2019-01-08 12:46:05**

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 agree. The forecast population 2017 to 2026 shows little change in total and therefore minimal requirement for house building, however there is a significant forecast shift in the age profile particularly in the over 75 age range and therefore feel that the plan should specifically address this shift.

This could be through the development of independent living complexes where residents have individual accommodation but share some form of common facilities, laundry, entertainment and catering along with 24 hrs staffing support but are able to live independently if appropriate.

Also feel that the protection of green spaces should be given a higher priority and would take this further with a commitment to increased planting particularly of native woodland.

In respect of town centres there is recognition that shopping habits are changing as a result of the internet but this is a crucial period and the LDP needs to have some specific coverage of options and plans. I feel that this should include the potential development of residential accommodation close to existing town centres to create a population that can use the shops and associated establishments. This could also be supported by the shift away from out of town retail expansion and the LDP should seek to limit this to existing sites rather than develop new.

Growing our economy

Question 2

Q2:

I would support alternative option 2

Q2 upload:

No file was uploaded

Question 3**Settlement business allocated:**

Feel that existing brownfield land should be the first land used regardless of location.

Upload Q3:

No file was uploaded

Question 4**Business Use Towns:**

Kelso already has a business / industrial focus at Pinnacle Hill and if demand is present extension to this site should be first option for any significant sized development

Upload Q4:

No file was uploaded

Question 5**Land delivery effectively:**

No but not sure of the specifics that the question is seeking to answer

Question 6**Agree?:**

Don't agree with the provision of additional business / industrial land by a proportion of mixed use / housing development land being made available for commercial use. Use of existing brownfield sites and the extension of existing industrial land must be the priority. There are few scenarios when land previously highlighted for housing should be suitable for industrial development. A possible alternative would be to consider more residential development in town centres to support their redevelopment and then reclassify housing land as commercial but don't feel that housing and commercial on the same site is a valid option

Upload Q6:

No file was uploaded

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

Generally agree, but difficult to comment when sites are across various settlements

Upload Q7:

No file was uploaded

Question 8**Housing countryside:**

Agree with the preferred option,

Disagree with the alternative proposal, feel that the development of ad-hoc individual houses does not foster the development of a community environment, does not significantly help with any perceived housing shortage and generally would be 'development' type properties and not properties suitable to the aging population profile identified in Table 2 and/or affordable properties or starter homes required to encourage younger generations to stay in the Borders

Upload Q8:

No file was uploaded

Question 9**Agree removed housing :**

Agree with proposed removals.

Would also suggest the removal of site reference AEDNA011 - Cliftonhill for the following reasons

- 1) Previous planning approvals suggested that no further applications would be considered for this settlement.
- 2) Scottish Water have previously stated that the foul water sewer does not have sufficient capacity
- 3) Sloping site impact associated with overlooking neighboring properties and associated surface water run off.
- 4) Increased traffic at an already dangerous junction.
- 5) No shop / Public house in Ednam to support further development
- 6) Openreach have no current plans to roll out improved broadband to Ednam
- 7) There are a number of individual developments that have already happened in close proximity to this site over recent years which are inappropriate to the

provision required but given that these have already taken place it feels inappropriate to consider further development in this area.

Supporting our town centres

Question 10

Core Activity Areas:

Feel that core activity areas should be retained and that developer contributions should also be maintained. There are a number of historic examples of businesses locating in an area to take advantage of incentives and as soon as the incentive is reduced or removed the council is held to ransom by the company. Where possible the development of residential accommodation in town centres above street level must be encouraged and where business identify space not required to support the business, could there be an option for the Council to take ownership and preserve both the fabric of the building and increase footfall through conversion to residential. Appreciate that finances are limited but if this is left to the private sector consistency and standards will not be at a required level.

Question 11

Berwickshire supermarket:

There is evidence in Galashiels that despite the proximity of recent supermarket development to the town centre that footfall in the centre is reduced by the development. People drive to a supermarket to undertake a particular shop and do not have a mind set to visit other shops. If there is a specific need for a new retail supermarket within Duns is there an option that this could be a smaller development in / close to the existing town centre? The development of anything larger would have the same impact as the Tesco / Asda development in Galashiels and the Council would not want to ignore this impact

Upload Q11:

No file was uploaded

Question 12

Develp contrib town:

No see answer to question 10

Delivering sustainability and climate change agenda

Question 13

Support alternative option:

Support the preferred option but it should be recognized in the plan that not all impacts require major investment. Some and / or increased maintenance in some areas for example gully emptying / cleaning can reduce flood risk minimize the requirement for expensive capital developments. Promotion of sustainability could be better and simple things like bulk purchase and onward supply of LED bulbs could encourage take up. The plan must have a strong focus on recycling, and must seek to clarify for households what can and cant be recycled. There is a lot of confusion as to what is recyclable in different areas and a lot of frustration that some things are still not being recycled once collected. The plan should also promote close working with business to support recyclable packaging and new businesses must be 'encouraged' by the planning process to be sustainable.

Question 14

National park:

Difficult question to answer, not sure what the specific attributes of the Borders are to be classed as a National Park when compared to existing National Parks and also not clear enough as to what potential benefits would ensue, financial support, economic benefits, tourism?

Upload Q14:

No file was uploaded

Regeneration

Question 15

Agree redevelopment:

Agree with the proposed sites, would suggest that all brownfield sites should be included within the plan unless that are specific reasons not to include.

Upload Q15:

No file was uploaded

Settlement Map

Question 16

Oxnam settlement:

Support

Question 17

Core frontage Newcastleton:

Support, but do feel that existing planning decisions need to be more consistent and also need to reflect that window replacements with UPVC can now be a suitable alternative to wood given that the same styles can be delivered in both finishes

Planning policy issues

Question 18

Agree amendments appendix3:

Improvements to Digital Connectivity must be given the highest priority to encourage business to the area

Care and Retirement Homes - Given the expected population changes and in particular age stratification there should be very clear policies in place to support controlled development and consideration of the most appropriate provision method i.e. public or private sector.

Car Parking - in a bid to support town centre re-generation there should be a clear policy re both the provision of and enforcement of car parking.

Any other comments

Question 19

Other main issues:

Consultation response is very time consuming and feel that this will not allow for a wide and representative response from all interested parties, accept that this is a wide and complex area but there feels to be a need to simplify the process and remove the focus for reliance on on-line responding.

Landowner details

Have you submitted any site suggestions in this consultation?

Yes

If yes, please confirm the site and provide the landowner details (if known) for each site you have suggested.:

AEDNA011 landowner not known