

## Participation

<p>General welcome for Master Plan concept with the following recurring themes –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- How can it be kept non-political?</li> <li>- Will politicians and officials pay any attention to its outcomes?</li> <li>- How can they be involved without politicising the process?</li> <li>- How will the Master Plan process develop and how will it remain inclusive?</li> </ul>	<p>There was no negative feedback on the concept of a Master Plan.</p> <p>The main concern or interest was how momentum and feedback can be maintained and how seriously would any outputs be taken by officials.</p>
<p>Apart from participation by members of the public, who else should be involved by way of local interest groups? For example: other local community councils, volunteer groups, schools, health services, housing associations etc.</p>	<p>Ties in with the concern for an inclusive process.</p>
<p>How does the LDP and general planning process work, who are the national and local protagonists, and how does the community engage with them?</p>	<p>With some exceptions there is a large deficit in the general community's perception and understanding of the planning and LDP process. In particular how land is zoned for development, how windfall developments are treated, how many new homes might be built and what infrastructural improvements accompany them.</p>
<p>Where are we in relation to the current LDP as it affects the likely timescale of any Master Plan?</p>	<p>Participants were unsure about where Peebles is in terms of LDP targets today and where these might be leading to and the degree to which current priorities are flexible or not.</p>
<p>How will the process prioritise between different age groups and different interests?</p>	<p>Most participants supported most initiatives that were on display, e.g. greater access, more connectivity, holistic planning of housing development and infrastructural improvements.</p> <p>There were some conflicts, however, e.g. –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Housing development north or south of the river</li> <li>- Large versus small housing developments</li> <li>- Cycle versus pedestrian lobby</li> <li>- Different age and ability groups have competing demands on what will be a limited budget</li> </ul> <p>Who sets the priorities?</p>

## Second Bridge

The main issues centred on –

- The future security of the river crossing.
- The need or desirability of substantially more housing development that would accompany it.
- Would it ease traffic congestion at peak times at the junction with the High Street?
- Cost versus other road and transport priorities.
- Route
- Impact on town's character, infrastructure and attractiveness to visitors and community alike.

There are two opposing views on future security of the river crossing. First, the town is dangerously dependent on a single crossing. Second, the existing bridge is sound and will serve the community for another 100 years with proper maintenance.

Most participants expressed anxiety over further large scale housing development in Peebles. Overdevelopment, loss of character, lack of affordable housing, pressure on infrastructure and services, wrong priority that served developer rather than community interests and undermined Peebles' attraction as a visitor destination.

As most developments were targeted at commuters to Edinburgh should not development be concentrated north rather than south of the river in future?

The focus of traffic congestion was at the junction of Tweed Bridge with the High Street mini-roundabout. A variety of views were expressed –

- The congestion is exaggerated and limited in duration
- The bridge is not at capacity yet
- The congestion is exacerbated by school run traffic. How about staggering local school start and finish times?
- Greater, safer pedestrian and cycle connectivity across the river and within the town would reduce traffic movements.

Concerns were expressed over cost versus the poor state of current roads and competing traffic priorities, e.g. Neidpath and Dirtpot Corners.

Concerns were expressed that a second bridge is being forced on the town

	<p>by developer interests. Greater transparency over developer contributions versus gains is desirable.</p> <p>The suggested routes for a second bridge are not favoured. The route if a bridge goes ahead should be further east (Cavalry Park/Eshiels). Some feedback asked why a route west of the town would not be better.</p> <p>If a second bridge does get the go-ahead it must include safe non-car traffic lanes for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders.</p>
--	--

## Transport and Access

<p>Cycle and walker interests were strongly represented, focusing on the continued development of cycle and multi-use paths.</p> <p>In particular –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Connect Innerleithen path with Whitestone Park.</li> <li>○ Multi-use path across the Tweed to support local access to town from developments south of the river.</li> <li>○ Better connectivity between roads and existing paths in and around the town.</li> <li>○ Look at a new path from Peebles to Eddleston and on to Roslin.</li> <li>○ Where paths not possible introduce cycle lanes on the roads.</li> </ul>	<p>There was general support for recent, current and future developments of non-car access in and around the town.</p> <p>There were some comments about the need to ensure that all groups should benefit from these paths wherever possible and that where width was a problem, walkers should take priority over cyclists and horse riders.</p> <p>New developments should take less priority than maintaining existing paths. There were some comments that other priorities were equally and perhaps more important in particular the state of the roads, parking and non-transport areas such as health and welfare facilities. This is a complex area with different funding streams and budgetary restraints/opportunities.</p> <p>A recurring theme was safe, well-lit pedestrian access for mothers, children and the elderly to and from schools, shops and welfare centres.</p>
<p>Need to ensure disabled access around the town is not forgotten. Make sure representative groups (e.g. TAP) are consulted.</p>	<p>Small improvements have big impact, e.g. levelling the path on the north bank of the Tweed below Haylodge Hospital.</p>
<p>Need to maintain clear pathways and pavements from overgrowing hedges and trees from private gardens.</p>	<p>Annual surveys via Community Council and other groups.</p>
<p>Get the basics right, i.e. spend more on maintaining existing roads, pavements and footpaths around the town (especially the minor roads which are in desperate need of proper maintenance)</p>	<p>Prioritisation needed</p>
<p>If housing developments are for Edinburgh commuters ensure investment in good roads to the city is delivered and user friendly, modern buses are deployed on that route with main bus-stop in Eastgate car-park</p>	<p>Ditto</p>
<p>Cheap or free parking for visitors, more parking needed to avoid free for all in the town's smaller side streets.</p>	<p>Ditto</p>

## Environment

<p>“Peebles is attractive because of its small, unique nature and its green surroundings. Major expansion will have a negative effect on tourism (sic)”</p>	<p>This was a fitting summation of the concern expressed about overdevelopment, loss of character, green spaces and mature woodland by many participants.</p>
<p>“Peebles is already stretched to the limit – services and schools are not keeping up”</p>	<p>Widespread concerns that the town’s infrastructure and services are not keeping pace with increased population.</p>
<p>“We bought a new house in Whitehaugh on the understanding that there would be 118 houses – now there are going to be 178”</p>	<p>Smaller scale development sites are preferred to unrestrained developer led housing schemes.</p>
<p>“More attention please to style and lay-out of houses in developments”</p>	<p>Genuine concerns that developments are un-ambitious in terms of quality, local style and integration of higher and low cost property.</p>
<p>“We need to retain and protect our green spaces, paths, woods and parks”  “We need to protect wild-life habitats in the town”</p>	<p>All round concerns were expressed that these are fundamental to the quality of life in Peebles. Amongst areas perceived to be under threat were –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Kingsmeadows House estate</li> <li>○ Rosetta Holiday Park</li> <li>○ Land south of South Parks</li> </ul> <p>In addition participants drew attention to the loss of mature trees to development with “lesser” species of tree being replanted by developers.</p>
<p>“Would like to see community use of defunct or unused buildings”</p>	<p>Current examples cited were –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ former Halyrude Primary School</li> <li>○ Kingsmeadows House and estate</li> <li>○ private garages opposite the Drill Hall</li> <li>○ house at foot of School Brae</li> <li>○ Veitch’s</li> </ul>
<p>“We need to build long-term sustainability into the Master Plan”</p>	<p>Emphasis on generating own energy, reducing car use and increasing social enterprise. Some of this sentiment reverberates throughout the feedback from participants. It is hard to quantify and define but needs to be remembered throughout the consultation process.</p>
<p>“Newly married with not much money, I came here 42 years ago to a small,</p>	<p>We need more affordable housing for young people who have been born</p>

cheap property and raised my family with my wife. Such a pity that it is so hard for the next generation”	and brought up in Peebles or who want to move here.
“We need more allotments and a transparent allotment policy”	Concern that current provision is so limited, and waiting lists are so long; there is strong demand for additional allocation, but hard to see how this can be provided when land on the periphery of the town is in private ownership and under strong pressure from developers.

## Health & Wellbeing

"It is difficult to get an appointment with my doctor"	
"I am concerned that there are no (fewer????) care homes in Peebles providing care without nursing support"  "I am concerned over the reduction in the care for elderly and infirm people (e.g. closure of the Firholm facility)"  "I am concerned about the provision for housing for elderly people and of care facilities if Tweed Bridge Court is developed"	
"We need a new health centre with parking and a new High School, if the LDP developments go ahead"	
"Green spaces, paths, woods and parks are essential for promoting health and well-being"	
"Can the High School be used to promote evening classes, continuing education etc"	

**Open for Business & Tourism**

“High Street is very important as Peebles is a tourist town. There are too many charity shops. Can SBC make it easier for small independent shops to set up?”	
“Housing development is geared towards Edinburgh commuters. We need more locally generated jobs”	
“The major expansion of Peebles will undermine its attractiveness to visitors”	