

**TAYplan Strategic Development Plan Authority**

**Summary of Unresolved Issues (Schedule 4)**

*Issue 14: Policy 4 Strategic Development Areas Part B & Supporting Text & General*

## Contents

|   |
|---|
| 1. Summary of Unresolved Issues   |
| 2. Copy of actual representations pertinent to this issue<br><br><i>(Confidential as it contains personal details which have not been redacted – for DPEA use only)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• All representations include any attachments submitted by the respondent</li><li>• Where representations were submitted in hard copy or by email these were entered into our system and all material originally submitted has been attached and appears here with the representation</li></ul> |
| 3. Library of documents <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• All documents and extracts referred to in the representation and/or the Schedule 4 are either contained in the library attached to this Schedule or where over 50 pages within the Core Library (separate folders).</li></ul>   |

## 1. Summary of Unresolved Issues

| Issue   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <b>Issue 14: Policy 4 Strategic Development Areas Part B &amp; Supporting Text &amp; General</b>  |  |  |
| <b>Development plan reference:</b>  | Page 14: Supporting Text & General<br>Page 15: Part B        | <b>Reporter:</b><br>[Note: For DPEA use only.] |
| <b>Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue &amp; Representation ref(s)</b>  |  |  |
| <b>Seeking a change</b>   |  |  |
| <b>ID Number</b>  | <b>Person/Organisation</b>                                   | <b>Representation Reference</b>                |
| 541485  | Colliers International for Lawrie & Symington Ltd            | PLAN349  |
| 450103  | CTC Right to Ride Network                                    | PLAN840  |
| 527724  | David Dykes  | PLAN482  |
| 445201  | Emac Planning for A&J Stephen Ltd                            | PLAN701  |
| 548522  | Emac Planning for A&J Stephen Ltd/Bett Homes                 | PLAN744  |
| 445204  | Emac Planning for Angus Estates Ltd                          | PLAN613  |
| 548523  | Emac Planning for Bett Homes                                 | PLAN767  |
| 548524  | Emac Planning for Stewart Milne Homes                        | PLAN783  |
| 450207  | Largo Area Community Council                                 | PLAN438  |
| 237724  | Lomond Land  | PLAN419  |
| 443979  | Lynne Palmer   | PLAN161  |
| 450585  | Methven & District Community Council                         | PLAN869  |
| 453889  | Royal Burgh of St. Andrews Community Council                 | PLAN926  |
| 547750  | St. Andrews Preservation Trust                               | PLAN843  |
| <b>Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:</b>  | Part B of Policy 4 on page 15 and supporting text on page 14 |  |
| <b>Planning Authority's summary of the representation(s):</b>   |  |  |
| <b>SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS SEEKING A CHANGE</b>  |  |  |
| <b><u>PART B</u></b>  |  |  |
| <b><i>Colliers International for Lawrie &amp; Symington Ltd (541485):</i></b> Consider that commercial viability and market conditions should be considered for the Strategic Development Areas and this should be recognised in the footnote on page 15. |  |  |
| <b><u>SUPPORTING TEXT &amp; GENERAL</u></b>   |  |  |
| <b><i>CTC Right to Ride Network (450103):</i></b> Promotes a modal shift to non car transport.  |  |  |
| <b><i>David Dykes (527724):</i></b> Consider that all the Strategic Development Areas will need developer contributions and the requirements to be set out in the Proposed Plan.  |  |  |

***Emac Planning for (A&J Stephen Ltd (445201); A&J Stephen Ltd/Bett Homes (548522); Angus Estates Ltd (445204); Bett Homes (548523) and Emac Planning for Stewart Milne Homes (548524)***): Consider that a number of small to medium sites should be brought forward in addition to the Strategic Development Areas so that the initial 5 year period of the Plan can ensure development can be delivered from the outset and secure investment in the regions economy.

***Largo Area Community Council (450207)*** Considers that more up to date data is used for proposed housing numbers to take account of current economic climate and recovery. Figures for St Andrews (1090 dwellings required) in the Structure Plan is already out of date.

***Lynne Palmer (443979)***: Supporting text makes no mention of importance of Perth Harbour and does not support the use of jargon such as employment land and abbreviations such as ha for hectares.

***Lomond Land (237724)***: Based on current economic climate they consider that a more robust and up to date evidence base is required to support the commitment to the identified Strategic Development Areas. Policy 4 should instruct the Local Development Plans to re-assess the Strategic Development Areas and have alternative/additional land allocations if the Strategic Development Areas have not been delivered within a certain time period. Currently smaller sites are easier to finance and develop for the volume house builders.

***Methven & District Community Council (450585)***: Consider that all the Strategic Development Areas will require development frameworks/masterplans.

***Royal Burgh of St. Andrews Community Council (453889) and St. Andrews Preservation Trust (547750)***: Both disagree with the statement that with the exception of West/North West Perth the other Strategic Development Area's already have a framework/masterplan in place or are of a scale/nature where one is not required. Their understanding is that masterplans or Strategic Development Framework's require public consultation and this has not happened for St. Andrews.

#### **Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

**NOTE TO REPORTER:** The text in italics in this section has been lifted directly from each individual/organisation's representation with minor typographical errors corrected.

#### **PART B**

***Colliers International for Lawrie & Symington Ltd (541485)***: Commercial viability and market conditions of the Strategic Development Areas should be recognised in the footnote on page 15.

#### **SUPPORTING TEXT & GENERAL**

***CTC Right to Ride Network (450103)***: Request that the 5th line of paragraph 2 on page 14 should be altered slightly to include "especially by car" after "reduce the need to travel".

***David Dykes (527724)***: Requests that the developer contributions requirements for each Strategic Development Area should be set out in the Proposed Plan.

***Emac Planning for (A&J Stephen Ltd (445201); A&J Stephen Ltd/Bett Homes (548522); Angus Estates Ltd (445204); Bett Homes (548523) and Stewart Milne Homes (548524)***): Requests that a number of small to medium sites should be promoted in the Proposed Plan in addition to the Strategic Development Areas.

**Largo Area Community Council (450207)** More up to date data should be used for proposed housing numbers to take account of current economic climate and recovery.

**Lynne Palmer (443979)**: Requests that the supporting text mentions the importance of Perth Harbour and replace jargon such as employment land with plain English and amend abbreviations such as ha for hectares.

**Lomond Land (237724)**: Request that Policy 4 instructs the Local Development Plans to re-assess the Strategic Development Areas and have alternative/additional land allocations if the Strategic Development Areas have not been delivered within a certain time period.

**Methven & District Community Council (450585) Royal Burgh of St. Andrews Community Council (453889) and St. Andrews Preservation Trust (547750)**: Request that all the Strategic Development Areas require development frameworks/masterplans to be carried out.

**Summary of responses (including reasons) by Planning Authority:**

## **RESPONSES TO REPRESENTATIONS SEEKING A CHANGE**

### **PART B**

Issue raised by **Colliers International for Lawrie & Symington Ltd (541485)**: It is considered that the commercial viability and market conditions of the Strategic Development Areas is adequately dealt with by another Schedule 4 (Issue number 24: Policy 8 Delivering the Strategic Development Plan) which recognises current market conditions and economic difficulties. Paragraph 3 of Policy 8's supporting text says that 'In times of economic recession, the funding of new projects is difficult'. The Plan also states specific mechanisms, which in accordance with Circular 1/2010 (014/SL/Doc5) highlights TAYplan's recognition of the economy. In the Plan's Vision and Objectives on page 6, TAYplan states under a number of objectives its focus to grow the economy. Furthermore, in the Foreword to the Plan in paragraph 7 on page 3, TAYplan states its commitment to 'maximising the assets we have and growing our economy in a manner which does not place unacceptable burdens on our planet'. There is no need to amend the footnote on page 15 as market conditions are considered as part of determining whether a site is effective.

### **SUPPORTING TEXT & GENERAL**

Issue raised by **CTC Right to Ride Network (450103)**: There is no requirement to modify the 5th line of paragraph 2 on page 14 to include "especially by car" after "reduce the need to travel" as footnote \*\* on page 14 adequately identifies the drive towards a modal shift to non car modes of transport. It is also considered the phrase 'reduce the need to travel' encompasses all modes of motorised transport and there is no requirement to specifically mention the car. Neither the Scottish Government, Tactran nor SEStran have sought a change to the statement.

Issue raised by **David Dykes (527724)**: It is considered that there is no requirement to identify the developer contributions requirements for each Strategic Development Area. Most Local Authority's has its own developer contributions policies in relation to education, infrastructure requirements etc. This issue is dealt with by another Schedule 4 (Issue number 24: Policy 8 Delivering the Strategic Development Plan). Paragraph 4 of the supporting text on page 22 recognises the role of other funding mechanisms: 'Local Development Plans to establish a mechanism(s), which may require new financial models...'. The flexibility and timing of developer contributions will be considered through Local Development Plans and/or planning applications. It will also require further detail to be brought forward on each of the Strategic Development Areas before the developer contribution requirements will be known.

Issue raised by **Emac Planning for (A&J Stephen Ltd (445201); A&J Stephen Ltd/Bett Homes (548522); Angus Estates Ltd (445204); Bett Homes (548523) and Stewart Milne Homes (548524))**: There is no requirement to identify a number of small to medium sites to be promoted in the Proposed Plan in addition to the Strategic Development Areas. It is the role of the Strategic Development Planning Authority to identify strategic sites for housing and employment purposes that will have cross boundary impacts. Small to medium site identification is a role and function for the Local Development Plan process as they are unlikely to have cross boundary impacts. In addition Policy 5 – Housing of the Proposed Plan provides flexibility to deliver an effective land supply through a range of sites and Policy 1 sets out the locational priorities providing a strategic framework for a range of other sites to be identified through Local Development Plans.

Issue raised by **Largo Area Community Council (450207)** The levels of house building planned for in North Fife (and other parts of the region) are the product of the TAYplan-wide Housing Need and Demand Assessment (2010) (CL/Doc49) and a series of wider strategic economic, social and environmental considerations, consistent with Scottish Planning Policy (2010) Paragraph 70 (014/SL/Doc6). The GROS 2006-based and 2008-based population and household projections have assisted in understanding the possible demographic implications of different levels of house building. This has been covered in more detail in Issues 016 Scale and Distribution of Housing.

Issue raised by **Lynne Palmer (443979)**: This issue is dealt with by another Schedule 4 (Issue 11: Policy 3 Transport) Although Policy 3 does not include a direct reference to Perth Harbour, the policy text does refer to “other harbours” which would include Perth. There is no requirement to specifically identify the importance of Perth Harbour within the supporting text because it is not of a scale of operation that has the same strategic implications in comparison to Dundee and Montrose Ports. It is also considered that there is no requirement to replace words such as employment land with plain English and amend abbreviations such as ha for hectares as these are standard everyday words and abbreviations.

Issue raised by **Lomond Land (237724)**: There is no requirement to instruct each Local Authority’s Local Development Plan to re-assess the Strategic Development Areas and have alternative/additional land allocations if the Strategic Development Areas have not been delivered within a certain time period. As stated on page 14 of the Proposed Plan each of the Strategic Development Areas, with the exception of the James Hutton Institute at Invergowrie and Forfar as a Regional Agricultural Service Centre, has already been identified in previous Local Authority plans or has planning permission and has therefore been taken forward in the Proposed Plan. In addition to this, there is a requirement under the Planning (Scotland) Act 2006 for a new Strategic Development Plan and Local Development Plan to be produced within 5 years of adoption of the previous plan and all sites will therefore be reviewed on a regular basis to ensure their continued effectiveness. The issue of an effective supply of housing sites and the suggestion that Local Development Plans must allocate additional land is dealt with by another Schedule 4 (Issue 17 Policy 5 Housing - Effectiveness of Housing Land). Page 16 of Policy 5 already explains the key flexibilities available to Local Development Plans and these are appropriate to deal with operational circumstances within the context of the strategy. The purpose of this flexibility is not to over supply but to ensure delivery of the scale that is being planned for with a plentiful enough supply of effective housing land in locations which deliver the strategy.

Issue raised by **Methven & District Community Council (450585) Royal Burgh of St. Andrews Community Council (453889) and St. Andrews Preservation Trust (547750)**: Part B of Policy 4 and footnotes \*\* and \*\*\* on page 15 of the Proposed Plan already identifies that Strategic Development Frameworks are required for the Strategic Development Areas to help establish key development parameters. All the Strategic Development Areas with the exception of Perth West/North West already have a framework or masterplan in place or are of a

scale/nature where one is not required (Orchard Bank, Linlathen, Forfar Regional Agricultural Service Centre and the James Hutton Institute). To state that all Strategic Development Areas require Development Frameworks is considered that it could be confusing with the potential implication that it could lead to the duplication of work. The Strategic Development Framework for St. Andrews is incorporated in the 2009 Local Plan (CL/Doc40) and was consulted on through that process. It is important to note that the Local Plan Development Frameworks for Cupar and St Andrews are indicative and subject to review through masterplanning which will involve community engagement.

## **CONCLUSION**

TAYplan considers that many of the issues raised are minor in detail and some are considered under other Schedule 4's, particularly Transport (Policy 3), Housing (Policy 5) and Delivering the Strategic Development Plan (Policy 8). It is considered that Policy 4B and related text is clear and consistent with Scottish Governments advice and policy. The requirement for Strategic Development Frameworks is critically important to achieving the vision of a better quality of place and life. The Policy is consistent with Scottish Planning Policy (2010). Therefore the issues raised do not warrant any change to the Proposed Strategic Development Plan (June, 2011) and propose that the elements dealt with in this Schedule 4 Summary of Unresolved Issues remain as written and unchanged.

|                                    |
|------------------------------------|
| <b>Reporter's conclusions:</b>     |
| [Note: For DPEA use only.]         |
| <b>Reporter's recommendations:</b> |
| [Note: For DPEA use only.]         |

## **2. Copy of representations pertinent to this issue**

**3. Library of documents and extracts (less than 50 pages) referred to within representations and/or this Schedule**