

TAYplan Strategic Development Plan Authority

Summary of Unresolved Issues (Schedule 4)

Issue Number 8: Policy 3: Managing TAYplan's Assets – Greenbelts

Contents

| |
|---|
| 1. Summary of Unresolved Issues |
| 2. Copy of actual representations pertinent to this issue <i>(Confidential as it contains personal details which have not been redacted – for DPEA use only)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• All representations include any attachments submitted by the respondent• 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 |
| 3. Library of documents <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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). |

1. Summary of Unresolved Issues

| Issue | | |
|---|--|--|
| Issue Number 8: Policy 3: Managing TAYplan's Assets – Greenbelts | | |
| Development plan reference: | Page 12: Managing TAYplan's Assets Supporting Text Page 13: Policy 3 Greenbelts | Reporter: [Note: For DPEA use only.] |
| Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue and representation references | | |
| Seeking a change | | |
| ID Number | Person / Organisation | Representation Reference |
| 548889 | Alaric Hopgood | PLAN826 |
| 548151 | Andrew McCafferty for GD Strawson and J Farquharson | PLAN449 |
| 548151 | Andrew McCafferty for GD Strawson and J Farquharson | PLAN445 |
| 442149 | Bidwells for Zurich Assurance Limited | PLAN668 |
| 450613 | Councillor Michael A Barnacle | PLAN814 |
| 445201 | Emac Planning for A & J Stephen Limited | PLAN700 |
| 542815 | Flora Selwyn | PLAN78 |
| 445159 | Geddes Consulting for Thomson Homes Limited | PLAN886 |
| 543112 | GS Brown Construction | PLAN89 |
| 548948 | Hargest Planning Limited | PLAN857 |
| 442882 | Homes for Scotland | PLAN217 |
| 546838 | Kinross-shire Civic Trust | PLAN494 |
| 450207 | Largo Area Community Council | PLAN437 |
| 548414 | Miss Lynn McGeorge | PLAN610 |
| 548414 | Miss Lynn McGeorge | PLAN603 |
| 544315 | Miss Marianne Baird | PLAN113 |
| 548386 | Miss Sarah Hunt | PLAN545 |
| 545660 | Mr Colin McAllister | PLAN150 |
| 546652 | Mr Howard Greenwell | PLAN256 |
| 548413 | Mr John Hendrie | PLAN575 |
| 443846 | Mr K C Fraser | PLAN560 |
| 548486 | Mr Ken Miles | PLAN833 |
| 328142 | Mr Mark Myles | PLAN395 |
| 543388 | Mrs Anne Tynite-Irvine | PLAN93 |
| 545391 | Mrs Jennifer Byrne | PLAN139 |
| 348875 | Mrs Jennifer Hopgood | PLAN793 |
| 377831 | Mrs Judith Harding | PLAN499 |
| 377831 | Mrs Judith Harding | PLAN500 |
| 541352 | Mrs Wendy Baylis | PLAN556 |
| 344887 | Penny Uprichard | PLAN876 |
| 548708 | Philip Anthony Hardie | PLAN797 |
| 538105 | PPCA Limited for Edinmore Properties Limited | PLAN19 |
| 545597 | Professor Charles McKean | PLAN148 |

| | | |
|--------|--|---------|
| 545572 | Professor Karla Pollmann | PLAN147 |
| 453889 | Royal Burgh of St. Andrews Community Council | PLAN921 |
| 442870 | Smiths Gore for Mansfield Estates | PLAN552 |
| 442870 | Smiths Gore for Mansfield Estates | PLAN541 |
| 547750 | St. Andrews Preservation Trust | PLAN849 |

Support as written

| ID Number | Person / Organisation | Representation Reference |
|-----------|---|--------------------------|
| 450585 | Methven & District Community Council Montgomery Forgan Associates for Headon | PLAN866 |
| 349140 | Developments Limited | PLAN611 |
| 445161 | Montgomery Forgan Associates for Morris Leslie Group | PLAN657 |
| 527724 | Mr David Dykes | PLAN479 |
| 546153 | Strathkinness Community Council | PLAN189 |

Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:

Greenbelts – this Schedule 4 relates to the two bullet points under the Greenbelts section of Policy 3.

Planning Authority's summary of the representation(s):

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS SEEKING A CHANGE

GENERAL

Geddes Consulting for Thomson Homes Limited (445159) have indicated that Policy 3 - green belts needs to accord with Scottish Planning Policy. The respondent indicates that the green belts around Perth and St. Andrews should provide clarity and certainty on where development will and will not take place. As required by Scottish Planning Policy, the Proposed Plan must set the principles for defining the green belt boundaries at Perth and St. Andrews to accommodate the future strategic requirement at settlements. These boundaries must be clearly identifiable using strong visual or physical landscape features and not be tightly drawn against the urban edge. The current green belt inner boundaries do not comply with this policy requirement and therefore intervention is necessary by the Strategic Development Plan Authority.

Mr John Hendrie (548413) has commented that the Proposed Plan alludes to preventing coalescence in respect of Perth and St. Andrews and has requested that this should refer to all other communities within the Plan.

Andrew McCafferty for GD Strawson and J Farquharson (548151 - PLAN449 and PLAN445) consider that the green belt boundaries are impossible to understand and also consider that the diagram illustrating "Perth Core Area" is unacceptable and cannot be understood.

Royal Burgh of St. Andrews Community Council (453889) are seeking two modifications to the green belt text within Policy 3.

- Firstly, the respondent requests that 'at both' is replaced with 'encircling' at bullet point one in the interests of accuracy as it is not possible to continue to designate green belt

boundaries that have not hitherto been designated.

- Secondly, the respondent requests an additional modification at bullet point one by replacing the word 'infrastructure' with 'proposals shown' and delete 'and Strategic Development Areas in Policy 4' as Strategic Development Areas are shown on the Proposals Map and so do not require separate mention.

PERTH

PPCA Limited for Edinmore Properties Limited (538105) does not agree with the proposed green belt around Perth and considers it unnecessary, excessive and untenable and prevents sustainable growth with alternatives available through Scottish Planning Policy. In addition, the respondent has indicated that reasons for designation given in the Strategic Development Plan must comply with purposes set out in Scottish Planning Policy and that land must be tested against the purposes of green belt set out in Scottish Planning Policy before it is designated as such.

Emac Planning for A & J Stephen Limited (445201); Homes for Scotland (442882); and Smiths Gore for Mansfield Estates (442870 - PLAN552 and PLAN541) has requested a modification to bullet point two for the green belt text within Policy 3 in order to avoid misinterpretation of the policy, specifically to ensure the continued separation of Perth and Scone.

Homes for Scotland (442882) has also requested modifications to bullet point two for the green belt text within Policy 3, including:

- The green belt consultation exercise was last undertaken in 2004. Given that the precise boundaries of the green belt will have a constraining effect on long term development potential, it is of considerable concern that the boundaries proposed are based on consultation last undertaken in 2004. There is no reference to any subsequent studies to assess the robustness of the green belt boundaries which would be provided. Green belt boundaries – which are intended to provide guidance over a 20 year period, should not be defined on the basis of studies which are out of date, or based on the premise of limiting development. The boundaries should make allowance for some development, and allow for opportunities that would be suitable adjacent to the green belt.

The requirements of Scottish Planning Policy should be followed when defining the inner and outer limits of the proposed Perth green belt.

Mr Mark Myles (328142) considers that the proposed extent of the Perth green belt is too vague and should be more clearly stated and shown with greater conviction on the diagrams within the Proposed Plan to include the area between Berthapark and Luncarty / Redgorton so as to properly guide the emerging Perth and Kinross Local Development Plan when it comes to defining the green belt boundaries.

Miss Lynn McGeorge (548414 - PLAN610 and PLAN603) although supportive of the approach proposed to protect and enhance the landscape qualities of Perth and Kinross, the respondent considers that many areas surrounding Perth, including Luncarty / Redgorton / Stanley / Stormontfield appear to have been excluded as being areas of beauty and worth protecting.

Smiths Gore for Mansfield Estates (442870 - PLAN552 and PLAN541) objects to the proposal for a green belt around Perth. The respondent firstly considers that it is not particularly necessary to provide a green belt as growth around Perth could be managed carefully through the Strategic Development Plan and Local Development Plan process, and

there is unlikely to be any major unplanned growth. Should a green belt be required by the Strategic Development Plan, there is a need to draw generous, appropriate and defensible boundaries around the villages in this area which allow for a suitable level of expansion.

Secondly, the respondent also states that Policy 3 specifically mentions Scone and the requirement to use "Perth green belt to sustain the identity of Scone". Whilst the respondent is supportive of the retention of the separate identity of Scone, it is considered that this should not be undertaken at the expense of providing the town with the necessary room to expand to meet its own needs. The green belt boundary should therefore be held back from the existing edge of the settlement to allow room for expansion. There is sufficient separation at present from the adjacent settlement to the south to sustain the identity of Scone with a small extension to the south side of Scone as per the respondent's submission to the Perth and Kinross Main Issues Report (October 2010 – February 2011).

GS Brown Construction (543112) consider that the green belt concept is an anachronism in planning terms and is too blunt and rigid in its application. The respondent indicated that they are particularly familiar with the proposed Perth green belt and consider that its imposition will rule out small scale infill type developments within the Perth Core zone.

Bidwells for Zurich Assurance Limited (442149) note that a new green belt is proposed within the Perth Core Area. Whilst a green belt would help preserve the landscape setting of Perth and the identity of Scone, a balance needs to be struck between those needs and that of the needs to accommodate and facilitate economic development and growth within the core area. Bearing in mind the long term nature of green belts, the respondent considers that a series of green wedges around Perth would be a more appropriate means of achieving those aims whilst facilitating economic development and growth in this key component of the TAYplan region. Whilst the final boundaries of a greenbelt will not be drawn through TAYplan but through a Local Development Plan, the respondent finally considers that these principles should be made clear within TAYplan.

Councillor Michael A Barnacle (450613) considers that the Perth green belt boundary should be drawn more tightly towards the outer ring road and the A9 west and north. In addition, the respondent considers that Kinross-shire should be included along with Perth and St. Andrews as an area of landscape and heritage importance.

ST. ANDREWS

Mrs Judith Harding (377831 –PLAN499); Mrs Judith Harding (377831 – PLAN500); Miss Marianne Baird (544315); Mrs Jennifer Byrne (545391); Largo Area Community Council (450207); Mrs Wendy Baylis (541352); Mr K C Fraser (443846); Mrs Jennifer Hopgood (348875); Alaric Hopgood (548889); Philip Anthony Hardie (548708); Penny Uprichard (344887); and Mrs Anne Tynte-Irvine (5433880)

All of the above respondents have commented that the green belt around St. Andrews has not yet been designated or fixed. The respondents therefore consider that the green belt should be set for St. Andrews before housing is allocated within the proposed western extension of the town. In addition, three of the above respondents have provided additional comments, including: **Mrs Judith Harding (377831 – PLAN500)** considers that there is no protection for landscape value (a tourist asset) which can be destroyed by allowing windfarms near settlements or places of outstanding beauty. **Largo Area Community Council (450207)** consider that TAYplan should make a more robust commitment to landscape protection given the importance of tourism to the rural economy. **Mrs Jennifer Hopgood (348875)** considers that the proposed green belt boundary does not protect the setting of St. Andrews to the west or the "views and special character...".

The following respondents have made separate representations on the proposed St. Andrews Greenbelt:

Mr Colin McAllister (545660); Mr Howard Greenwel (546652); St. Andrews Preservation Trust (547750), Flora Selwyn (542815); and Miss Sarah Hunt (548386) have indicated that they do not consider that golf courses or tourist facilities are acceptable forms of development within the St. Andrews green belt and therefore these exceptions should be reviewed.

Professor Karla Pollmann (545572) has commented that the St. Andrews green belt should be retained and development should stop eating into and destroying it.

Professor Charles McKean (545597) has requested a modification to the first bullet point after St. Andrews as a critical part of the identity and setting of St. Andrews lies in its sharp edge with the countryside and its distant views. The respondent considers that this has been gravely eroded in the last 30 years, in the approaches from south, east and west; and that the Proposed Plan should be used to prevent any further blurring of its identity.

Hargest Planning Limited (548948) supports the principle of a green belt around St. Andrews as well as its principal role in protecting the landscape setting of the town and views into and out of its historic core. However, the respondent considers that the description of the green belt should be amended to reflect the potential for long term growth to the west of the current Strategic Development Area, particularly within the Craigtoun area of west St. Andrews, on the grounds that, the development of this area will not adversely affect either the landscape setting of the town or views into or out of the historic core.

KINROSS

Two respondents (**Mr Ken Miles (548486)** and **Kinross-shire Civic Trust (546838)**) have commented on the omission of Kinross within Policy 3 and have highlighted the important landscape setting and important heritage of the town. It should also be noted that Councillor Michael A Barnacle has made a similar comment which is summarised above. **Mr Ken Miles (548486)** also considers that Kinross should be afforded a green belt designation to protect its setting.

Kinross-shire Civic Trust (546838) considers that Kinross-shire should be identified in the Strategic Development Plan as an area of Landscape and Heritage Interest as much of Kinross-shire is covered by the Area of Great Landscape Value Policy in the current Kinross Area Local Plan. The respondent also comments that Kinross-shire has a number of Sites of Special Scientific Interest, has the Loch Leven Special Protection Area (National Nature Reserve), Sites of Local Conservation Interest, Conservation Areas and Scheduled Monuments. Perth & Kinross Council have also intimated that it will consider replacing the Area of Great Landscape Value with a special landscape value policy in the new Local Development Plan.

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS SUPPORTING AS WRITTEN

GENERAL

Methven & District Community Council (450585) although indicating strong support for the green belt policies, it is considered that core villages such as Almondbank and Methven should be incorporated into bullet point two as Methven & District Community Council covers villages near, but not in Perth, therefore the green belt must secure the landscape and leisure opportunities for local people and visitors and prevent urban sprawl.

PERTH

Mr David Dykes (527724) and **Montgomery Forgan Associates for Morris Leslie Group (445161)** support the Perth green belt in order to sustain the historic identity of Scone.

ST ANDREWS

Strathkinness Community Council (546153) have indicated their support to limiting the types of land uses within the St. Andrews green belt to protect the setting and historic core of the town.

Montgomery Forgan Associates for Headon Developments Limited (349140) support the objective of protecting the important landscape settings and historic core of St. Andrews through the designation of a green belt. This position has underpinned the work undertaken so far by Headon Developments which recognises that the correct balance can be struck between securing the town's landscape setting and historic core and the need to ensure there is sufficient housing and employment land supply within St. Andrews to allow for its planned and measured expansion, thus securing the economic sustainability of the town.

Modifications sought by those submitting representations:

GENERAL

Geddes Consulting for Thomson Homes Limited (445159):-

- *existing green belt boundaries around Perth and St. Andrews should be amended to meet the strategic requirements for growth, reflect the long term settlement strategy and ensure that settlements are able to accommodate planned growth, meeting the objectives of Scottish Planning Policy without the inner boundary being drawn too tightly against the urban edge.*

Mr John Hendrie (548413):-

- *The Plan alludes to preventing coalescence in respect of Perth and St. Andrews. Can it please refer to all other communities within the Plan?*

Andrew McCafferty for GD Strawson and J Farquharson (548151 – PLAN449):-

- *The diagram illustrating "Perth Core Area" is unacceptable and cannot be understood. It should be deleted and replaced with a clearer version which shows recognisable features/settlements on the ground.*

Andrew McCafferty for GD Strawson and J Farquharson (548151 – PLAN445):-

- *Request that the way that the proposed green belt around the eastern side of Perth is shown on the plan on page 9 is clarified preferably by showing a relationship to a recognisable feature/settlement on the ground.*

Royal Burgh of St. Andrews Community Council (453889):-

- *Change "continuing to designate green belt boundaries at both St. Andrews and Perth" to "designate green belt boundaries encircling both St. Andrews and Perth".*
- *Change "to manage long term planned growth including infrastructure in this Plan's Proposals Map and Strategic Development Areas in Policy 4" to "to manage long term planned growth including proposals shown in this Plan's Proposals Map."*

PERTH

PPCA Limited for Edinmore Properties Limited (538105):-

- *Object to the blanket approach to proposed Green Belt designation around Perth City.*

EMAC Planning for A & J Stephen Limited (445201):-

- *Amend the second bullet to read: "using Perth green belt to ensure the continued separation of Perth and Scone to sustain the identity of Scone and provide sufficient land for planned development around key villages and settlements".*

Homes for Scotland (442882):-

- *Amend the second bullet point to: 'using Perth green belt to sustain the identities of Perth and Scone, and providing sufficient land for planned development around key villages and settlements, subject to a full review of the existing greenbelt'*

Smiths Gore for Mansfield Estates (442870 – PLAN552):-

- *Remove the "Proposed Green Belt" requirement or change the text in Policy 3, as suggested by Homes for Scotland to; " using Perth green belt to sustain the identities of Perth and Scone, and providing sufficient land for planned development around key villages and settlements, subject to a full review of the existing greenbelt'.*

Smiths Gore for Mansfield Estates (442870 – PLAN541):-

- *Page 7 Proposals Map. Remove the "Proposed Green Belt" requirement or change the text in Policy 3 , as suggested by Homes for Scotland to "using Perth green belt to sustain the identities of Perth and Scone, and providing sufficient land for planned development around key villages and settlements, subject to a full review of the existing greenbelt'.*

Mr Mark Myles (328142):-

- *Policy 3 highlights that the identity of Scone is to be protected. The Proposed Plan should state that other rural settlements within the Perth Core Area are as equally important e.g. Redgorton, Luncarty, Almondbank and that their identities should also be protected. As such I consider that the proposed extent of the green belt should be more clearly stated and shown with greater conviction on the diagrams within the proposed plan to include the area between Berthapark and Luncarty/Redgorton so as to properly guide the emerging Perth & Kinross Local Development Plan when it comes to defining the green belt boundaries.*

Miss Lynn McGeorge (548414 – PLAN603 and PLAN610):-

- *No specific change identified, considers that many areas surrounding Perth, including Luncarty / Redgorton / Stanley / Stormontfield appear to have been excluded as being areas of beauty and worth protecting.*

GS Brown Construction (543112):-

- *No specific change identified, although concerned that the greenbelt concept is an anachronism in planning terms and is too blunt and rigid in its application. Familiar with the proposed Perth Green Belt and consider that its imposition will rule out small scale infill type developments within the Perth Core zone.*

Bidwells for Zurich Assurance Limited (442149):-

- *A series of green wedges would be a more effective means of achieving the stated goals.*

Councillor Michael A Barnacle (450613):-

- No specific change identified, although considers that the Perth green belt boundary should be drawn more tightly towards the outer ring road and the A9 west and north. In addition, Kinross-shire should be included along with Perth and St. Andrews as an area of landscape and heritage importance.

ST. ANDREWS

Mrs Judith Harding (377831 –PLAN499 and PLAN500); Miss Marianne Baird (544315); Mrs Jennifer Byrne (545391); Largo Area Community Council (450207); Mrs Wendy Baylis (541352); Mr K C Fraser (443846); Mrs Jennifer Hopgood (348875); Alaric Hopgood (548889); Philip Anthony Hardie (548708); Penny Uprichard (344887); and Mrs Anne Tynte-Irvine (5433880):-

- No specific change identified, although all consider that the green belt should be set for St. Andrews before housing is allocated within the proposed western extension of the town.

Mr Colin McAllister (545660); Mr Howard Greenwell (546652); St. Andrews Preservation Trust (547750); Flora Selwyn (542815); and Miss Sarah Hunt (548386):-

- Have all indicated that they do not consider that golf courses or tourist facilities are acceptable forms of development within the St. Andrews green belt.

Professor Karla Pollmann (545572):-

- *Keep the green belt of St. Andrews and stop eating into it and destroying it.*

Professor Charles McKean (545597):-

- *Policy 3: ...continuing to designate green belt boundaries at St Andrews...add ' to encircle the town prior to the identification of housing land '*

Hargest Planning Limited (548948):-

- No specific change identified, although consider that the description of the green belt should be amended to reflect the potential for long term growth to the west of the current Strategic Development Area, particularly within the Craigtoun area of west St. Andrews, on the grounds that, the development of this area will not adversely affect either the landscape setting of the town or views into or out of the historic core.

KINROSS

Mr Ken Miles (548486):-

- Considers that Kinross should be afforded a green belt designation.

Kinross-shire Civic Trust (546838):-

- No specific change identified, although considers that Kinross-shire should be identified in the Strategic Development Plan as an area of Landscape and Heritage Interest as much of Kinross-shire is covered by the Area of Great Landscape Value Policy in the current Kinross Area Local Plan.

Summary of responses (including reasons) by Planning Authority:

RESPONSES TO REPRESENTATIONS SEEKING A CHANGE

GENERAL

Geddes Consulting for Thomson Homes Limited (445159; and, Andrew McCafferty for GD Strawson and J Farquharson (548151 – PLAN449 and PLAN445);- Policy 3 (Greenbelts) accords with Scottish Planning Policy (Pages 32-33, Paragraphs 159-164) (CL/Doc2). Scottish Planning Policy is clear on the role Strategic Development Plans have in establishing the principle of a greenbelt. In this regard, Scottish Planning Policy specifies that the Strategic Development Plan “should establish the need for a green belt, identify its broad area and set the policy for future development within it. Local Development Plans should establish the detailed boundaries of the green belt and identify types of development which are appropriate within the green belt.” (Page 33, Paragraph 161). This is what the Proposed Plan does. The Scottish Government nor any other Key Agency have raised concern, nor sought any changes to Policy 3 (Greenbelts) or associated maps. TAYplan does not consider that a modification to Policy 3 is necessary.

Mr John Hendrie (548413);- TAYplan considers that the level of detail in Policy 3 (Greenbelts) and the supporting text (Page 12) is appropriate for a strategic planning policy document and does not require to prevent coalescence to all settlements within the TAYplan region. Topic Paper 3: Resources and Climate Change (Page 11, Paragraph 5.13) (CL/Doc32) specifies that Perth and St. Andrews have designated green belts in order to preserve their historic settings, views and special character. Scottish Planning Policy also states that “most settlements do not have or need green belts because other policies or designations, such as countryside policies, provide an appropriate context for decision making” (Scottish Planning Policy, Page 32, Paragraph 160) (CL/Doc2). Therefore, the prevention of coalescence of other settlements is an issue which will be considered in more detail within Local Development Plan policy and/or during the planning application process.

Royal Burgh of St. Andrews Community Council (453889);- The principal for green belts at Perth and St. Andrews was established in their respective Structure Plans, although the detailed boundaries will be set out in the emerging Perth & Kinross and St. Andrews and East Fife Local Development Plans (Background Technical Note (April 2010), Page 8, Paragraph 2.23) (CL/Doc58). Scottish Planning Policy is clear on the role Strategic Development Plans have in establishing the principle of a green belt. In this regard, Scottish Planning Policy specifies that the Strategic Development Plan “should establish the need for a green belt, identify its broad area and set the policy for future development within it (Scottish Planning Policy, Page 33, Paragraph 161) (CL/Doc2). The specific changes sought to the text would not provide consistency across the Plan.

The St. Andrews green belt was designated in the approved Fife Structure Plan (2009) (CL/Doc39) with the boundaries being defined through the Local Development Plan – currently at examination stage. Through the Local Development Plan process there has been considerable consultation on this alongside the proposed Strategic Development Area. To make any changes to this, at this late stage in a process of designating and defining the boundary, would undermine the current wording of Policy 3 and could have implications for other policies of the Proposed Plan.

The High Court decision by Lord Justice Clerk, Lord Brodie and Lord McEwan on September 7th 2011 (CL/Doc76) dismissed the legal challenge to the Fife Structure Plan 2009 stating that

“The effect of our quashing those parts of the Plan that relate to St Andrews West would be that it would cease to be a strategic land allocation. That would undermine the settlement

strategy of the Plan. It would disrupt the local plan process. It would frustrate the policy decision that St Andrews must make its contribution to the economic regeneration of Fife. In this way the wider economic strategy would be undermined and, in my opinion, would become unworkable. I think that there would also be a vacuum in the development plan because there would no longer be a coherent planning framework for development control in St Andrews West.”

PERTH

PPCA Limited for Edinmore Properties Limited (538105); Mr Mark Myles (328142); Miss Lynn McGeorge (548414 – PLAN603 and PLAN610); GS Brown Construction (543112); Bidwells for Zurich Assurance Limited (442149); and Councillor Michael A Barnacle (450613):- Policy 3 (Greenbelts) accords with Scottish Planning Policy (Pages 32-33, Paragraphs 159-164) (CL/Doc2). Scottish Planning Policy is clear on the role Strategic Development Plans have in establishing the principle of a greenbelt. In this regard, Scottish Planning Policy specifies that the Strategic Development Plan “should establish the need for a green belt, identify its broad area and set the policy for future development within it. Local Development Plans should establish the detailed boundaries of the green belt and identify types of development which are appropriate within the green belt.” (Page 33, Paragraph 161).

The principal for a green belts at Perth was established in the approved Perth Structure Plan (2003) (CL/Doc46), although the detailed boundaries will be set out in the emerging Perth & Kinross Local Development Plan (Background Technical Note (April 2010), Page 8, Paragraph 2.23) (CL/Doc58).

In relation, to the Perth green belt, Policy 3 does not suggest a blanket ban on development. The green belt will protect the historic core and setting of Perth as well as accommodating infrastructure and planned development, whilst preventing the sprawl of the city into the countryside. Consequently, and whilst read in conjunction with Policy 1: Location Priorities; this forms an important element of ensuring that growth is focussed firstly within the Perth Core Area and particularly that the largest concentrations are at the Perth West/North West Strategic Development Area as defined in Policy 4 (Page 15). This approach is therefore an integral element of the Spatial Strategy of the Proposed Plan and is consistent with Scottish Planning Policy (Pages 32-33, Paragraph 160) (CL/Doc2), whilst also forming a continuation of the approach set out in the Perth and Kinross Structure Plan (2003) (CL/Doc46). A failure to implement the green belt in this way would make the planned and coordinated growth of Perth City at the heart of the Perth Core Area impossible. Only by putting in place a green belt and by drawing its boundaries to take account of planned growth can the decision making framework be capable of supporting sustainable growth, consistent with Scottish Planning Policy (Page 32, Paragraph 159) (CL/Doc2), whilst allowing the Perth & Kinross Local Development Plan to define the specific boundaries to assist in the delivery of the Spatial Strategy of the Strategic Development Plan.

The Scottish Government nor any other Key Agency have raised concern, nor sought any changes to Policy 3 (Greenbelts) or associated maps. TAYplan does not consider that a modification to Policy 3 is necessary.

Emac Planning for A & J Stephen Limited (445201); Homes for Scotland (442882); and Smiths Gore for Mansfield Estates (442870 – PLAN552 and PLAN541):- TAYplan do not consider it necessary to modify the second bullet point of Policy 3 (Greenbelts) Proposed Plan relating to Perth. The designation of a green belt around Perth aims to protect its historic core and setting, whilst accommodating infrastructure and planned development. The emerging Perth & Kinross Local Development Plan will define the specific boundaries of the greenbelt. In conjunction with bullet point one, Policy 3 (Greenbelts) is clear and concise and accords with

Scottish Planning Policy (Pages 32-33, Paragraphs 159-164) (CL/Doc2). Although the respondents are only requesting relatively minor modifications to the wording of the second bullet point of Policy 3 (Greenbelts), the changes requested are considered to be repetitive with other parts of Policy 3 (Greenbelts), therefore any change to the Proposed Plan would mean that a short, concise and visionary Strategic Development Plan would not be implicated (Planning Circular 1/2009: Development Planning, Page 4, Paragraph 14) (CL/Doc29). Such changes are not considered necessary.

ST. ANDREWS

Mrs Judith Harding (377831 –PLAN499 and PLAN500); Miss Marianne Baird (544315); Mrs Jennifer Byrne (545391); Largo Area Community Council (450207); Mrs Wendy Baylis (541352); Mr K C Fraser (443846); Mrs Jennifer Hopgood (348875); Alaric Hopgood (548889); Philip Anthony Hardie (548708); Penny Uprichard (344887); Mrs Anne Tynte-Irvine (5433880); Hargest Planning Limited (548948); Professor Karla Pollmann (545572); and Professor Charles McKean (545597):- Policy 3 (Greenbelts) accords with Scottish Planning Policy (Pages 32-33, Paragraphs 159-164) (CL/Doc2). Scottish Planning Policy is clear on the role Strategic Development Plans have in establishing the principle of a greenbelt. In this regard, Scottish Planning Policy specifies that the strategic development plan “should establish the need for a green belt, identify its broad area and set the policy for future development within it. Local Development Plans should establish the detailed boundaries of the green belt and identify types of development which are appropriate within the green belt.” (Page 33, Paragraph 161).

The Finalised St. Andrews & East Fife Local Plan (2009) (Pages 98 and 141) (CL/Doc40) sets the proposed green belt boundaries for St. Andrews but is clear that the inner boundary of the green belt may be adjusted via the Masterplanning process for the St. Andrews West proposal. A green belt for St. Andrews has been a proposal of the St. Andrews & East Fife Local Plan since March 2005, when the Consultative Draft St. Andrews & East Fife Local Plan was published. The green belt proposal carried through (in an amended form) to the St. Andrews & East Fife Local Plan - Finalised Draft of August 2006 and is now included (with further amendment) as proposal LW4 24 in the Finalised St. Andrews & East Fife Local Plan (2009). The size of the green belt has increased, in response to representations made and the comments of various Committees, at each stage of the Local Plan process. In addition, in drawing the green belt boundaries for St. Andrews, Fife Council have taken into consideration various landscape studies.

It should be noted that the Finalised St. Andrews & East Fife Local Plan (2009) (CL/Doc40) is currently under Examination by Scottish Ministers. The St. Andrews green belt proposal (LW4 24, Policy E17) will be considered as part of this examination, however it is the view of Fife Council that appropriate boundaries have been set for the proposed St. Andrews green belt. Scottish Planning Policy (Page 33, Paragraph 162) (CL/Doc2) states that inner boundaries should not be drawn too tightly around the urban edge, but where appropriate should create an area suitable for planned development between the existing settlement edge and green belt boundary.

The Scottish Government nor any other Key Agency have raised concern, nor sought any changes to Policy 3 (Greenbelts) or associated maps. TAYplan does not consider that a modification to Policy 3 is necessary.

The High Court decision by Lord Justice Clerk, Lord Brodie and Lord McEwan on September 7th 2011 (CL/Doc76) dismissed the legal challenge to the Fife Structure Plan 2009 stating that ..

“The effect of our quashing those parts of the Plan that relate to St Andrews West would be that it would cease to be a strategic land allocation. That would undermine the settlement strategy of the Plan. It would disrupt the local plan process. It would frustrate the policy decision that St Andrews must make its contribution to the economic regeneration of Fife. In this way the wider economic strategy would be undermined and, in my opinion, would become unworkable. I think that there would also be a vacuum in the development plan because there would no longer be a coherent planning framework for development control in St Andrews West.”

Mr Colin McAllister (545660); Mr Howard Greenwell (546652); St. Andrews Preservation Trust (547750); Flora Selwyn (542815); and Miss Sarah Hunt (548386):- TAYplan does not consider that the issues raised are of strategic significance. The Proposed Plan does not identify types of development which are appropriate within the St. Andrews green belt. This is matter is addressed by Policy E17 in the Finalised St. Andrews & East Fife Local Plan (2009) (CL/Doc40) (Page 141) which is consistent with the approach sought in Scottish Planning Policy (Page 33, Paragraph 161) (CL/Doc2). It should be noted that that the Finalised St. Andrews & East Fife Local Plan (2009) currently under Examination by Scottish Ministers which will consider the St. Andrews Greenbelt issue.

KINROSS

Mr Ken Miles (548486); and Kinross-shire Civic Trust (546838):- Scottish Planning Policy states that “most settlements do not have or need green belts because other policies or designations, such as countryside policies, provide an appropriate context for decision making” (Scottish Planning Policy, Page 32, Paragraph 160) (CL/Doc2). TAYplan therefore considers that there is no strategic requirement for a greenbelt at Kinross as the policy framework for countryside development adjacent to main settlements will be established by the emerging Perth & Kinross Local Development Plan.

Kinross-shire Civic Trust (546838):- TAYplan does not consider that the issue raised is of strategic significance. Policy 3 (Natural and Historic Assets) is clear and concise on the importance of safeguarding sensitive landscapes. The policy framework for particular important landscapes, such as Kinross-shire is likely to established by the emerging Perth & Kinross Local Development Plan.

RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIONS SUPPORTING AS WRITTEN

TAYplan welcomes the support for these issues.

CONCLUSION

TAYplan considers that 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. Scottish Natural Heritage, Scottish Government nor any other Key Agency have sought any changes to Policy 3 (Greenbelts) or associated maps.

The Proposed Strategic Development Plan takes forward the green belt principles established in approved Structure Plans. Any change to Policy 3 (Greenbelts) would undermine the Development Plan process of establishing green belt boundaries which is being taken forward through Local Plans / Local Development Plans. TAYplan consider that Policy 3 (Greenbelts) is consistent with Scottish Planning Policy, Page 32-33, Paragraphs 159-164) and therefore does not consider that any modifications are necessary.

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