

**REPORT TO: DUNDEE, PERTH, ANGUS AND NORTH FIFE
STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT PLANNING AUTHORITY
JOINT COMMITTEE MEETING ON 31st AUGUST 2010**

**REPORT ON: SESplan MAIN ISSUES REPORT: CONSULTATION
RESPONSE**

**REPORT BY: PAMELA EWEN, STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT PLANNING
AUTHORITY MANAGER**

REPORT NO: SDPA09-2010

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 This report is to seek authorisation to submit the following comments to SESplan Strategic Development Planning Authority (SDPA) as TAYplan's response to their Main Issues Report.
- 1.2 This consultation response could have been responded to through delegated powers to the TAYplan Manager. However, given this is an adjoining Strategic Development Planning Authority's Main Issues Report it was considered that Members would be interested in the issues which it raises.

2 RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 It is recommended that The Joint Committee:
- a) approve Appendix One to this report as TAYplan's response to SESplan's Main Issues Report consultation.

3 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 3.1 There are no financial implications arising from this report.

4 SESplan MAIN ISSUES REPORT

- 4.1 SESplan is the SDPA which includes Edinburgh City, part of Fife, Borders and the three Lothian Council areas. The central vision states "*The South East of Scotland will be a sustainable and competitive city region with residents benefiting from economic prosperity in a high quality place.*" With five key aims surrounding this vision:

- Grow the economy;
- Meet housing demand and need and provide community facilities;
- Promote improved infrastructure and connectivity;
- Encourage sustainable development; and,
- Conserve and enhance the built and natural environment.

- 4.2 The report sets out the context and challenges for the economy, population and households, transport and infrastructure, environment, resources and climate change. The main challenges set out to deliver this vision are:
- Continue the role of SE Scotland as the key economic driver;
 - Contribute to the response to climate change and promote sustainability;
 - Develop and enhance good transport and digital links within SE Scotland region itself, with the rest of the country and the UK, and to Europe and international destinations;
 - Provide infrastructure and services to promote new development and investment;
 - Safeguard and improve the environment for residents, workers, tourists biodiversity and economic investment;
 - Provide land for general and affordable housing; and,
 - Reduce economic disparities within the SESplan area.
- 4.3 The reports sets out two options for strategic spatial development and considers a number of strategic policy areas identifying their preferred approach, and in some instances, an alternative.
- 4.4 The Main Issues Report considers two strategies based on 'market recovery' and 'high growth'. 'Market recovery' is the preferred strategy where the regional economy returns to 'business as usual' by 2012 and continues to grow steadily. The 'High Growth' option is where the General Registers Office for Scotland (GRO) projections is not adjusted to take into account the recent economic and population slowdown. In respect of housing targets existing plans and proposals across the area already identify land for approximately 140,000 housing units. The 'market recovery' scenario identifies a further need for 27,000 housing units from 2019 to 2032 (the alternative 'high growth' strategy identifies a further 45,000 housing units).
- 4.5 Priority locations are identified for future development at: Edinburgh Central, Edinburgh Waterfront, West Edinburgh, SE Edinburgh, East Coast Corridor, Fife Forth Corridor, Midlothians Borders Corridor, and West Lothian Corridor. The key proposals more specifically relating to the TAYplan area are the Fife Forth Corridor, including the Forth replacement crossing and A92 improvements.
- 4.6 A range of strategic policy areas are considered and these are set out within Appendix One.
- 4.7 The Main Issues Report consultation seeks responses to a number of questions raised through the report. These are set out, together with TAYplan's proposed response, in Appendix One to this report. The closing date for submissions was 27th August 2010. This Committee Report has been forwarded to SESplan for their information and an extension to submit the formal response has been given until 2nd September 2010.

- 4.8 In summary, the main points raised within the TAYplan response relate to the need for housing (market and affordable) to be met within the SESplan area, otherwise this could have implications for adjoining Housing Market Areas such as the Kinross area. In a number of spatial strategy and policy areas the Plan should provide more of a focus on the relationship with adjoining areas to the SESplan area, for example in recognising the national role of Dundee Port in the renewables sector, the M90 corridor and A92, and improving integrated transport and faster connections to/from Edinburgh airport.

5 CONSULTATIONS

- 5.1 The Treasurer and Clerk to TAYplan, the Director of Infrastructure Services, Angus Council, The Director of City Development, Dundee City Council, The Head of Development Services, Fife Council and the Executive Director (Environment), Perth & Kinross Council have been consulted and are in agreement with the contents of this report.

6 BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 6.1 A full copy of the Main Issues Report and related documents can be viewed at 'www.sesplan.gov.uk'.

Pamela Ewen
Strategic Development Planning Authority Manager
19th August 2010

SESplan Main Issues Report

Q1. Do you support the proposed vision for the SESplan area? Do you have any preferred alternatives? What are your reasons for your view?

TAYplan Response

Yes. There is nothing in the vision we would disagree with. Perhaps it could be strengthened by recognising the specific economic role Edinburgh should continue to have as Scotland's capital city and the benefit of that for the wider east coast corridor (Aberdeen-Newcastle) and beyond.

Q2. Do you support the proposed key aims for the SESplan area? Do you have any preferred alternatives? What are your reasons for your view?

TAYplan Response

Yes. It is not clear what is meant by 'the national hub for development' stated in the first aim. The Proposed Plan put this within the context that there are and will be other national hubs where development will be concentrated.

Q3. Is the preferred approach to the scale of future development, on the basis of the 'market recovery' scenario related to economic growth areas, appropriate? If not, should the SDP identify land sufficient to meet the 'high growth' scenario? Is there another approach the SDP should follow, and if so why?

TAYplan Response

TAYplan has no clear preference for either strategy. What is important to areas within TAYplan which are influenced by the Edinburgh City Region housing market, e.g. Kinross-shire, is that the spatial development strategy meets the housing needs of the SESplan area within its area, and does not, as a result of reducing the supply of new housing, put pressures on such adjoining areas. This requires to be monitored.

Q4. Is the preferred approach to sustainable development appropriate? Are there other approaches that the SDP should follow and if so, why?

TAYplan Response

Yes, the preferred approach is appropriate.

Q5. Is the approach to linking future development to the provision of essential infrastructure and seeking contribution towards essential infrastructure appropriate? If not are there alternative mechanisms for contributions which the SDP should explore and why? What are these?

TAYplan Response

No comment.

Q6. Is the preferred approach to guide developments towards accessible locations appropriate? Should the SDP follow another approach and, if so, why?

TAYplan Response

No comment.

Q7. Is the preferred approach to promote sustainable economic growth areas appropriate? Is the alternative approach appropriate or should the SDP follow other approaches and if so, why?

TAYplan Response

No comment.

Q8. Is the preferred approach to identify a strategic retail hierarchy based around Edinburgh City Centre appropriate? Is the alternative approach appropriate and if so, why?

TAYplan Response

No comment.

Q9. Is providing housing land supply across the SESplan area as set out in Figure 12 appropriate? If not, should the SDP identify land sufficient to meet the high growth scenario? Is there another approach that the SDP should follow and if so, why?

TAYplan Response

Yes, it is considered appropriate to identify the level of growth across the strategic growth areas. It could be interpreted that there is no proposed housing supply outwith these strategic growth areas and clarity is required on this and how this relates to the overall supply.

Q10. Is the preferred approach to continue to support the redevelopment of brownfield land appropriate? Should the SDP set a target and if so, why? Are there other alternative approaches that the SDP should follow and if so, why?

TAYplan Response

No comment.

Q11. Should the SDP set a benchmark of 25% affordable housing contribution to all sites? If not, should the SDP set a target for each partner authority based on local needs or should the SDP support the provisions of affordable housing with each LDP setting their own targets? Are there alternative approaches to the provision of affordable housing?

TAYplan Response

No preference. It is important for adjacent areas that SESplan Authorities meet their housing needs within that area, and for affordable housing within the more local area.

Q12. Is the preferred approach to protecting and enhancing SE Scotland's natural heritage and landscapes appropriate? Is there another approach that the SDP should follow and if so, why?

TAYplan Response

Yes, it is important to protect and enhance the natural and built environment. In particular, the attraction and draw of Edinburgh as the capital city has economic benefits for the TAYplan area too.

Q13. Is the preferred approach to designating the green network appropriate? Are the opportunities for the development of the green network appropriate? Are there other strategic opportunities which should be identified? Are there other approaches that the SDP should follow and if so, why?

TAYplan Response

No comment.

Q14. Is the preferred approach to broadly maintaining the Green Belt appropriate? Are there other alternative approaches that the SDP should follow and if so, why?

TAYplan Response

No comment.

Q15. Is the preferred approach to controlling development in the countryside appropriate? If not, what approach should the SDP follow and why?

TAYplan Response

No comment.

Q16. Is the preferred approach to climate change and energy appropriate? If not, what should be changed or are there other approaches which the SDP should follow and if so, why?

TAYplan Response

No comment.

Q17. Is the preferred approach to renewables appropriate? Are there other approaches that the SDP should follow and if so, why?

TAYplan Response

The national role of Dundee Port in renewables infrastructure should be acknowledged, given the east coast emphasis in relation to this sector of the economy and the offshore proposals.

Q18. Is the preferred approach to forestry appropriate? Are there other approaches that the SDP should follow and if so, why?

TAYplan Response

No comment.

Q19. Is the preferred approach to minerals appropriate? Are there other approaches that the SDP should follow and if so, why?

TAYplan Response

No comment.

Q20. Is the preferred approach to protecting agricultural land and other important soils appropriate? Are there other approaches that the SDP should follow and if so, why?

TAYplan Response

No comment.

Q21. Is the preferred approach to maintaining water and controlling flooding appropriate? Are there other approaches that the SDP should follow and if so, why?

TAYplan Response

No comment.

Q22. Is the preferred approach to waste appropriate? Are there other approaches that the SDP should follow and if so, why?

TAYplan Response

No comment.

Q23. Is the preferred approach of continuing to support the continued development of the City Centre appropriate? Are there other approaches that the SDP should follow and if so, why?

TAYplan Response

No comment.

Q24. Is the preferred approach to continuing to support the redevelopment and regeneration of Edinburgh Waterfront appropriate? Are there other approaches that the SDP should follow and if so, why?

TAYplan Response

No comment.

Q25. Is the preferred approach which promotes housing alongside the nationally important business proposals in West Edinburgh appropriate? Are there other approaches that the SDP should follow and if so, why?

TAYplan Response

The importance of Edinburgh Airport, speeding up travel times, and improved integration of the transport network from Edinburgh to Dundee and up the east coast and A9 corridor should be emphasised. The Proposed Plan should recognise the importance of this for neighbouring TAYplan area.

Q26. Is the preferred approach to further expand South East Edinburgh appropriate? Are there other approaches that the SDP should follow and if so, why?

TAYplan Response

No comment.

Q27. Is the preferred approach to east Coast Corridor appropriate? Are there other approaches that the SDP should follow and if so, why?

TAYplan Response

No comment.

Q28. Is the preferred approach to Fife Forth Corridor appropriate? Are there other approaches that the SDP should follow and if so, why?

TAYplan Response

The Proposed Plan needs to recognise the importance of the M90 corridor and the A92 linking into the TAYplan area.

Q29. Is the preferred approach to Midlothian Borders appropriate? Are there other approaches that the SDP should follow and if so, why?

TAYplan Response

No comment.