

14 DECEMBER 2010

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN CONSULTATIONS**REPORT BY STRATEGY MANAGER**

This report seeks the Partnership's approval for proposed responses to consultation on the Perth & Kinross Council Local Development Plan Main Issues Report and updates on an officer response to Angus Council's Local Development Plan consultation.

1 RECOMMENDATIONS

1.1 That the Partnership:-

- (i) approves the proposed response to Perth & Kinross Council consultation on the Main Issues Report, as detailed in Appendix A; and
- (ii) notes the officer response to Angus Council's Local Development Plan consultation, as detailed in Appendix B.

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 Tactran has a "Key Agency" role in the Development Planning Process both for Strategic and Local Development Plans. Perth & Kinross Council is undertaking consultation on the Local Development Plan (LDP) Main Issues Report, while Angus Council is seeking initial views on land use planning issues and constraints to assist in developing their Main Issues Report.

3 DISCUSSION**Perth & Kinross Council Consultation**

- 3.1 Perth & Kinross Council published the Local Development Plan Main Issues Report (MIR) and associated documents for consultation on 8 October 2010. The consultation ends on 14 January 2010. The LDP covers that part of the Perth & Kinross Council area outwith the Cairngorms and Loch Lomond & The Trossachs National Parks. Following consultation, the Proposed Plan will be published in December 2011 with approval of the Plan and publication of the finalised Environmental Report programmed for 2014. The consultation documents are available for inspection at:
<http://www.pkc.gov.uk/MainIssuesReport>.
- 3.2 The MIR seeks views on which policy and development options should be included in the LDP to shape the future of land use in Perth & Kinross over the next 14 years. It also highlights key changes that have occurred since the six Local Plans, which it replaces, were last produced. Informal consultation was undertaken with Tactran officers and other Key Stakeholders prior to publication of the MIR.

- 3.3 A series of questions are posed in the MIR. There is an opportunity also to make additional representations about the MIR. The proposed on-line responses, including proposed additional comments, are shown in Appendix A.
- 3.4 Supporting documentation has also been published, comprising a Monitoring report for 2010, Equalities Impact Assessment and Environmental Report. No significant issues were identified in these documents.

Angus LDP Consultation

- 3.5 Angus Council has commenced preparation of a new LDP which will guide development in Angus over the next 10 years. The Council is seeking views on the most important land use planning issues and constraints over the next 5 – 10 years and inviting suggestions on potential sites to meet the future development needs of Angus through an on-line questionnaire.
- 3.6 The closing date for the consultation is 23 December. Appendix B shows the officer response, which the Partnership is asked to note. Formal consultation on the Main Issues Report and Proposed Plan will be the subject of detailed reports to future Partnership meetings.

4 CONSULTATIONS

- 4.1 Tactran officers have been closely involved in the stakeholder consultation forum which has been established by Angus Council to inform the development of their Local Development Plan.

5 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 There are no resource implications arising directly from this report.

Michael Cairns
Strategy Manager

For further information e-mail michaelcairns@tactran.gov.uk or tel 01738 475774.

NOTE

The following background papers, as defined by Section 50D of the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973 (and not containing confidential or exempt information) were relied on to a material extent in preparing the above Report:

Perth & Kinross Local Development Plan Main Issues Report

Perth & Kinross Local Development Plan Main Issues Report Environmental Report

Perth & Kinross Local Development Plan Main Issues Report Monitoring report for 2010

Perth & Kinross Local Development Plan Main Issues Report Equalities Impact Assessment

Perth & Kinross MIR Questions

Chapter 4: Main Land Use and Delivery Issues

Section 4.2 Housing Supply and Distribution

Q1. Do you agree that the LDP should seek to provide a 7 year effective housing land supply? Please provide reasons for your answer. (Pages 33-34 – paragraphs. 4.2.1-4.2.6)

Yes. The identification of effective housing land supply for the majority of the plan period should enable parallel consideration and identification of the provision of sustainable transport requirements arising from housing developments. The need for housing development to bear its share of the costs of enhancing transport infrastructure and services to accommodate increased travel demands should be strongly and clearly articulated through incorporation of policies within the eventual LDP.

Q2. Do you agree with the proposed adjustments to the TAYplan MIR housing requirement, namely a 10% reallocation from the Kinross HMA to the Perth HMA, and an assumption that 15% of the overall housing requirement in the Highland HMA will come from small sites? If not, please provide a justification. (Pages 35-37 – paragraphs. 4.2.7-4.2.11)

Tactran supports the reallocation from the Kinross HMA to the Perth HMA. Residential development should be concentrated in larger settlements where more sustainable travel alternatives to car travel tend to be greatest and can be more readily and cost-effectively developed.

Q3. Do you agree with the assumption that 10% of the overall housing land requirement will be met by windfall sites? If not please provide a justification. (Page 37 – para. 4.2.12)

Tactran does not support a general assumption that 10% of the housing land requirement should be met by windfall sites. All commercial housing sites should be chosen to ensure that good levels of accessibility to essential services by modes other than the private car are either available or can be readily and cost-effectively provided. Windfall sites should only be permitted where this criterion can be satisfied.

Q4. Do you agree with the proposal to apply minimum density policies to larger greenfield sites of over 2ha? Please give reasons for your answer. Are the density ranges suggested in figure 14 appropriate? If not, why not? (Pages 38-39 – paragraphs. 4.2.15-4.2.17)

Tactran supports this proposal as more densely populated sites are generally easier to serve by public transport and link in to walking and cycling routes.

Q5. Do you agree with the policy of requiring 25% of sites to contribute towards Affordable Housing, including in Perth City Centre? (Pages 41-42 – paragraphs. 4.2.25-4.2.27)

Yes. In the interests of improving social inclusion, affordable housing should be located close to essential facilities and/or in areas which are well served by public transport and other sustainable transport modes.

Q6. Do you support the inclusion of the 2009 Housing in the Countryside policy in the LDP? If not, what changes would you like to see and why? (Page 43 – paragraphs. 4.2.31-4.2.32)

Tactran supports measures that restrict residential development in rural areas to sites in villages and settlements with access to a range of services and/or good public transport links. It is accepted that an exception to this policy may be needed to allow for development for essential rural workers, engaged in farming, forestry, etc.

Q7. Do you agree with the principle of not identifying settlement boundaries for the smallest settlements? Please give reasons? (Page 43 – paragraphs. 4.2.31-4.2.32)

Yes, subject to the general principle that development and expansion of settlements must be cohesive and should not result in piecemeal development which is more difficult to serve by public transport.

Section 4.3 Economic Development

Q8. Do you agree with the assessment of additional economic development land required in the Plan period? Please give reasons for your answer. (Pages 43 – 44 – paragraphs. 4.3.1-4.3.3)

No comment.

Q9. Do you agree with the proposal to retain existing economic development land? If not, what alternative approach would you suggest? (Pages 44-45 – paragraphs. 4.3.5-4.3.7)

Yes, subject to ensuring that development land has, or can be cost-effectively provided with good accessibility by non-car modes of transport.

Q10. Do you support the principle of providing for mixed use developments by locating business land in or close to existing residential areas? Do you think that it would assist with the deliverability of employment land? (Pages 45-46 – paragraphs.4.3.8-4.3.13)

This principle is supported as it offers considerable scope for reducing the need to travel and also travelling more sustainably for employment and other needs.

Q11. Do you agree that there should be a specific policy to support key tourist destination resorts? (Pages 47-47 – paragraphs. 4.3.16- 4.3.19)

No comment.

Q12. Do you support the development of a flexible criteria-based framework to encourage tourism-related businesses? (Page 47 – para. 4.3.20)

Yes. The criteria-based framework should include an assessment of accessibility by all modes of transport with encouragement to ensure accessibility by public transport and other non-car modes, where possible.

Q13. Do you agree with the policy approach to support key rural businesses? (Page 48 – paragraphs. 4.3.21-4.3.23)

Yes. This policy approach is supported, particularly where it ensures that consideration is given to the sustainability of locations and hence providing employment opportunities in rural areas with a consequent reduced need to travel.

Q14. Vacant and redundant farm buildings tend to be redeveloped for housing rather than business uses. Should more be done to reuse them for farming or other employment purposes? Page 48 – paragraphs. 4.3.21-4.3.23)

Yes. This approach would be supported, in terms of providing employment opportunities in rural areas with a consequent reduced need to travel for rural dwellers and limiting the numbers of new residential occupants in rural areas who are more likely to commute to urban areas.

Q15. Should tourism and or business applications be required to make provision for accommodation for their work force, either through dedicated staff accommodation or by the provision of affordable housing in the local area? If so should this be applied to all scales of development or only larger scale proposals? (Pages 48-49 – paragraphs. 4.3.24-4.3.25)

This principle is supported and should apply to all scales of development to reduce the need for car-based commuting.

Q16. Do you support the proposed strategy for retailing? If not, what alternative would you suggest? (Pages 49–50 – paragraphs. 4.3.26- 4.3.32)

Yes. This strategy is supported as it will ensure development occurs at locations with good levels of accessibility by non-car modes.

Section 4.4 Green Infrastructure

Q17. Do you support the approach proposed to protect and enhance the landscape quality of Perth and Kinross? Please give reasons for your views. (Pages 50-52 – paragraphs. 4.4.1-4.4.14)

No comment.

Q18. Is the approach being proposed to the protection and enhancement of biodiversity appropriate? If not, why not, and what alternative would you suggest? (Pages 52-53 – paragraphs. 4.4.15-4.4.17)

No comment.

Section 4.5 Climate Change

Q19. Does the MIR address the key issues that the LDP will require to address in terms of mitigating climate change? If not, what's missing? (Pages 53–58 – paragraphs.4.5.1-4.5.24)

Not fully. In recognising the importance of reducing the need to travel and encourage more sustainable travel behaviour and choices, the MIR addresses much of the mitigation effort which will be needed to reduce the transport impact on climate change. However, it is believed that consideration should be also given to the application of parking provision and controls as part of the MIR and Proposed Plan and that stronger Planning Policy support is given to the development and effective implementation of workplace and other development Travel Plans. There should also be strong Planning Policy encouragement of measures and infrastructure to support a shift towards more sustainably powered vehicles for the movement of people and freight in line with Climate Change targets of seeking to decarbonise transport by, for example, increased use of electrically powered vehicles in new development and provision of associated charging infrastructure etc.

Q20. Are there any other issues that the LDP will require to address in terms of climate change adaptation? If so, what are they? (Pages 53-59 – paragraphs. 4.5.1-4.5.4 & 4.5.25-4.5.30)

See answer to Question 19 above.

Section 4.6 Infrastructure Delivery

Q21. Do you support the general approach to developer contributions towards infrastructure provision? (Page 63 – paragraphs. 4.6.15- 4.6.17)

Q22. Do you agree that developer contributions will be needed to contribute towards major transport infrastructure in the Perth Area and that those should be applied to the entire Perth area at varying rates. (Page 63– paragraphs. 4.6.15-4.6.17)

The general approach is supported particularly in light of the severe financial constraint being faced by the public sector for the foreseeable future. In addition to seeking developer contributions towards Capital costs of delivering transport infrastructure to accommodate the implications and requirements of new development it is believed that stronger emphasis needs to be given to seeking contributions for smaller scale infrastructure measures to encourage greater access by, and use of, public transport, cycling and walking and also Revenue contributions for servicing development, for example, to support “kickstart” bus services to new developments.

Chapter 5: Spatial Strategy

Section 5.2 Perth Area

Q23. Do you agree that the Perth Core Area should be extended to include Methven, Stanley and Balbeggie? If not, why not? (Pages 68-69 – paragraphs. 5.2.3-5.2.5)

The extension of the Perth Core Area to include these commuter settlements on the western, northern and eastern approaches to Perth, in addition to the existing inclusion of Bridge of Earn on the southern approach, is supported subject to further development in these areas contributing to the delivery of necessary improvements to transport infrastructure, such as the A9 – A94 link road, and towards the cost-effective provision of sustainable alternatives to the private car. As indicated in responses to earlier Questions, it is important that housing and other development is allocated to areas which are currently, or are capable of being cost-effectively well served by public transport, walking and cycling options, in order to encourage less reliance on car-based travel for commuting and other transport needs.

Q24. Do you agree with the preferred Green Belt boundary shown in Map 1 and the general approach to development within it? (Pages 70-71 paragraphs.5.2.8-5.2.9)

No comment.

Q25. Do you support the hierarchal approach to the identification of sites to meet the additional requirement? If not, why not and what other approach would you suggest? (Page 71 – paragraphs. 5.2.10- 5.2.11)

Yes. This will help to ensure development takes place, where possible, in locations with good levels of accessibility by non-car modes.

Q26. *Is the MIR correct to discount the new village proposal at Craigend to the west of Methven as being contrary to the TAYplan strategy because of its location outwith the Core area? If not, why not and what approach would you suggest? (Pages 68-76 – paragraphs. 5.2.3- 5.2.7 & 5.2.1-5.2.18)*

Yes .

Q27. *Is it reasonable to assume that the sites within Perth will contribute a total of 700 houses to the overall supply? If not, why not? (Pages 76-80 – tables and maps 4&5)*

No comment.

Q28. *Which of the strategic sites identified within the Perth Core area do you think have potential for housing development and are likely to be developed within a reasonable time period? (Pages 80-81 – paragraphs.5.2.19, table & map 6)*

No preference. Subject to a general expectation that the Development Plan will place a strong policy emphasis on promoting more sustainable integration of land use and transport planning policies and solutions, the allocation of strategic sites is considered to be a matter for the Planning Authority to determine, within these criterion, in the first instance.

Q29. *Which sites identified within or adjacent to the Perth Core area villages do you think have potential for housing development? (Pages 82-89 – paragraphs. 5.2.20-5.2.25 & maps 7-12)*

The above answer to Question 28 applies also in relation to general housing development site allocations. However it is believed that site A in Scone may be difficult to serve by bus. There is also a need to ensure that bus routes serving the Park & Ride car park provide an attractive service for Park & Ride users.

Q30. *Which of the housing sites identified in villages outwith the Perth Core area have potential for housing development? What alternatives would you suggest? (Pages 89-93 – para. 5.2.26, maps 13-19)*

See above answers to Questions 28 and 29. As a general comment allocations for proposed housing development must have regard to ease of access and frequency of bus services, in line with responses given to earlier Questions 1; 7; 19;21;22; and 23.

Q31. *Do you agree with the proposed new economic development sites? If not, what alternatives would you suggest? (Pages 94-95 – paragraphs. 5.2.27-5.2.30 & map 20)*

In broad principle these are supported. However, consideration needs to be given to access to the sites identified by non-car modes. The Friarton site for example, has no public transport and poor links for cyclists. The application of Accession software that can be made available by Tactran can assist in identifying accessibility of employment and other development sites.

Section 5.3 Highland Perthshire Area

Q32. *Do you agree with the preferred option to allocate 70% of the additional housing allocation to Aberfeldy and Pitlochry and the remaining 30% to the landward area? If not why not, and what alternative would you suggest? (Pages 98-99 – paragraphs. 5.3.3-5.3.6)*

See responses to Questions 28 and 29 above.

Q33. Which of the sites identified in Aberfeldy and Pitlochry do you think have potential for housing development? What alternatives would you suggest? (Pages 100-102 – paragraphs. 5.3.7-5.3.8, maps 22&23)

See responses to Questions 28 and 29 above.

Q34. Which of the sites identified in the landward area of Highland Perthshire have potential for housing development? What alternatives would you suggest? (Pages 103-111 – para. 5.3.9 & maps 24- 30)

See responses to Questions 28 and 29 above.

Section 5.4 Kinross-shire Area

Q35. Do you agree with the preferred option to allocate 75% of the additional housing allocation to Kinross and Milnathort and the remaining 25% to the larger villages in the landward area but outwith the Loch Leven Catchment area? If not, why not and what alternative would you suggest? (Pages 113-114 – paragraphs. 5.4.1-5.4.5)

Yes. This will have the effect of allocating the majority of housing within Kinross, Milnathort and the larger villages/settlements having the largest range of facilities and services and greatest ease of access to good public transport links.

Q36. Which of the sites identified in Kinross and Milnathort have potential for housing? What alternatives would you suggest? (Pages 114-117 paragraphs. 5.4.6-5.4.9, map 31)

See answers to Questions 28 and 29 above.

Q37. Do you agree with the preferred option for the allocation in the landward area to be distributed between sites in 3 or 4 settlements, rather than concentrating it on one larger site? If not, why not? (Page 117 – paragraph 5.4.10)

See answers to Questions 28 and 29 above.

Q38. Which option in the landward area of Kinross-shire do you prefer? Which sites have potential for housing? What alternatives would you suggest? (Pages 117-122 – paragraphs. 5.4.11-5.4.13, maps 32- 37)

See answers to Question 28 and 29 above.

Q39. Do you agree with the proposed approach to housing development in the Loch Leven Catchment area? (Page 122 paragraphs. 5.4.14-5.4.15)

See answers to Questions 28 and 29 above.

Q40. Do you agree with the proposal to meet the employment land requirement by identifying land at Turfhill and South Kinross? (Pages 122-123 – paragraphs. 5.4.16-5.4.17, map 38)

Site B would be preferred as it has the better public transport links however, consideration will have to be given to providing good pedestrian links to the bus stops on Station Road and the Park and Ride site. Site C is more conveniently located for bus stops though fewer services operate past the site.

Section 5.5 Strathearn Area

Q41. Do you agree with the preferred option to allocate 80% of the additional housing allocation to Crieff and the remaining 20% to the landward area? If not, why not, and what alternative would you suggest? (Pages 125-126 – paragraphs. 5.5.5-5.5.9)

Yes. Tactran agrees with allocating the majority of additional housing to Crieff as having the largest range of facilities and services, and ease of access to good public transport links.

Q42. Which of the sites identified in Crieff have potential for housing development? What alternatives would you suggest? (Pages 126-129 – paragraphs. 5.5.10-5.5.13, map 39)

See answers to Questions 28 and 29 above.

Q43. Which of the sites identified in the landward area of Strathearn have potential for housing development? What alternatives would you suggest? (Pages 129-131 – para. 5.5.14, map 40-43)

See answers to Questions 28 and 29 above.

Q44. Do you support the re-allocation of the existing employment land within the Auchterarder Framework to a larger site of 6ha (shown on Map 44 as Site B)? If not, why not? (Pages 131-132 – para. 5.5.17, map 44)

See answers to Questions 28 and 29 above.

Q45. Do you agree that the site options identified for employment land within Crieff have potential? If not, why not, and what other sites would you suggest? (Pages 132-133 – para. 5.5.18, map 45)

Sites D and E would not be supported as these are more than a five minute walk from the nearest bus stop.

Section 5.6 Strathmore and the Glens Area

Q46. Do you agree with the preferred option to allocate 90% of the additional housing allocation to Blairgowrie/Ratray, Alyth and Coupar Angus and the remaining 10% to the landward area? If not, why not, and what alternative would you suggest? (Pages 136-137 – paragraphs. 5.6.5- 5.6.8)

Yes. Tactran agrees with allocating the majority of additional housing to Blairgowrie/Ratray, Alyth and Coupar Angus as the settlements having the largest range of facilities and services, and ease of access to good public transport links.

Q47. Which sites identified in Blairgowrie/Ratray have potential for housing development? What alternatives would you suggest? (Pages 137-139 – paragraphs. 5.6.9-5.6.11, map 46)

Site A would be less desirable as it is further from the main bus routes than the other sites. All sites will need good quality direct links to the main bus routes to ensure that bus travel is attractive to new residents, as well as promoting walking and cycling.

Q48. Which of the sites identified in Alyth have potential for housing development? What alternatives would you suggest? (Pages 140-141 – paragraphs. 5.6.12-5.6.14, map 47)

Site A would be less desirable as it is further from the main bus route than the other sites.

Q49. Do you agree that the site identified in Coupar Angus has potential for housing development? If not, why not, and what alternatives would you suggest? (Page 142 – para. 5.6.15, map 48)

See answers to Questions 28 and 29 above.

Q50. Which of the sites identified in the landward area of Strathmore have potential for housing development? What alternatives would you suggest? (Pages 143-146 – para. 5.6.16, maps 49-53)

See answers to Questions 28 and 29 above.

Q51. Do you agree with the proposed approach to housing development in Lunan Valley Lochs catchment? (Pages 146 – paragraphs. 5.6.17-5.6.19)

See answers to Questions 28 and 29 above.

Q52. Do you agree with the proposal to direct 75% of the requirement for additional employment land within the Strathmore and the Glens Area to Blairgowrie? If not, why not? (Pages 146-147 – paragraphs. 5.6.20-5.6.23)

Yes. This is supported as the new employment will be more realistically accessible by a range of modes other than the private car.

Q53. Do you agree that the site options identified in Blairgowrie and Coupar Angus for employment land have potential to meet additional requirement? If not what alternatives would you suggest? (Pages 146-147 – maps 46 &48)

No comment.

Additional MIR Representations/Comments

Part of the MIR that you are commenting on (Give paragraph no, map reference. question number etc). Points that you would like us to take into account as your representation.

General Comments

Throughout the MIR document there is no mention of the Regional Transport Strategy (RTS) although it is noted that the RTS is mentioned in the Environmental Report. Whilst the references to Tactran in relation to the Consultation Process (page 12) are welcomed, it is suggested there should be specific reference to, and account taken of, the RTS as the statutory strategic transport policy/plan for Perth & Kinross and the surrounding TAYplan region.

Related to the above comment, there is also no mention of the Regional Park & Ride (P&R) Strategy, which has previously been supported by Perth & Kinross Council. There should be reference to the strategic role that P&R can play in respect of land use policy and related matters – e.g. improving accessibility; encouraging modal shift in favour of more sustainable modes, particularly in relation to travel within and around Perth; links with retail and industrial location policy; tourism etc. It is also considered that the LDP should protect the sites identified in consultation with PKC officers within the P&R Strategy and through the more detailed work we are currently progressing jointly in relation to Perth East P&R facility in the Walnut Grove area and the proposed Perth North facility, which should link with development plans for the north and western edge of Perth. Future provision/protection for

the A94/Scone P&R facility in light of the proposed re-development of the current site would also seem appropriate. In terms of related Land Use, the Tactran P&R Strategy identifies the opportunity for shared use of these facilities as strategic overnight lorry parking facilities.

Paragraph 2.3

The LDP Key Objectives are broadly supported. In relation to Creating Quality Places, the reference to ensuring that new development contributes to reducing the need to travel is fully supported. In addition to reducing the need to travel, location of new development should also encourage the use of more sustainable modes, such as walking, cycling and public transport, in preference to the private car for commuting and other travel demands in line with Scottish Government's Mode Hierarchy, referred to in SPP and the recently published Draft DPM-TAG. The Plan should promote the use of more sustainable transport modes for the movement of both people and goods. There seems to be little or no recognition of the freight transport implications of land use and development location at present.

Given the significant impacts of transport, there should be specific reference under the heading of Climate Change within the Plan's objectives, to reducing the need to travel and encouraging more sustainable modes of transport for both people and goods. Reference could also be made to the role of infrastructure in promoting sustainable development.

Section 3

There is little or no mention of connectivity within or to/from the Perth & Kinross area – e.g. in terms of connectivity and accessibility supporting internal and external economic competitiveness and social cohesion. The current levels of internal and external connectivity, including issues like relative public transport connectivity/accessibility; virtual connectivity in terms of Broadband coverage etc.; would also be relevant here and in terms of determining options for and the preferred LDP Spatial Strategy.

Paragraph 3.6.9

Reference should be made to the recognition of Perth as a Strategic Node in the Strategic Transport Projects Review (STPR) as well as in the NPF2.

Figure 15

The context set by Figure 15 is questioned. This suggests that Greater Perth is the lowest house price area but this is presumably influenced heavily by the flat market. Anecdotal experience suggests that Greater Perth prices are, on average, higher for family housing, which tends to encourage families to locate further away from Perth, in turn contributing to increased commuter travel.

Section 4.6

It is suggested that, in addition to Funding Infrastructure (Key Issue 21), Transport and Accessibility (sections 4.6.8 – 4.6.14) should be defined as a separate Key Issue for the LDP, reflecting the crucial strategic linkages between transportation and land use policy and planning. The paragraphs in this section appear to focus in on Perth and one, albeit key, aspect of the proposed solutions to Perth's transportation issues/problems. Tactran fully supports the proposed A9/A94 road link and associated package of pedestrian, cycling and bus priority measures. These proposals are included within the Tactran RTS Delivery Plan. However, there is a limited overview of the wider transportation context this sits within, with little mention of the issue and importance of connections between settlements, including

road, bus, rail etc., reflecting the national mode hierarchy set out in NPP; NTS and other relevant national policy statements.

Various other key proposals for improved economic infrastructure and transport links are identified in the RTS and the Perth & Kinross Economic Strategy 2009 – 2014 Action Plan (e.g. Park & Ride; Perth transport interchange; improved rail links etc) but none of these seem to be discussed/considered in the same level of detail. Tactran would welcome further officer discussion on the content and mix of the suggested packages and how these relate to the RTS and RTS Delivery Plan.

There should be specific mention of the potential role that Travel Planning and other behavioural change approaches can contribute. This should be linked with a strengthening of the approach taken within the Planning system to ensuring that both the development and implementation of effective Travel Plans is built into the Planning system by requiring developers to not only develop Travel Plans, but also monitor and ensure/demonstrate their effective implementation.

Section 5.2

In relation to the Perth area allocations and the Strategic Expansion Areas specific consideration should be given to protection of proposed sites for Park & Ride facilities serving the eastern and northern approaches to the City, in addition to new roads infrastructure.

Map 20

This map appears to make no provision for the proposed Perth East Park & Ride facility in the Walnut Grove area or the Perth North Park & Ride around the Bertha Park area.

Section 5.5

No reference is made to the Tay Estuary Rail Study/Service (TERS) which seeks to enhance rail connectivity in Strathearn and includes a proposal for enhancement to Gleneagles Station with the provision of a link road off the new grade separated Junction on A9/A823.

Q. What issues related to the effects of climate change should the Local Development Plan take into account? Please detail below

The effects of climate change are related to the levels of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. One of the main sources of the principal greenhouse gas, carbon dioxide, is transport and this is the only source that is forecast to grow. It is imperative then that reducing the need to travel and promoting alternatives to the use of petrol and diesel engined vehicles are at the core of all relevant considerations in the LDP. A requirement to produce and implement Travel Plans for all significant developments will support such considerations.

Q. Angus has a high quality built and natural heritage which should be protected and enhanced.

Agree.

Q. Do you think there is a need for more housing to be built in Angus?

Yes. Additional housing will be needed to accommodate projected demographic change/growth and support the continued economic wellbeing of the area.

Q. There is a need for more of the following types of housing.

(Please tick the relevant box(es))

- Market housing
- Affordable housing
- Supported housing for the elderly
- Family housing
- Flats

Subject to a general expectation that the Development Plan will place a strong policy emphasis on promoting more sustainable integration of land use and transport planning policies and solutions, the allocation of specific housing sites and types is considered to be a matter for the Planning Authority to determine, within these criterion in mind, in the first instance.

The location of additional housing must take account of broader strategic/policy objectives of reducing transport's impacts on carbon emissions and climate change by reducing the need to travel and encouraging a shift to more sustainable modes for the movement of both people and goods.

In the interests of improving social inclusion, affordable housing should be located close to essential facilities and/or in areas which are well served by public transport and other sustainable transport modes.

Q. There is enough land/property available across Angus for employment use.

No comment.

Q. Shopping facilities/provision in my area meet my needs.

No comment.

Q. New development should take place in accessible locations that reduce the need to travel by car and/or promote travel by public transport, walking and cycling.

Strongly agree. In addition to the more traditional approach of seeking developer contributions towards the Capital costs of delivering transport infrastructure requirements of new development, it is believed that stronger emphasis needs to be given to seeking contributions for smaller scale infrastructure measures to encourage greater access by, and use of, public transport, cycling and walking and also Revenue contributions for servicing development, for example, to support to fund secure cycle parking and “kickstart” bus services to new developments.

Q. What issues relating to rural development should be addressed by the Local Development Plan? Please detail below

The need to ensure that rural development is accessible by modes other than the private car is paramount. Development preferably should be located where there are sustainable bus routes. Failing this any new development should be required to give consideration to supporting the establishment of appropriate transport facilities such as demand responsive transport or promotion of car sharing. The need to travel can be reduced through the provision of appropriate electronic communication and therefore access to or provision of broadband should be a major consideration in reviewing rural development.

Q. Are there any land use issues affecting your town or village which you think should be addressed by the Local Development Plan?

No comment

Q. The above topics are not exhaustive and any comment concerning the future development and use of land in Angus is welcomed. Please submit any further comments or information.

Specific transport related topics that should be considered in the LDP. In addition to those listed above this should include ensuring that any major freight generators should be located such that the alternative modes of sea and rail can be used for freight movement. Also, the Regional Park & Ride Strategy and Action Plan promotes new bus based Park & Ride. These include providing small car parks next to long distance bus and coach stops at Forfar and Brechin; and Park and Ride car parks to serve Dundee on the A90 from the north and A92 from east, with the possibility that potential car park sites on these approaches to Dundee may be appropriately located in Angus. At this stage no detailed evaluation has been undertaken on potential locations though Tactran would wish to see potential sites identified in the Regional P&R Strategy safeguarded within the LDP.