

Hugh Wallace

Glendevon Energy Company Ltd

From: Linda Chalmers [<mailto:LChalmers@pkc.gov.uk>]

Sent: Friday, March 3, 2017 4:21 PM

To: CHX Fossoway Community Council - Generic Email Account <FossowayCommunityCouncil@pkc.gov.uk>

Cc: Hugh Wallace <Hugh@glendevonenergy.co.uk>; Katie Briggs <KatieBriggs@pkc.gov.uk>; Councillor Dave Cuthbert <DCuthbert@pkc.gov.uk>; Councillor Joe Giacopazzi <JGiacopazzi@pkc.gov.uk>; Councillor William Robertson <WBRobertson@pkc.gov.uk>

Subject: Consultation on LDP2 and A977 Mitigation Measures 18/2/17 called by Local Elected Members

Sent on behalf of Councillor Mike Barnacle

Dear Trudy

The above event was well attended and the comment forms for planning and consultation forms re the A977 are being collated.

However, I feel I must write to you regarding Hugh Wallace's letter and enclosures circulated by him to around 50 houses in the Back Crook and Drum recently because, whilst I respect the right of any resident to object to planning proposals and lobby their neighbours, I feel this letter has the capacity to undermine the local members' consultation containing misinformation and inaccuracies that I must challenge here and in future public meetings. It is important to note that the proposal in Crook of Devon is for a zoning in the LDP2, it is not a planning application, if that ever materialises.

I will deal with the points in order they are made in Hugh's letter viz:

1. 50 houses is the maximum number in the MIR, it could be less and probably should be if it goes ahead for zoning in LDP2.
2. Crook of Devon, including Drum, is regarded as one settlement in our LDP1 (Page 218); separation is history.
3. The argument that a change in the boundary here will inevitably lead to pressure for development on the north is spurious. Development outwith settlement boundaries has to be agreed and have community support through the next LDP stage beyond 2028.

4. I share Hugh's scepticism that the developers may not deliver the benefits promised and there would be a need for robust scrutiny around this if LDP2 zoning materialised.
5. I defend the role of elected members in bringing forward 'for consultation' proposals with a perceived community benefit, we do not have collective wisdom to decide these matters and need to consult. It is important to stress that although no additional housing supply land is currently required in Kinross-shire; if no other proposals are put forward for the rural areas of the shire, no affordable housing will be built before 2028, just expensive houses in gap and infill sites for the Edinburgh market (approximately 300 since 2012). I completely disagree that the arguments Councillors cited for the site's inclusion in the MIR have lapsed.
6. Scottish Water have confirmed to me that only a small number of additional 'foul-only' connections can be made to the Drum WWTP and not all those on the waiting list can be accommodated. When talking about planning zoning effectively up to 2028 it is clear that 'a growth project' is absolutely needed to expand the plant; whilst the Council would happily accommodate Crook Moss Gypsy Traveller site (conditions still not complied with here) for this purpose, I would prefer the MIR site we are discussing, albeit with lower housing numbers, especially the affordable element.
7. 'Major' mitigation measures for the A977 are a requirement of our LDP1 (Para 7.1.18) introduced by local members (in the absence of reference to it by PKC) supported by the Reporter at Scottish Government level for this 'forgotten road' as far as PKC are concerned. I fundamentally disagree with PKC Roads Officers and the developer's Transportation Study that there is no need for a roundabout. This road carries more HGV's than any other road PKC is responsible for (Councillor Cuthbert has the figures) and PKC think it could take more easily; I have yet to find a resident who agrees. Incidentally, PKC argued for such a roundabout at the 2004 public inquiry into the new Clackmannan Bridge which I attended and the community have been campaigning for it ever since. I constantly get complaints about the 'speed' of traffic on the Drum straight above current limits and believe the only way, in the absence of effective police enforcement, to slow such traffic is a physical feature like a roundabout at the B9097 junction. I do not think the whole of Crook and Drum being 20 mph will be agreed by PKC Roads Officers or be effective!
8. I dismiss the 'comment' on community benefit as 'trifling'. A previous proposal for this site at LDP1 stage was for 65 houses and less community benefit, which the community rightly rejected.
9. I agree with Hugh that no building should be adjacent to the Village Hall, which should retain its prominence.
10. I agree re density with Hugh and suggest tree screening would need to be a pre-requisite of

any application, should that materialise.

11. It is incumbent if the zoning is accepted for LDP2 that developer requirements are stipulated and enforced and maximum numbers of houses stipulated and not 'indicative'. Forward Planning should be held to this at LDP2 consultation, if the site is included.
12. I thought Farm Shops were popular but won't comment on the viability of such proposals at this stage.
13. The idea of Employment Land being zoned in Crook of Devon came from me, although not necessarily at this locus. Blairingone, Powmill and Rumbling Bridge all have such zoned uses but Crook of Devon does not and is the largest settlement in Fossoway.
14. The proposal, as I understand it, is to relocate the pedestrian crossing down the Drum straight from its current location. I would want this, irrespective of the development. The current location has seen 2 accidents in the last year from traffic speeding on approaches and I have been lobbied by residents regarding this.

The pavement on the bend from the crossing to the school road is not a safe route to school (I recall an HGV overturned in Shand's field and have the photograph). A pavement on the south side of the A977 from the Hall car park to the new crossing would be inherently safer, in my view; I would agree with Hugh that extending the pavement along the B9097 makes sense.

In summary, I have been working to secure funding from both the Scottish Government and PKC for the A977 since first elected in 1999 and had only secured £250,000 from the former before 2016. Due to Councillor Cuthbert's budgetary negotiating skills at PKC's Capital Budget debate in June 2016, a further £600,000 was secured which I thought the community would welcome. Clearly this money will not fund all the measures I summarised from my files in the resident's letter about the consultation event; it could all be spent in Crook of Devon, possibly without any development zoning, but that would seem unfair and disproportionate to the other villages on the A977. This is why local members linked the consultations together and I will make no apologies for that. We have to deal with development proposals put forward in as even-handed a way as possible and I hope some community consensus results from the exercise but I fear Hugh's letter does not help this process in any way. Notwithstanding this, I am pledged to support the majority community views that emerge from the consultation exercise on both planning zoning and A977 issues.

I understand you have suggested that the CC hold a 'special' meeting in Crook of Devon to discuss this matter in public further before deciding your response to Forward Planning and I sincerely hope this is agreed at your meeting on 7th March in Blairingone.

Yours sincerely

Councillor Mike Barnacle

Independent Member for Kinross-shire

PS I attach the consultation form re the A977 mitigation measures prepared by Councillor Cuthbert and myself, not circulated with Hugh's letter to neighbours, for the CC's information and suggest more could be available for residents who have not completed same at the suggested 'special' meeting.

This e-mail and any attachments may contain confidential and privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail, delete this e-mail and destroy any copies. Any dissemination or use of this information by a person other than the intended recipient is unauthorized and may be illegal.

[Quoted text hidden]



Potential development land within the village boundary.pdf

344K