

### Councillor Barnacle

#### School and Public Transport

A short life member officer working group has been reconstituted and I am on that group to lobby for improvements to be considered.



#### Winter Service

At the Environment, Enterprise and Infrastructure Committee on 6 September, the Council agreed to introduce an additional nightshift gritting route for the coming winter. Operating out of the Kinross depot to cover A class roads, this should improve the situation in the early mornings during severe ice and snow events.

#### Local Development Plan 2 (LDP2)

Following representations on LDP2 from Kinross-shire, a short life member officer working group will be set up and I am to be a on it. Local members will be meeting the planners regarding LDP2 on 3 October.

Following a meeting of the Kinross-shire Ward Forum of Community Councils on 15/8/17 and of Ward Councillors on 29/8/17 to discuss LDP2, I wrote to P Marshall and B Murray, Planning & Sustainable Development, PKC, on 31/8/17 to summarise the agreed position on issues of concern. A slightly abridged version of the letter is below.

#### Infrastructure

Welcome report accompanying LDP2.

General agreement that Plan should facilitate identifying zoned parking areas within settlements during its lifetime.

Surely Park & Ride and Supermarket Site should be zoned in masterplan. Local members to lobby Scottish Government and Sainsbury's.

Agreed we have policy CF2 to protect old railway lines.

Insist mitigation measures for A977 and Route Action Plans re A911 and B9097 are emphasised, amid current discussions with Planning and Roads re related developments.

Cllrs Barnacle and Purves to lobby for further budgetary provision. TRACKS working on footpath initiative between Kilmagadwood and Scotlandwell. Portmoak CC suggested a general aspiration to create non-motorised (cycle and pedestrian) links between settlements.

#### Policies

**PM4 Settlement Boundaries:** The decision at Keltybridge under Planning Eyesores is an example. The Powmill settlement boundary would be subject to review when you agree we could revisit the masterplan concept during lifetime of LDP2, supported by Fossoway CC. Both the local members and Fossoway CC prefer the 2004 boundary for Rumbling Bridge that included village setting north of Care home and the locus of a recent planning consultation, we would welcome this areas inclusion primarily as open space for community benefit use to be explored further.

**RD1 Residential Areas:** Support from Forum on strengthening policy RD1.

**RD3 Housing in the Countryside:** Forum felt my figures were correct and planning don't recognise extent of windfall development.

**RD4 Affordable Housing:** There is a need for a revision of the policy, its definition and effectiveness, in delivering appropriate provision in the rural villages. We seek to secure on-site provision, not financial contributions.

**RD5 Gypsy Traveller Sites:** Local members would welcome further discussion on policy RD5.

**HE3 Conservation Areas:** If Cleish and Blairadam CC instigated a community led study into feasibility of conservation area status for Keltybridge and Maryburgh, would planning support this? Forum felt that conservation reports on planning applications should be appended to DMC reports and posted on planning website.

**NE2 and NE3 Trees and Biodiversity:** Forum disagree with Peter's response and feel Cllr Barnacle's points are well made. It is rare for bio-diversity and tree protection officers to appear at DMC and there

is a general feeling that the timing and veracity of surveys should be more strictly enforced. The question of the 'independence' of surveys was raised when they are commissioned by applicants, rather than PKC, this in relation to other areas such as building retention, transport, etc.

**ER1 Renewable Energy:** CCs and local members are aware of current consultation and should have commented.

**ER6 Landscape Designations:** Forum do not understand why supplementary guidance that is part of Policy cannot be subject to objection and/or review. Disagree fundamentally with planning department's approach on lack of designation for Cleish Hills and Devon Gorge. It is further stated that initial dialogue with neighbouring local authorities on Regional Park issues do not contain significant resources and should be undertaken to 'test' responses before allocating resources. Councillors Barnacle and Purves will endeavour to address these issues through their committee roles.

**EP7 Drainage within Loch Leven Catchment:** Brenda indicated to local members recently that water quality of Loch Leven has seen a deterioration. We feel that Policy EP7 should be tightened and mirror EP6, including a review of settlements within the catchment that have had their boundaries removed. Why should Loch Leven have less protection than Lunan Valley?

General agreement that a new policy to protect "assets of community value" from immediate closure and change of use should be explored and that this should extend to garages and shops.

Forum felt that more clarity is needed on housing numbers in LDP guidance! There was also a view that planning should encourage more developers to engage in voluntary pre-application consultations rather than limiting this to 'major' applications.

#### Site Zonings

##### Fossoway

I thought developer interest was significant for Blairingone at the consultation event earlier this year.

Both local members and Fossoway CC accept that the proposals put forward at February's consultation event for Crook of Devon are opposed by approximately 60% of respondents in relation to the detail, scale and impact on the village. However, we disagree on the way forward. The CC oppose re-zoning of this site. We feel that a number of community benefits offered and suggested are worthy of further exploration, in the context of a smaller development and so advocate zoning as "an Opportunity site" for further consultation with the community; with particular reference to affordable housing, employment opportunities, A977 mitigation measures and a growth project to facilitate expansion of the Drum WWTP.

Both local members and Fossoway CC disagree with the planning department over the revision of the settlement boundary mentioned earlier for Rumbling Bridge.

*Continues over page...*

### Councillor Barnacle continued...

The Forum note Peter's agreement to the points made on Carnbo and Powmill.

#### Glenfarg

The CC will suggest on Employment site.

#### Kinross and Milnathort

Forum accept and welcome Peter's comments on a masterplan approach for Kinross/Milnathort to be developed during LDP2. It is agreed that we should seek to safeguard land alongside Junction 7 of the M90 against any development that would hinder upgrading. We think that Employment site 20 east of Milnathort should be taken out of the settlement boundary as non-viable.

We recognise that Peter has noted Cllr Barnacle's comments on employment zoning west of the motorway.

The recent planning refusal at Beaufield, Balado has reinforced our view that there should be no more housing development in Balado until mains drainage is available.

#### Portmoak CC

Portmoak CC agreed with Cllr Barnacle's suggestion that Stephen's field should be incorporated into the settlement boundary of Kinnesswood and designated as open space for community use.

#### Conclusion

I trust this update will be useful to yourselves and look forward to further dialogue in advance of the published plan, set to be discussed as I understand it at a special meeting of Perth & Kinross Council on 22 November 2017.

### Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Supplementary Guidance

#### Copy of my letter to PKC Planning, 31/8/17 (slightly abridged)

I refer to the consultation I attended at Birnam. I would like to place on record my continuing objection to the exclusion of the Cleish Hills and Devon Gorge from designation as Local Landscape Areas (para 7.8 of the SEA Non-Technical Summary), following a flawed consultants exercise (see my letters of 11/2/16 and 14/7/17 enclosed). It is no coincidence that loss of these AGLV's from our Local Plan suddenly results in them featuring as areas with highest capacity for windfarm development in your Map 6.1 of the Guidance. I am alarmed by this prospect and register the strongest objection to it. In low-lying agricultural areas to the south and west of Kinross-shire, very large turbines (the majority now) will have considerable landscape and visual impact and I strongly endorse the comments on your guidance from the Kinross-shire Civic Trust enclosed. I am, however, reasonably reassured that the Guidance suggests there is little capacity in the Ochil Hills for further windfarm developments; you will no doubt recall my earlier representations reminding officers of a previous landscape study involving PKC, Clackmannan Council and SNH that recommended one wind farm in the Ochils and at a suggested location; thanks to Scottish Government Reporters we now have 3 and not at the suggested location.

I note also the high capacity for solar farms in Kinross-shire in your Map 6.3 of the Guidance and whilst I'm not against such forms of renewable energy, I would not like to see a proliferation of them in our landscape, so cumulative effect needs to be taken into account. As regards Run of River Hydro-Schemes, I supported the recent local development on the Devon at Rumbling Bridge and I am generally in favour of such schemes being taken forward, subject to the usual environmental checks with SEPA and SNH.

I trust you can take my comments into account before finalising your guidance.

**Councillor Mike Barnacle  
Independent Member for Kinross-shire**