

Councillor Barnacle

Abridged copy of Cllr Barnacle's submission dated 2/2/18 to PKC regarding LDP2.



Proposed Local Development Plan 2 INFRASTRUCTURE

It is disappointing that a Kinross-shire section of the Plan in terms of Spatial Strategy has been dropped and settlements for the whole authority area listed alphabetically. Where is the accompanying infrastructure report for the shire we were promised, I note only reference to a Kinross and Milnathort study!

Would the Plan support identified parking areas within settlements during its lifetime?

Why is the supermarket site and neighbouring Park & Ride not identified in the Kinross settlement?

I lament the complete lack of reference to the need for mitigation measures for the Route Action Plans for the A977, A911 and B9097.

There is no reference to the lack of a rail service in Kinross-shire, despite administration support.

POLICIES

Placemaking: Whilst welcoming a capacity range to address previous concerns, I suspect it will be far too generous to the development sector.

Settlement Boundaries: I regard the potential for exceptions on development as generous and open to breaches thereof; I feel they should be restricted to illustrations of community benefit.

Residential Amenity: The policy mentions improving that of existing residents and I feel this should be accorded more importance. Could we consider the creation of significant buffer zones between developments. Could we also enhance the policy to give communities more time to protect 'assets of community value', such as garages and hotels, giving more time for alternative proposals.

Housing in the Countryside: I maintain that planning at PKC don't recognise the extent of windfall development in Kinross-shire, serving the Edinburgh market.

Affordable Housing: LDP2 should recognise the need for appropriate provision in the rural villages, rather than just the tiered settlement development approach of Tayplan.

Traveller Sites: I believe this policy is far too 'open door' and open to breaches thereof. I refer you to my comments later regarding the Crook Moss and Greenacres sites!

Conservation Areas: There is no mention of exploring new possibilities, contrary to national policy.

Spatial Framework for Wind Energy and Landscape: Policy 31 D and 37 should refer also to Local Landscape Area designations and their need for protection from inappropriate development. There is an urgent need to review the exclusion of the Cleish Hills and Devon Gorge from such designation following a deeply flawed consultant's exercise.

Trees, Woodland and Development: Experience of inappropriate felling by developers suggests that tree protection is not strong enough and that TPOs alone (not mentioned here) are insufficient to safeguard important groups of trees - a major omission in 'Big Tree County'. I would like to see much greater attention at planning committees to the representations from our biodiversity and tree officers!

Loch Leven Catchment: This policy fails to mention the 'protocol' between SEPA, SNH and PKC. There is an urgent

need for review of this in relation to its total lack of effectiveness when dealing with the increasing number of retrospective applications.

Finally: A number of policies allow for survey/reports to be commissioned by applicants, rather than chosen by PKC and the applicant billed. In areas such as airfield safeguarding, buildings retention, habitat, trees and transport it often produces a report open to challenge because it is not 'independent'.

SITE ZONINGS

Balado: I support the revised settlement boundary here.

Cleish & Blairadam: I am content with the settlement boundaries. However, Greenacres traveller site has expanded way beyond the planning department's potential, stated in May 2006 and I still have concerns that the current boundary will be breached, particularly on the north west.

Fossway: Final development proposals should be seen in the context of work by the Fossway Community Strategy Group.

Blairingone: I support MU74 and E22.

Carnbo: I support the settlement boundary but feel there should be no more housing development until mains drainage is available.

Crook of Devon and Drum: I am in support of the settlement boundary here and the inclusion of the mixed use site MU266. PKC had discredited the work of their landscape consultant by repeatedly ignoring his assessment of the Crook Moss area as being not appropriate for development, mainly through drainage constraints, when sanctioning development of the neighbouring Crook Moss gypsy/traveller site against the wishes of the local community and members. Residents of the Crook Moss site have been there since March 2012 and as far as I'm aware are still in breach of conditions on drainage and water supply, also landscaping. The site is an eyesore, with a lack of enforcement obvious nearly 6 years later; it is undoubtedly the worst planning decision I have encountered in nearly 20 years as a local councillor. We also know from Scottish Water that both Crook of Devon & Drum WWTP's are at or near capacity and require upgrades; the development of MU266 can be 'a growth project' to fund such upgrades.

Powmill: I have noted concerns about the range of housing presented for H53 and suggest it is on the high side. There is no requirement for A977 mitigation measures to be addressed through contributions, which I suggest is an oversight.

Rumbling Bridge: I support E24 and the amendment to the settlement boundary to include open space on the former area of village setting to the north.

Glenfarg: Would the settlement boundary prohibit an Employment site?

Kinross and Milnathort: I have concerns about the current level of housing growth here, in particular the apparent disregard of planning conditions on the Kinross High School and Lathro Farm sites. Is a community masterplan approach facilitated by LDP2? H49 Pacehill site in Milnathort: I understood this site has already received planning permission, against my wishes, for I believe it is over-development.

Portmoak: I am content with the settlement boundaries in this CC area, however I would like to see a successful outcome to the CC's dialogue with the landowner, in order that Stephen's field can be acquired for community use.

Councillor Mike Barnacle