

**Councillor Mike Barnacle
Independent Councillor for
Kinross-shire
PKC LDP2 Representations
Forwarded to Scottish Government
Reporters Unit**



The representations I made to PKC on Local Development Plan 2 that have been forwarded to the Scottish Government Reporters Unit cover the following areas (see list below).

- Issue 02 Placemaking
- Issue 05 Policy 6 – Settlement Boundaries
- Issue 09 Housing in the Countryside
- Issue 10 Residential Development
- Issue 13 The Historic Environment
- Issue 14 A Low Carbon Place
- Issue 16 A Natural, Resilient Place
- Issue 18 Water Catchment Areas
- Issue 24 A Connected Place
- Issue 31 Greater Perth South & West Settlements – Outwith Core
- Issue 38 Kinross-shire Area – Kinross-Minathort
- Issue 39 Kinross-shire Area – Settlements with Proposals
- Issue 40 Kinross-shire Area – Settlements without Proposals
- Issue 50 Whole Plan Issues

However, I noted in my email of the 18/2/19 that, although content that PKC's responses correctly recorded my representations to the Government, there were two exceptions.

Prime Agricultural Land Policy – I had stated in a letter of 14/7/17 to PKC that this policy is not strong enough and there has been significant failure to protect such land from development, contrary to national planning policy. We should not as a country with a finite area of such land for food production and an increasing population have such a short-term view on such development.

A Low Carbon Place (Policy 31d On Spatial Framework For Wind Energy) – I sought to emphasise the need for Local Landscape Area designations to be protected from inappropriate development and to emphasise my continuing objection to the exclusion of the Cleish Hills and Devon Gorge from such designation following a deeply flawed consultants exercise, enclosing background information thereon.

I have now received assurances that the above omissions will be brought to the attention of the Reporters.

REPEAT – Kinross-shire Public Transport Community Survey from the March edition of the Newsletter with changed feedback date of 15/4/19.

continues over page...

Council Budget Debate 20/2/19 on Years 2019/22

The administration's budget was passed 'using the Provost's casting vote'. I noted the considerable areas of agreement, in rejecting a number of the draconian cuts suggested by officers, between the three political groups (Administration of Liberal/Tory, SNP and Independent Group) namely instrumental music charges increase, school crossing patrollers, primary swimming lessons, play areas and greenspace maintenance, recycling centres, public transport, public conveniences, winter and roads maintenance.

The Independent Group totally rejected the move to a frozen school meals distribution centre in Dundee, fully reinstated the School Estate review budget to restrict school closures, rejected the increases in parking charges and reinstated the budget for flood prevention, unlike the Administration. We were able to do this based on council tax increases of 2.5%, 3% & 3% for the next three years, compared with an Administration increase of 4% p.a. Pressure now for council tax increases arises following the council tax freeze imposed for 10 years on local authorities by the SNP Government, which started with a promise of local authority taxation reform that never happened.

We also included in our budget, reinstatement of the previously agreed school crossing patroller cuts of £65,000, unlike the Administration! We were still able to allocate a net £400,000 contribution to reserves compared with the Administration figure of £75,000.

We also allocated additional expenditure for a feasibility study into the provision of a new railway station and link to the Fife Circle from Kinross. (A unanimous council position at an earlier debate when the Council met in Kinross).

In summary, our Revenue Budget amendment would have rejected most controversial cuts, put more into reserves and cost constituents less than that of the Liberal/Tory administration.

In our capital budget, which Councillor Robertson supported, we had money for the upgrade of Cleish Primary School, rural footpaths and the B9097 Action Plan Funding.

I was very happy to support our budget and regret a situation where, after such little debate, it was rejected. It is surely time to re-examine how we deal with the budget process at PKC.

Letter to Councillor Lyle Re School Crossing Patrollers and the Current PKC Budgetary Situation

Copy of a letter send to Murray Lyle, Leader of the Council on 21 February 2019

Dear Murray
School Crossing Patrollers and the Current PKC Budgetary Situation

I refer to my letter of the 8th instant and your reply of the 13th instant regarding the above. Following yesterday's budget debate, at which the Independent Group proposal that the cuts to School Crossing Patrollers suggested by Officers and also following the decision by the Education Committee on a previous saving in this area, should all be rejected, as you know the decision on the budgets went to a casting vote from the Provost. The effect of this is that those earlier savings decided by the Education Committee for Crossing Patrollers in my Ward will not be reversed. I find it difficult to advise my constituents in these jobs that they are to lose them, purely as a result of the Provost's casting vote in the budget debate.

I therefore think that it is imperative, as stated in my previous letter, that the Crossing Patrollers in Crook of Devon and Kinross should not lose their positions before an adequate safety audit of their crossing has been undertaken and I seek your assurance that this will be done.

Yours sincerely,

Cllr Michael Barnacle
Independent Member for Kinross-shire

PS As regards yesterday's budget debate, which was the first time to my knowledge as a Councillor of nearly 20 years standing that three papers went to a casting vote of the Provost, as I indicated to you following that, I think it is time to review the budget setting process. In my view, it would be much better if political groups were able to present their proposals at a budget meeting, without an initial decision being made. This presentation could then be followed by a meeting one week later to decide the budget going forward, giving time for dialogue between groups, etc. and possible changes to be made to arrive at a better outcome for our constituents. I believe this happens in some other local authorities. The Independent Group asked the previous administration to consider this approach, rejected by the previous Provost. Perhaps Dennis might think this idea as worthy of reconsideration?

I have not received a response to date.

Councillor Mike Barnacle