



Perth & Kinross Council

Questions from the Main Issues Report

DevelopmentPlan@pkc.gov.uk

Local Development Plan Team
Perth and Kinross Council
35 Kinnoull Street
Perth
PH1 5GD

We would like to hear your views on how land across the area will be used and developed in the years ahead to meet population, economic, and environmental challenges.

The MIR is a discussion document that outlines the main issues the Local Development Plan will have to address. The background to each question below is explained in the MIR (Main Issues Report).

Your views will be considered in establishing a Proposed Local Development Plan by December 2011.

We welcome a response to all or any of the questions outlined below; and comments on any other aspects of the Main Issues Report may also be submitted. The Main Issues Report can be viewed in full on the Councils website at www.pkc.gov.uk/MainIssuesReport; or as a printed document at all Perth and Kinross Council offices and libraries.

Representations should be submitted by using the Online Local Development Plan (interactive web-based facility allowing representations to be made through the Council website), by e-mail using this form or alternatively in writing to the Local Development Plan Team at the address at the top of the page.

If you want to use this form type your comments in the blue box and return the form to us by using the '**email**' button at the end of the form. Should you want a copy of your reply for your own records you can use the '**print**' button.

Contact Details:

Name

Address

Email

The deadline for making comments on the Main Issues Report or any of the questions is 11 February 2011.

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 you answer. *(Pages 33-34, paragraphs 4.2.1-4.2.6)*
- 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)*
- 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, Paragraph 4.2.12)*

- 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 the figure 14 appropriate? If not, why not? (*Pages 38-39, paragraphs 4.2.15-4.2.17*)
- 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*)
- 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*)
- Q7. Do you agree with the principle of not identifying settlement boundaries for the smallest settlements? Please give reasons for your answer. (*Page 43, paragraphs 4.2.31-4.2.32*)

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*)
- 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*)
- Q10. Do you support the principles of providing for mixed use development 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*)

Q11. Do you agree that there should be a specific policy to support key tourist destination resorts? (*Pages 46-47, paragraphs 4.3.16-4.3.19*)

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

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

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)*

Q15. Should tourism and or business application 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)*

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)*

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*)

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*)

Section 4.5 Climate Change

Q19. Does the MIR address the key issue 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*)

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 and 4.5.25-4.5.30*)

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)*

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)*

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)*

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)*

Q26. Is the MIR correct to discount the new village proposal at Criagend 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 and 5.2.1-5.2.18)*

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 and 5)*

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, paragraph 5.2.19, table and map 6)*

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

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, paragraphs 5.2.26, maps 13-19*)

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*)

Section 5.3 Highland Perthshire

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 alternatives would you suggest? (*Pages 98-99, paragraphs 5.3.3-5.3.6*)

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*)

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, paragraph 5.3.9, maps 24-30*)

Section 5.4 Kinross-shire Area

Q35. Do you agree with the preferred option to allocate 75% of the additional housing allocations 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 alternatives would you suggest? (*Pages 113-114, paragraphs 5.4.1-5.4.5*)

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*)

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, paragraphs 5.4.10*)

Q38. Which option on 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*)

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*)

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*)

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 are? If not, why not, and what alternatives would you suggest? (*Pages 125-126, paragraphs 5.5.5-5.5.9*)

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*)

Q43. Which of the site identified in the landward are of Strathearn have potential for housing development? What alternatives would you suggest? (*Pages 129-131, paragraph 5.5.14, maps 40-43*)

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, paragraph 5.5.17, map 44)

Q45. Do you agree that the site options identified for employment land within Crieff have potential? If not, why no, and what other sites would you suggest? (Pages 132-133, paragraphs 5.5.18, map 45)

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/Rattray, Alyth and Coupar Angus and the remaining 10% to the landward are? If not, why not, and what alternative would you suggest? (*Pages 136—137, paragraphs 5.6.5-5.6.8*)

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

Q48. Which of the sites identified in Alyth have potential for housing development? What alternatives would you suggest? (*Pages 140-141, paragraphs .6.12-5.6.14, map 47*)

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, paragraphs 5.6.15, map 48*)

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

Q51. Do you agree with the proposed approach to housing development in Lunan Valley Catchment? *(Page 146, paragraphs 5.6.17-5.6.19)*

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

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, map 46 and 48)*

The deadline for submitting comments on any aspect of the Main Issues Report including the above questions is 11 February 2011.

Submit by email

Print Form