

Issue 5	Economic Development	
Development plan reference:	3.3 Economic Development Policies, page 25 ED1 - Employment and Mixed Use Areas, page 25 ED3 - Rural Business Diversification, page 26	Reporter: Hugh M Begg
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
Hansteen Property Investments Ltd (00370) Portmoak Community Council (00638) Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd (00754) Universities Superannuation Scheme Ltd (00844) Manse LLP (00850) Alexander Harley Seeds Ltd (00885) Councillor Michael Barnacle (02633) Perthshire Chamber of Commerce (03005) Scottish Environment Protection Agency (03194) Scottish Natural Heritage (05211)		Crieff Hydro Ltd (07710) Jim Pritchard (09104) Scone Palace & Estate (09163) TACTRAN (09203) CKD Galbraith (09289/9) Culfargie Estates Ltd (09289/20) Kinross Estate Company (09313) Dall Estate (09313) Andrew Donaldson (09389) G S Brown (09817) Homes for Scotland (10214) Scottish Natural Heritage (05211)
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	Economic Development Policies and supporting text pages 25-28	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):		
<p><u>Economic Development Policy Group</u> Perthshire Chamber of Commerce (03005/1/001): Query over the term of what is '<i>tourism related</i>' (paragraph 3.3.6) as out of centre tourism related retail is having an adverse impact on town centres. Clearer definition of what is '<i>tourism related</i>' retail recommended at paragraph 3.3.6.</p> <p>Alexander Harley Seeds Ltd (00885/1/001): No mention within supporting text of Economic Development section of the role high tech businesses/industry can play in the Perth and Kinross economy.</p> <p>Portmoak Community Council (00638/1/007); Jim Pritchard (09104/1/005): Both representations support the supporting text as written for the Economic Development section.</p> <p><u>Policy ED1 Employment and Mixed Use Areas</u> TACTRAN (09203/4/001): Significant employment development will generate additional travel and recommends that Supplementary Guidance produced in relation to Policy ED1B includes the need for effective Travel Plans.</p> <p>Hansteen Property Investments Ltd (00370/2/002): Object to the wording used within Policy ED1B which states that mixed use sites with one main use will not be considered acceptable and a range of uses is encouraged. Policy wording is not considered flexible and suggest a change in wording of the Policy ED1B that includes the removal of the</p>		

sentence *‘Proposals for mixed use opportunity sites that comprise predominantly one use will not be acceptable’.*

G S Brown (09817/3/009): Issues can arise with the amenity of residential uses conflicting with commercial uses. Different owners and companies have different business models and the delivery of mixed use sites is administer and difficult to find a suitable commercial operator for mixed use developments.

Sainsbury’s Supermarkets Ltd (00754/4/005): Objects to employment uses mentioned within Policy ED1A because it does not include retail. Retail is a significant employment generator and attracts investment. Retail is one of the few industries that continues to do well in current economic conditions.

Perthshire Chamber of Commerce (03005/1/002): Policy ED1B should allow for the possibility of small scale development close to housing where a number of small businesses from the same sector would operate from one complex. Policy should not be restrictive of dominant uses within mixed use sites.

Scone Palace & Estate (09163/4/001): It is not clear whether Policy ED1A is purely related to employment areas as allocated in the plan, or to any existing and proposed employment areas. There may also be a good reason to have a retail outlet which is contributing to e.g. the tourism offer within an employment area such as a craft workshop cluster. These should not be unreasonably restrained.

Scone Palace & Estate (09163/4/002): Sufficient retail outlets should be located close to where people live to help reduce the need to travel. This can be managed carefully without having an impact on existing centres.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (03194/1/001): No reference made within Policy ED1A for waste management being an appropriate land use on employment sites. Zero Waste Plan Annex B paragraph 4.6 (S4_Doc_386) states that *‘Subject to detailed site specific considerations, waste management facilities can be considered appropriate for sites allocated in development plans for employment and industrial use...’.*

Considers it not appropriate for land uses to be detailed in supplementary guidance as these should be identified in the text of the policy.

Manse LLP (00850/1/003): Objects to Policy ED1A in particular as it makes reference to retail uses within employment areas at paragraph (d). The Proposed LDP successfully addresses the retail hierarchy for Perth City and should therefore be capable of predicting the extent of, in particular, convenience retail provision across the Plan period and should seek to focus this within existing defined centres within the retail hierarchy. There is no need to make specific reference to circumstances whereby retail development within employment designated areas would be acceptable.

Scottish Natural Heritage (05211/25/001): Policy ED1 should reflect the outcome of Table 8.1 of the Habitats Regulations Appraisal (S4_Doc_131).

Homes for Scotland (10214/1/015); Universities Superannuation Scheme Ltd (00844/1/002); Manse LLP (00850/1/004): All are supportive of Policy ED1 as written.

Policy ED3 Rural Business and Diversification

Andrew Donaldson (09389/1/001): Policy ED3 sets a preference for development within

or adjacent to settlement boundaries. Although the policy also allows for development outwith settlements the wording of the policy is such that such businesses must contribute to the local economy through the provision of permanent employment, visitor accommodation, additional tourism or recreational facilities or involves the reuse of existing buildings. This in effect limits any new rural business and diversification which is not related to tourism, and tourism accommodation to development which will reuse existing buildings.

The policy should be changed to read '*permanent employment or visitor accommodation or additional tourism or recreational facilities or etc*'.

Crieff Hydro Ltd (07710/1/001): Supports the Council's recognition that rural businesses are equally important drivers of sustainable economic growth in the region and that Policy ED3 recognises that some rural locations are appropriate for tourism and rural based businesses.

However, they seek the strengthening of Policy ED3 in terms of its support not only for '*new tourism related development*', but also to existing tourism related developments, particularly where it can be demonstrated that diversification of the business will improve the quality of visitor facilities and allows a new market to be exploited or the tourism season extended.

Culfargie Estates Ltd (09289/20/001): In principle supports rural business and diversification within Policy ED3. However policy does not go far enough in providing a positive climate for the rural economy.

If Policy ED3 was expanded to promote any rural site which could be demonstrated to provide a positive contribution to the rural economy, whilst containing sufficient mitigation to prevent significant adverse effect on the locality, this would also allow for small regional business and light industry centre.

Perthshire is a predominantly rural county with a heavy reliance on primary industries and tourism, each of which support a range of secondary small industries requiring premises - suitable rural brownfield and former agricultural sites provide an opportunity to fulfil this demand and is in line with SPP (Core_Doc_048).

Scone Palace & Estate (09163/4/003): Policy ED3 should provide support for destination, niche retailing that supports the tourism offer. Such retailing is often intrinsic or complimentary to many visitor attractions. Such retail does not affect existing centres retail offer as it is a different type of retail. The policy should be in line with the SPP paragraph 45 (S4_Doc_084). The modification proposed will help remove any unnecessary planning barriers as specified by paragraph 45 of SPP.

Paragraph 3 of Policy ED3 is not very clear what is meant by it and what housing policies are being referred to. As a result the policy position is unclear. The policy should be more supportive of on site housing.

Alexander Harley Seeds Ltd (00885/1/002): Policy ED3 and the supporting text does not contain any reference to renewable energy development. This is considered a backwards step from the current local plan. Renewable energy development is the economic opportunity of a generation for rural Scotland. Locally owned small to medium scale development can be developed by local agribusinesses and landowners. Existing and potential rural businesses could be strengthened significantly by diversifying into

renewable energy. Policy ED3 should communicate a clear understanding that these developments are very important for the rural economy.

PKC has a statutory duty to advance these goals in their Local Development Plan and the role that locally owned renewables can play in this ought to be reflected in Policy ED3.

Kinross Estate Company (09311/1/001): The objectives of the policy are generally supported. However, it is considered that the policy is missing a vital element, which if included could broaden the policy support for development that would generate economic benefit to the rural economy.

It is recommended that the following text is added to the 1st paragraph of the policy *'involves the reuse of existing buildings, or increases gross value added to the local economy.'*

The recognition of added value would allow policy support for developments that would result in employment opportunities.

TACTRAN (09203/6/001); Dall Estate (09313/1/001); Councillor Michael Barnacle (02633/1/003); CKD Galbraith (09289/9/001); Portmoak Community Council (00638/1/009): All Support Policy ED3 as written.

Modifications sought by those submitting representations:

Economic Development Policy Group

Perthshire Chamber of Commerce (03005/1/001): Definition of what is *'tourism related'* retail to be included at paragraph 3.3.6.

Alexander Harley Seeds Ltd (00885/1/001): Add into introductory text to the Economic Development section of the important role that high tech business/industry will have on the economy of Perth and Kinross.

Policy ED1 Employment and Mixed Use Areas

TACTRAN (09203/4/001): Supplementary Guidance that is to be produced in relation to Policy ED1B should include the need for effective Travel Plans.

Hansteen Property Investments Ltd (00370/2/002); G S Brown (09817/3/009): Change in wording of the Policy ED1B that involves removal of the sentence *'Proposals for mixed use opportunity sites that comprise predominantly one use will not be acceptable'*.
Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd (00754/4/005); Manse LLP (00850/1/003): Deletion of criteria (d) within Policy ED1A.

Perthshire Chamber of Commerce (03005/1/002): Recommends addition of following wording to Policy ED1B (unless the proposal is supported by evidence which demonstrates the benefits of the proposal in line with this policy) to end of sentence beginning *'Proposals for mixed use opportunity site that comprises...'*

Scone Palace & Estate (09163/4/001): *'Areas identified for employment uses'* within Policy ED1A should be more carefully defined and Criteria (d) should be altered to allow flexibility in relation to appropriate retail opportunities.

Scone Palace & Estate (09163/4/002): The list of uses allowed within mixed use areas should include an element of retail.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (03194/1/001): Waste management be specified as an appropriate land use under Policy ED1A

Scottish Natural Heritage (05211/25/001): Policy ED1 in general does not contain any measures to ensure the protection of the qualifying interests of Natura 2000 sites for future proposals arising under this policy. As such it is recommended that the following additional criteria is added to the list in Policy ED1A:

'(e) Proposals should not result in adverse impacts, either individually or in combination, on the integrity of a European designated site(s).'

Policy ED3 Rural Business and Diversification

Andrew Donaldson (09389/1/001): Policy ED3 should be changed to read *'permanent employment or visitor accommodation or additional tourism or recreational facilities or etc'*.

Crieff Hydro Ltd (07710/1/001): Modify the Policy ED3 as follows: *'New [ADD and existing] tourism related development will be supported where it can be demonstrated that it improves the quality of new or existing visitor facilities, allows a market to be exploited or extends the tourism season.'*

Culfargie Estates Ltd (09289/20/001): Modify Policy ED3 to allow greater latitude and support for rural economic activity, as opposed to economic activity within settlements, where such activity is already broadly supported.

Scone Palace & Estate (09163/4/003): Criteria (f) should be modified to state *'Outwith settlement centres, retailing will only be acceptable if it can be demonstrated that it is either, ancillary to the main use of the site and would not be deemed to prejudice the vitality of existing retailing centres in adjacent settlements, or is providing a niche, destination, retailing experience which supports the tourism/visitor offer of Perth and Kinross.'*

Paragraph 3 of Policy ED3 requires clarification and an explicit expression of support for rural housing associated with businesses and enabling housing should be provided.

Alexander Harley Seeds Ltd (00885/1/002): Policy ED3 and the supporting text should contain reference to renewable energy development.

Kinross Estate Company (09311/1/001): It is recommended that the following text is added to the first paragraph of the policy *'involves the reuse of existing buildings, or increases gross value added to the local economy'*.

Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:

Economic Development Policy Group

Perthshire Chamber of Commerce (03005/1/001): It is recognised that shopping has become increasingly common to be a primary reason for people to undertake travel. It is now an influential motive for day trips, holidays and business trips. However, there is no industry standard definition for the term *'tourism related retail'*. The Use Classes Order (Scotland) 1997 (Core_Doc_018) does not distinguish such a form of retailing within Use Class 1 (Shops) and it is considered that the creation of a definition for the purposes of

the LDP may end being unduly restrictive and ultimately challengeable.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Alexander Harley Seeds Ltd (00885/1/001): High technology industries account for a very low percentage (less than 4%) within the Perth and Kinross economy which is predominantly tourism, finance and service related. Paragraph 3.3.4 of the Proposed Plan does however provide support for new industries to establish in Perth and Kinross and this does not preclude the high-technology sector.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Policy ED1 Employment and Mixed Use Areas

TACTRAN (09203/4/001): Supplementary Guidance on Travel Plans is scheduled to be produced as part of the Transport and Accessibility Policy TA1 (S4_Doc_387) of the LDP. Therefore it is considered there is no need to repeat the task already scheduled in the LDP's Draft Action Programme 2012-2024 (Core_Doc_172) to be produced in 2013 and adopted in parallel with the Plan.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Hansteen Property Investments Ltd (00370/2/002); G S Brown (09817/3/009); Perthshire Chamber of Commerce (03005/1/002): The policy is quite clear that sites allocated for mixed use should not become a dominant or single use site, in particular residential. This is to promote and ensure there is greater integration of various employment generating uses with residential and thereby reduce the need for extensive travel. A dominant or single use site will not achieve this and is not considered sustainable. Single use sites will not meet the aspirations of SPP Paragraph 79 (S4_Doc_294) and Policy 2(F) of TAYplan (S4_Doc_066) promotes a mix of land uses on development sites with good links to sustainable modes of transport.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd (00754/4/005); Manse LLP (00850/1/003); Scone Palace & Estate (09163/4/001 & 09163/4/002): Whilst it is acknowledged that retail does provide employment it is excluded from the term employment category because the Use Classes Order Scotland 1997 (Core_Doc_018) gives retail a use class (1) of its own. Retail developments have a very different impact on an area in comparison to general employment development. Traffic levels and customer numbers are much higher with retail and this has a greater impact than most other employment generators. In addition both SPP (paragraphs 52-65) (S4_Doc_295) and TAYplan (Policy 7) (S4_Doc_068) supports and promotes retail development in city centres, town centres and commercial centres. The effect of allowing this proposed modification would encourage retail use in out of centre locations and have an adverse impact on town centres. It would also be contrary to both the SPP and the retail policies within the Proposed LDP. Most employment development and most employment sites contained within the LDP are out of centre and therefore any retail development, unless ancillary is not compatible with current retail planning policy. Policy ED1 does not restrict retail use within a mixed use development provided it is ancillary to the main use.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (03194/1/001): Scottish Governments Zero Waste Plan (Annex B, paragraph 2.2) (S4_Doc_431) supports waste on employment and

industrial sites. *'LDP's should identify a plentiful supply of employment and industrial land as a network of sites suitable for waste management uses, consistent with SPP, to ensure private sector competition, as not all industrial sites will be developed for waste management uses.'*

Paragraph 4.6 of the Zero Waste Plan (S4_Doc_386) also states that *'Modern waste management infrastructure is designed and regulated to high standards and is similar to other industrial processes. Subject to detailed site specific considerations, waste management facilities can be considered appropriate for sites allocated in development plans for employment and industrial use.'*

SEPA recommended that Policy EP9 (S4_Doc_388) was changed to reflect that waste management facilities were appropriate on employment/industrial land, as a consequence, Policy ED1 should be amended to reflect that waste is an appropriate land use on those sites. This is in line with Annex B of the Zero Waste Plan. (S4_Doc_432).

Policy ED1A does not restrict waste management as an appropriate land use. Numerous mixed use sites within the LDP may be suitable for certain types of waste management such as recycling centres, waste transfer and closed loop recycling. The issue raised is noted and accepted.

If the Reporter is so minded to recommend that the proposed modification is adopted, the local authority would be comfortable with this modification provided it is made clear that whilst waste management facilities can be considered appropriate for employment and industrial land this will be subject to detailed site specific considerations.

Scottish Natural Heritage (05211/25/001): It is considered that amending Policy ED1 to incorporate the mitigation measures as set out in the Habitats Regulations Appraisal (including Appropriate Assessment) (S4_Doc_131) of the Proposed Plan, and detailed in the previous section would provide greater clarity and transparency for applicants as to which settlements and in what circumstances the provisions of the Plan's Policy NE1: International Nature Conservation Sites (S4_Doc_389) will apply for proposals arising under these policies. It would also set out what will be expected of them in making a planning application.

If the Reporter is so minded the suggested additional text by the respondent should be added to Policy ED1 as detailed in the 'Modifications Sought' section.

Policy ED3 Rural Business and Diversification

Andrew Donaldson (09389/1/001): It is considered that the wording of Policy ED3 does not preclude non tourism related business opportunities within the rural areas of Perth and Kinross. The policy suggests that a business proposal in rural area will be supported if it contributes to the local economy, either through employment, provision of visitor accommodation, additional tourism/recreation facilities or the re-use of existing buildings. It is considered that the policy is not overly focussed on rural tourism and does not exclude the potential support for other business proposals.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Crieff Hydro Ltd (07710/1/001): There is no clear benefit to Policy ED3 by adding the words *'and existing'* to the beginning of the second paragraph. The policy and the second paragraph already specifically mentions improving existing visitor facilities. The extension of existing tourism facilities is a new tourism venture and is already supported by the first

sentence in Policy ED3 and within Policies ED4 and ED5 (S4_Doc_390) and (S4_Doc_391).

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Culfargie Estates Ltd (09289/20/001): It is considered that Policy ED3 provides sufficient support to rural business development outwith settlements. The third sentence of the first paragraph says '*sites outwith settlements may be acceptable if they allow an existing business to diversify or is related to a site specific resource or opportunity*'. It is considered that this policy provides enough flexibility for business developments outwith a settlement but enough control to ensure that any inappropriate developments are not supported.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Scone Palace & Estate (09163/4/003): Paragraph 45 of SPP (S4_Doc_084) makes no specific mention of retailing within rural areas. It is considered that retail development unless ancillary to an attraction or business would be inappropriate outwith settlements as out of centre retail is not supported by SPP paragraph 61 (S4_Doc_296) nor TAYplan Approved Plan (Policy 7) (S4_Doc_068). It is therefore considered that it would be inappropriate to support its inclusion within Policy ED3.

The issue regarding rural housing with business developments needs to be reading line with residential development policies and housing in the countryside policies, which allows some scope for such developments in certain situations or locations.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Alexander Harley Seeds Ltd (00885/1/002): Policy ED3 does not highlight support for specific developments within rural areas. It is considered that renewable energy development is covered by '*site specific resource*' within the third sentence of the policy. In addition it is considered that Policy ER1 Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation (S4_Doc_392) provides acceptable support for renewable energy development in Perth and Kinross.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Kinross Estate Company (09311/1/001): It is considered that the beginning of the second sentence of the first paragraph already mentions contribution to the local economy and therefore there is no need to repeat this at the end of the same sentence.

No modification is proposed to the Plan.

Reporter's conclusions:

Economic Development Policy Group

1. Read as a whole Section 3.3 gives general support for all forms of economic development which meets the policies of the Scottish Government Economic Strategy, Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) and TAYplan.
2. There is no industry standard definition for tourism-related development and it is understandable that Perthshire Chamber of Commerce should wish to understand what

the Council has in mind in using this term. In response to a request for further information the Council stated that that tourism-related development can be described as: *“Development in hospitality, leisure and retail facilities and infrastructure where the primary purpose is to attract tourism visits (overnight and/or leisure day visits) thereby generating revenues and employment within the local economy.”* This is a helpful clarification which can usefully be incorporated within the Glossary of the Proposed Plan.

3. In support of its statement in paragraph 3.3.6 that 13% of all job opportunities are generated by *tourism-related development* the Council has referred to the Office of National Statistics and in particular to NOMIS - the labour market statistics web site. Although the data relied upon refers to the position in 2008 there is no evidence to support a view that the figure should be revised either up or down. It is not immediately understandable why tourist related developments and facilities should be accorded special mention rather than other forms of economic activity, including finance and services, which generate income and employment in Perth and Kinross.

4. While there can be no dispute that *high-tech business and high-tech industry* play a part in growing the economy of Perth and Kinross, these forms of economic development, like *tourism-related developments*, are difficult to define with precision. The insertion of text drawing particular attention to the potential contribution of these activities to the exclusion of other activities would be to clutter the text and be an unnecessary addition to the Council's commitment to support all forms of sustainable economic growth in Perth and Kinross.

Policy ED1 Employment and Mixed Use Areas

5. Depending on the particular circumstances, development of employment and mixed use areas may well generate significant volumes of additional traffic. As a note to Policy TA1: Transport Standards and Accessibility Requirements the Council is committed to the issue of supplementary guidance which will explain when a travel plan and transport assessment is required. While there is no need to repeat that exercise with respect to Policy ED1, it would be helpful to users of the plan if there was a cross reference to the terms of Policy TA1: Transport Standards and Accessibility Standards by way of a note below Policy ED1A which states the Council's commitment to the issue of relevant supplementary guidance.

6. The specification of waste management as an appropriate land use in Policy ED1A would be in tune with the Scottish Environment Protection Agency's (SEPA's) Zero Waste Plan to which the Council is committed and, in particular, to the terms of its Annex B. The policy should be amended accordingly.

7. It would be appropriate for the wording of the policy to incorporate the mitigation measures as set out in the Habitats Regulations Appraisal of the Proposed Plan by presuming against any proposal which would harm a European Protected Site.

8. None of the respondents has sought the deletion of the whole of Policy ED1B. The intent of Policy ED1B is clear and the removal of the sentence: *“Proposals for mixed use opportunity sites that comprise predominantly one use will not be acceptable”* would strike at its heart. No persuasive justification has been provided for an amendment to this policy.

9. The Council's policies towards retail and commercial development are treated separately from economic development in section 3.4 of the Proposed Plan. Policy

ED1B deals with areas allocated in the Proposed Plan for employment and mixed use areas. It is perfectly understandable that the Council should seek to apply criteria which will ensure that developments in such areas are compatible one with another. The policy does not place an embargo on retail development in these areas. Moreover, the requirement that it be ancillary to other acceptable uses can ensure that sites intended for mixed use are not dominated by retail developments which have particular characteristics including traffic generation which are not necessarily seen as compatible by other potential investors on these sites. No persuasive justification has been provided for the deletion of item (d) or any amendment to the wording.

Policy ED3 Rural Business and Diversification

10. A fair reading of Policy ED3 confirms that it does not have the effect of limiting any new rural business and diversification which is not related to tourism and tourism accommodation to development which will reuse existing buildings. Nor are there any persuasive arguments to make specific reference to wind energy, or to include a reference to gross value added to the local economy from that source even if there were a recognised methodology readily to hand whereby that increment could be satisfactorily defined and thereafter calculated.

11. Sentence 4 within the first paragraph includes a set of criteria against which proposals for rural businesses and diversification will be assessed. It is essential that the introductory text be clear and specific. For clarity the sentence should be amended.

12. The following paragraph refers to “*new tourism development*” and later to “*existing visitor facilities*”. Given the difficulty in defining tourism development which the Council has acknowledged elsewhere in its responses, and the distinction which can be made between visits by residents, by day visitors, and tourists the addition of the word *existing* to the initial phrase would clarify matters.

13. There is no policy support at either national or strategic level making a special case for retailing developments outwith settlement centres which are not ancillary to the main use of a the site whatever that use may be. Accordingly, there is no need to alter the text of criterion (f) in that respect.

Reporter’s recommendations:

Glossary

1. Add a definition for “tourism-related development to the Proposed Plan’s glossary to read as follows: “*Development in hospitality, leisure and retail facilities and infrastructure where the primary purpose is to attract tourism visits (overnight and/or leisure day visits) thereby generating revenues and employment within the local economy.*”

Policy ED1A

2. Add the following text as a Note: “*Supplementary guidance prepared in relation to Policy TA1: Transport Standards and Accessibility Requirements will explain when a travel and transport assessment is required.*”

3. Add the following text to the policy as item (e): “*Proposals for waste management facilities can be considered to be acceptable subject to detailed site specific considerations.*”

4. Add the following text to the policy as item (f): *“Proposals should not result in adverse impacts, either individually or in combination, on the integrity of any European designated site.”*

Policy ED3

5. Delete sentence 4 of the introduction to the policy and insert the following: *“This is provided that they will contribute to the local economy through the provision of permanent employment, or visitor accommodation, or additional tourism or recreational facilities, or involves the re-use of existing buildings.”*

6. Amend the first clause of paragraph 2 of the introduction to the policy to read as follows: *“New and existing tourism-related development will be supported....”*