

## Members' Library Service Request Form

Date of Document	13/11/15
Originator	Iain Mcfarlane, Service Manager - Planning
Originator's Ref (if any)	SESplan MIR response
Document Title	East Lothian Council response to the SESplan Main Issues Report

Please indicate if access to the document is to be "unrestricted" or "restricted", with regard to the terms of the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985.

Unrestricted	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Restricted	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	------------	--------------------------

If the document is "restricted", please state on what grounds (click on grey area for drop-down menu):

For Publication
-----------------

Please indicate which committee this document should be recorded into (click on grey area for drop-down menu):

Planning Committee
--------------------

Additional information:

Authorised By	Douglas Proudfoot
Designation	Head of Service (Development)
Date	03/07/15

For Office Use Only:	
Library Reference	189/15
Date Received	13/11/15
Bulletin	Nov15

**REPORT TO:** Members' Library Service

**MEETING DATE:**

**BY:** Depute Chief Executive - Partnership and Community Services

**SUBJECT:** East Lothian Council Response to the SESplan Main Issues Report

---

## **1 PURPOSE**

- 1.1 To note the Council's response to the South East Scotland Strategic Development Plan Main Issues Report, further to the report and debate of 25 August 2015 and subsequent Member workshop of 11 September 2015.

## **2 RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 It is recommended that Members note the comments submitted, as detailed in Appendix 1 to this report.

## **3 BACKGROUND**

- 3.1 The Planning etc. (Scotland) Act 2006 requires that each planning authority and strategic development planning authority must prepare and publish a Development Plan
- 3.2 MIR2 and its supporting documentation was approved by the SESplan Joint Committee for consultation in May 2015.
- 3.3 That approval was ratified by Members at a meeting of East Lothian Council on 23 June 2015.
- 3.4 At the Council Meeting of 25 August 2015 members agreed
- (i) to discuss the issues raised by the MIR at a briefing meeting and workshop with officers.
  - (ii) to delegate to the Head of Development and planning spokesperson(s) the final response to the consultation, subject to the discussions of the above meeting and workshop.

3.5 The comments set out in Annex 1 were agreed subsequent to the workshop meeting of 11 September and duly submitted to SESplan in response to the MIR.

#### **4 POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

4.1 None

#### **5 EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

5.1 This report is not applicable to the well being of equalities groups and an Equalities Impact Assessment is not required.

#### **6 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

6.1 Financial – none

6.2 Personnel – none

6.3 Other – none

#### **7 BACKGROUND PAPERS**

7.1 Planning etc. (Scotland) Act 2006

7.2 Town and Country Planning (Development Planning) (Scotland) Regulations 2008

7.3 Scottish Planning Policy (SPP)

7.4 Scottish Government Planning Series Circular 6/2013: Development Planning

<b>AUTHOR'S NAME</b>	Iain McFarlane
<b>DESIGNATION</b>	Service Manager, Policy and Projects
<b>CONTACT INFO</b>	x7292
<b>DATE</b>	13/11/15

## **ANNEX 1**

### **Response to SESplan MIR for SDP2 following Members Briefing and Workshop**

#### **Spatial Strategy:**

- Members/ support the preferred option but with emphasis on the flexibility of the growth corridor so that development is not concentrated on Musselburgh, due to concerns that it may have reached its physical and infrastructure capacity for development;
- Development should be directed along the A1 and ECML corridors eastwards, potentially to Dunbar and beyond subject to travel times;
- The growth corridor should include the North Berwick Branch line;
- Support for Blindwells to expand beyond the 1600 and support that potential for a second new settlement be highlighted, to enable development to be directed away from existing towns if required by future need and demand;
- Concern that all the strategies would place pressure on already stretched infrastructure in East Lothian and that this should be addressed before new development is planned.

#### **Place to do Business**

- Cockenzie should not be limited to the energy/ renewable sector but should have more flexibility for diverse uses. Members are aware of the constraints of NPF3 and discussions with Scottish Government on this are ongoing;
- QMU site should not be limited to life sciences but a more flexible approach should be taken including food & drink. QMU's subject portfolio wouldn't be reflected by limit to life sciences;
- Blindwells should be included as a strategic employment site and should have a sub-regional centre within it;
- Macmerry and Spott Road should be included as strategic employment sites;
- The Cement Works area at Dunbar (brown field land, ex quarry) should be protected as a future employment / development area;
- Economic clusters should provide for sectoral as well as geographical clusters so that coast and countryside are identified as areas for tourism and Food and Drink sector support

#### **Economic growth scenarios**

- Support for the preferred option for steady economic growth

#### **Housing Land**

- Support for preferred option with Edinburgh meeting a larger proportion of its housing need but with some dispersed out to the other SESplan areas;
- New settlement(s) to be promoted to allow new housing demand to be directed to it/them instead of to existing settlements