

Members' Library Service Request Form

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Date of Document | 12/06/18 |
| Originator | Andrew Stewart |
| Originator's Ref (if any) | |
| Document Title | LDP Action Programme: Consultation Responses |

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):

| |
|----------------------|
| East Lothian Council |
|----------------------|

Additional information:

| | |
|---------------|---------------------|
| Authorised By | Douglas Proudfoot |
| Designation | Head of Development |
| Date | 13/06/18 |

| | |
|----------------------|----------|
| For Office Use Only: | |
| Library Reference | 89/18 |
| Date Received | 13/06/18 |
| Bulletin | Jun 2018 |

DRAFT ACTION PROGRAMME (2016) CONSULTATION RESPONSES

| Representee | Issue raised | Summary of Comment(s) | Modification sought | ELC Response | Action eg modification |
|--------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| Alistair Kettles | The education costs for Proposal TT12, 16 homes at Woodhall Road and Proposal TT14, 55 homes at Park View | An inconsistency between the draft Action Programme and the proposed plan, with regard to the education costs for Proposal TT12, 16 homes at Woodhall Road and Proposal TT14, 55 homes at Park View; the same cost is included for both sites | No modification sought | There was no inconsistency between the draft Action Programme and the Proposed Plan. The Draft Action Programme (2016) included total costs for specific education interventions and not proportional costs associated with specific development proposals such as TT12 or TT14. | No modification to the Action Programme is necessary. |
| Francis Ogilvy | LDP's minerals allocations and policies | There is a legal requirement for a land bank of resources for sand and gravel extraction which the current allocation falls far short of. The proposed LDP action programme completely fails to address the issues raised in respect of both land bank or facilitating the potential to bring forward reasonable proposals for mineral development. | Modify or delete PROP MIN5: Mineral Resources | <p>The LDP has safeguarded sites where there are known viable reserves of sand and gravel as required by SPP.</p> <p>The LDP has not identified an area of search for sand and gravel resources within East Lothian because areas where permission for such workings might be approved cannot be identified with confidence by the LDP without significant technical study that is most appropriately carried out at project level.</p> | The Report of Examination recommended that the LDP is modified to provide context to Policy MIN5 in the supporting text. However, this modification does not necessitate any amendments to the Action Programme. |

DRAFT ACTION PROGRAMME (2016) CONSULTATION RESPONSES

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|
| Magnus Thorne | PROP DR2: Hallhill North and flooding constraints associated with the site | The representation refers to SEPA's interim position statement on planning and flooding (July 2009 para12) which states 'Development Plans and Action Programmes should spell out how unavoidable impacts will be mitigated and delivered'. The representee expects that ground condition constraints referred to in para 2.133 will be addressed and mitigated in the LDP in detail. | No modification sought | SEPA's more recent Development Plan Guidance Note on Flood Risk (published in August 2017) has no references to LDPs Action Programmes. It is submitted that SEPA has been a key consultee throughout the LDP process. The Council, including being the flood authority, and SEPA have worked together to ensure that the Local Development Plan affords due weight to flood risk. In accordance with SEPA's approach to sustainable flood management, the Council has undertaken a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment to inform the preparation of its LDP. The SFRA has provided a strategic overview of flood risk in the LDP area and helped to identify the area's most appropriate for development and those that should be safeguarded to secure sustainable flood management (avoiding unacceptable risk). As a result of this, any allocated development that has been assessed as having a potential flood risk is required to have a Flood Risk Assessment carried out as part of the development management process at project stage, and if necessary to identify any detailed mitigation measures. | No modification to the Action Programme is necessary. |
| Homes for Scotland; Gladman Planning | Para 3.34 of the LDP | These representations sought an amendment to para 3.34 of the LDP which suggested that the rate of delivery of housing is dependent on factors not related to the SDP requirements or the LDP or its Action Programme. Such an amendment is suggested to ensure that the LDP and its Action programme are less passive in the process of delivery. | Amend paragraph 3.34 to make clear that the LDP's spatial strategy is able to maintain a generous supply of effective housing land. | The Report of Examination recommended that para 3.34 of the proposed LDP is modified slightly to clarify that the rate of housing delivery that will take place may be (instead of will be) dependent on many factors not related to the SDP requirements, or the LDP or its Action Programme. However, it is considered that this slight modification does not require any consequential amendments of the LDP's Action Programme. The Action Programme seeks to align stakeholders, phasing, financing and infrastructure investment that is necessary to support the required rate of housing delivery. The Action Programme clearly seeks regular involvement and collaborative working between all stakeholders to positively influence the overall rate of development. | No modification to the Action Programme is necessary. |

DRAFT ACTION PROGRAMME (2016) CONSULTATION RESPONSES

| | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| <p>Musselburgh Conservation Society; Inveresk Village Society</p> | <p>Policy HSC1: Health Care Sites</p> | <p>The LDP should be much more specific in para 3.115 and 3.116 about how primary care provision for such a huge increase in population is to be met particularly in the Musselburgh Cluster. This matter should also be addressed in the LDP's Action Programme.</p> | <p>Modify the LDP's para 3.115 and 3.116 to explain in more details how primary care provision for a huge increase in population is to be met.</p> | <p>While the Report of Examination acknowledged the unease expressed within the representations with regard to the future provision of health services, dentists and emergency services, it found that the proposed LDP contains sufficient detail at this time to enable particular proposals to come forward. The Reporters agreed with the council that it is not the role of the LDP to actually deliver the activities of other bodies and agencies but to identify where future development of facilities might be required. With regard to health care provision, the Report of Examination considers that the LDP does this, as far as it can, through Proposal HSC2. The Council submits that it is not the role of the LDP or its Action Programme to deliver the activities of other bodies. The Council submits that the LDP reflects how these other bodies intend to accommodate the impacts of the LDP. They advise that there is sufficient accommodation within current primary care facilities at Musselburgh to meet the demands of population growth there. NHS Lothian and the East Lothian Health and Social Care Partnership are already in negotiations with affected practices to increase their capacity to deliver services over time.</p> | <p>No modification to the Action Programme is necessary.</p> |
|---|---------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|