

STATEMENT ON NATIONAL PLANNING FRAMEWORK 4

Application Number:	20/00830/FULL
Description of Development:	Erection of Crematorium Building and associated Parking, Access, Turning Space, Landscaping and Boundary Enclosures
Site Address:	Land North East Of Duntrune House Duntrune
Grid Ref:	344924 : 735118
Applicant Name:	Duntrune Ltd

At its meeting on 3 February 2023 the Development Management Review Committee (DMRC) requested a statement on National Planning Framework 4, *in particular Policies 1, 13 and 29, in respect of the proposed development.*

Planning service statement

National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) was adopted by the Scottish Ministers on 13 February 2023, following approval by the Scottish Parliament in January. At that date NPF4 became part of the statutory development plan. The development plan covering this part of Angus now comprises:

NPF4, 2023; and
Angus Local Development Plan (ALDP), 2016.

As a result of the introduction of NPF4, TAYplan no longer forms part of the development plan. NPF3 and Scottish Planning Policy (2014) are also replaced by NPF4.

This statement should be read alongside the Report of Handling for the application, which sets out relevant policies of the ALDP.

The undernoted policies of NPF4 are relevant to determination of the proposal: -

Sustainable Places

1. Tackling the climate and nature crises
2. Climate mitigation and adaptation
3. Biodiversity
4. Natural places
5. Soils
6. Forestry, woodland and trees
7. Historic assets and places
9. Brownfield, vacant and derelict land and empty buildings
13. Sustainable transport

Liveable Places

14. Design, quality and place
18. Infrastructure first
22. Flood risk and water management
23. Health and safety

Productive Places

29. Rural development

The full text of the relevant NPF4 policies can be viewed at Appendix 1 to this report.

Assessment

Sections 25 and 37(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 require that planning decisions be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The proposals compatibility with the ALDP is set out in the Report of Handling for the application and as indicated above, this statement must be read in conjunction with that document.

NPF4 now forms part of the statutory development plan and the policies it contains must be considered in the determination of the review.

The ALDP was adopted in September 2016 while NPF4 was adopted on 13 February 2023. Planning legislation indicates that where there is any incompatibility between the provision of the national planning framework and a provision of a local development plan, whichever of them is the later in date is to prevail.

There are no policies in NPF4 which deal specifically with applications for crematorium developments. Crematorium developments can attract reasonably significant numbers of people attending funeral services and memorial gardens; they can generate employment and can provide an important and necessary service for the community. Policies relating to the general location of development, including the safeguarding of greenfield land, accessibility of the site, rural employment, and community facilities are therefore relevant as well as policies relating to design, the natural and built environment, amenity and infrastructure issues.

NPF4 Policy 1 indicates that *when considering all development proposals significant weight will be given to the global climate and nature crises.*

The suitability of the proposed location

The suitability of the proposed location in relation to ALDP policy is set out in the Report of Handling.

The NPF4 spatial principles seek (amongst other things) to: -

limit urban expansion so we can optimise the use of land to provide services and resources;
encourage sustainable development in rural areas, recognising the need to grow and support urban and rural communities together.

In respect of sustainable places, NPF4 indicates that *Scotland's Climate Change Plan, backed by legislation, has set our approach to achieving net zero emissions by 2045, and we must make significant progress towards this by 2030 including by reducing car kilometres travelled by 20% by reducing the need to travel and promoting more sustainable transport.*

Policy 2 relates to climate mitigation and adaptation and the policy intent is to encourage, promote and facilitate development that minimises emissions and adapts to the current and future impacts of climate

change. Policy 2 requires development proposals to be *sited and designed to minimise greenhouse gas emissions as far as possible*; and *to be sited and designed to adapt to current and future risks from climate change*.

Policy 5 relates to soils and indicates that development proposals will only be supported if they are (amongst other things) designed and constructed in accordance with the mitigation hierarchy by first avoiding and then minimising the amount of disturbance to soils on undeveloped land.

Policy 9 indicates that *proposals on greenfield sites will not be supported unless the site has been allocated for development or the proposal is **explicitly** supported by policies in the LDP*.

Policy 13 relates to sustainable transport. Its intent is to encourage, promote and facilitate developments that prioritise walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport for everyday travel and reduce the need to travel unsustainably. Policy 13 indicates development proposals will be supported where it can be demonstrated that the transport requirements generated have been considered in line with the sustainable travel and investment hierarchies and where appropriate they meet a number of criteria. Policy 13 also indicates that ***development proposals for significant travel generating uses will not be supported in locations which would increase reliance on the private car, taking into account the specific characteristics of the area***.

Policy 14 design, quality and place indicates that development proposals will be supported where they are consistent with the six qualities of successful places. Those qualities include (amongst other things) *connected* – ***supporting well connected networks that make moving around easy and reduce car dependency***. The policy indicates that *development proposals that are poorly designed, detrimental to the amenity of the surrounding area or inconsistent with the six qualities of successful places, will not be supported*.

Policy 29 rural development seeks to ensure that rural places are vibrant and sustainable and rural communities and businesses are supported. The policy offers support to proposals that contribute to the viability, sustainability and diversity of rural communities and local rural economy. It requires proposals to be suitably scaled, sited and designed to be in keeping with the character of the area; and **to take into account the transport needs of the development as appropriate for the rural location**.

NPF4 places increased emphasis on locating new development in locations which have good access for sustainable travel options and avoiding increased reliance on the private car. Officers have concluded in relation to the local development plan policies that the site has poor accessibility and information submitted in support of the application indicates that the majority of traffic visiting the site would do so via private car. As indicated in the Report of Handling, a Scottish Government Reporter refused planning permission for a crematorium facility located around 1.8km southeast of the application site because (amongst other things) it did not enjoy good accessibility, particularly for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users. That proposal was in a location close to the current application site and with similar characteristics in terms of limited accessibility by sustainable modes of transport.

While the site is in a countryside location, it is likely to predominantly serve an urban area where access would be reliant on the private car. There is little evidence that it would encourage rural economic activity, support the service function of small towns, or that it could not be in a location which has better accessibility and supports the role of urban locations. A development of this nature in a location close to the urban fringe of a city would not be consistent with the NPF4 spatial priority of compact urban growth and limiting urban expansion.

This proposal is not consistent with those aspects of NPF4 which seek to ensure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations that are accessible by a range of sustainable transport modes and provide communities with easy access to services without increasing reliance on the private car.

The site is not allocated for development in the ALDP and would involve the use of greenfield land in circumstances where the proposal is not explicitly supported by the ALDP. The proposal is contrary to Policy 9 of NPF4. In addition, the proposal would involve disturbance of soils on undeveloped land in circumstances where that could be avoided, and as such it is not consistent with Policy 5 of NPF4.

Other development plan considerations

NPF4 Policy 23 relates to health and safety and requires consideration of matters relating to the impact of proposals on health, air quality and noise. Policy 14 design, quality and place indicates that development proposals that are poorly designed, detrimental to the amenity of the surrounding area or inconsistent with the six qualities of successful places, will not be supported. The requirement of Policy 14 for development to be connected and reduce car dependency is addressed earlier in relation to the suitability of the proposed location. Otherwise, these policies provide similar tests to those provided by ALDP policies in respect of impacts on amenity and the suitability of the proposed design. The conclusion relating to impacts on amenity and the suitability of the proposed design set out in the Report of Handling is not altered by the approach set out in NPF4.

NPF4 Policy 3 relates to biodiversity and requires proposals for local development to include appropriate measures to conserve, restore and enhance biodiversity. NPF4 Policy 4 relates to natural places and indicates development proposals which by virtue of type, location or scale will have an unacceptable impact on the natural environment, will not be supported. It requires consideration of impacts on designated sites and protected species. NPF4 Policy 6 relates to forestry, woodland and trees and offers support to development proposals that enhance, expand and improve woodland and tree cover. It indicates that proposals will not be supported where they result in adverse impacts on ancient woodlands, veteran trees, hedgerows or individual trees of high biodiversity value. These policies provide similar tests to those provided by ALDP in respect of protected sites and species, and impacts on woodland and trees. The conclusion relating to those matters set out in the Report of Handling is not altered by the approach set out in NPF4. Matters relating to biodiversity enhancement required by Policy 3 could be secured by planning condition.

NPF4 Policy 7 seeks to protect and enhance historic environment assets and places, and to enable positive change as a catalyst for the regeneration of places. This policy requires consideration of similar matters to those provided by ALDP policies and the conclusion relating to impacts on cultural heritage set out in the Report of Handling is not altered by the approach set out in NPF4.

NPF4 Policy 18 indicates that development proposals will only be supported where it can be demonstrated that provision is made to address impacts on infrastructure, which includes road infrastructure. It suggests where planning conditions, planning obligations, or other legal agreements are to be used, the relevant tests will apply. This policy requires consideration of similar matters to those provided by ALDP policies and the conclusion relating to impacts on the public road network (and the necessity to have suitable sightlines at junctions on the public road) set out in the Report of Handling is not altered by the approach set out in NPF4.

NPF4 Policy 22 relates to flood risk and water management and seeks to strengthen resilience to flood risk by promoting avoidance as a first principle and reducing the vulnerability of existing and future development to flooding. It requires proposals to not increase the risk of surface water flooding to others,

to manage rain and surface water through sustainable drainage and supports connections to the public water supply. This policy requires consideration of similar matters to those provided by ALDP policies and the conclusion relating to impacts on flooding, drainage and water supply set out in the Report of Handling is not altered by the approach set out in NPF4.

Conclusions

NPF4 places greater emphasis on addressing the twin global climate and nature crises. It indicates that Scotland's Climate Change Plan, backed by legislation, has set our approach to achieving net zero emissions by 2045, and we must make significant progress towards this by 2030 including by reducing car kilometres travelled by 20% by reducing the need to travel and promoting more sustainable transport. The overarching spatial strategy indicates that we will limit urban expansion so we can optimise the use of land and promote compact urban growth. The national planning policies place emphasis on locating development in locations that are accessible by means other than private car and directing new development to the right location. This is the most effective means the planning system has to contribute towards the overall goal of reducing car kilometres travelled.

While the proposal does not give rise to conflict with a number of detailed policies, the location is not consistent with the overarching aims of NPF4. The application proposes development on greenfield land on a site close to but outwith a major city. The development would rely predominantly on access by the private car, and it would generate significant vehicle movements in a location which is not accessible by a choice of sustainable transport modes. Accordingly, it is not a development which has been sited to minimise greenhouse gas emissions. The proposed development would not contribute to the target of reducing car kilometres travelled by 20%, and the disturbance of soils and the use of greenfield land in these circumstances is not explicitly supported by policies in the ALDP. The proposal would not support the spatial priority of compact urban growth.

NPF4 Policy 1 gives significant weight to the global climate and nature crises when considering development proposals. Policy 2 requires proposals to be sited and designed to minimise lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions as far as possible. The proposal does not attract support from NPF4 policies 1 and 2 for the reasons detailed above. The proposal is not consistent with the overarching spatial strategy that NPF4 promotes; it is not consistent with those policies that seek to encourage, promote and facilitate the reuse of brownfield, vacant and derelict land and empty buildings, and to help reduce the need for greenfield development; and it is not consistent with those policies that seek to encourage, promote and facilitate developments that prioritise walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport for everyday travel and reduce the need to travel unsustainably.

The proposal is contrary to NPF4 for the following reasons:

The proposal is contrary to the NPF4 Spatial Principle of sustainable development in rural areas and policies 13, 14 and 29 because the development would generate significant vehicle movements in a location which is not accessible by a choice of sustainable transport modes and would increase reliance on the private car.

The proposal is contrary to the NPF4 Spatial Principle of compact urban growth and limiting urban expansion, and policies 9 and 5 because the development is located on greenfield land where the site is not allocated for development and the proposal is not explicitly supported by policies of the ALDP; and by locating the development on undeveloped greenfield land, it does not avoid or minimise disturbance to soils.

The proposal is contrary to NPF4 policies 1 and 2 because the development would generate significant vehicle movements in a location which is not accessible by a choice of sustainable transport modes and would increase reliance on the private car and accordingly the development has not been sited to minimise greenhouse gas emissions and is not consistent with the need to address global climate and nature crises.

Appendix 1 -

National Planning Framework 4– national planning policies

Policy 1 Tackling the climate and nature crises

When considering all development proposals significant weight will be given to the global climate and nature crises.

Policy 2 Climate mitigation and adaptation

- a) Development proposals will be sited and designed to minimise lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions as far as possible.
- b) Development proposals will be sited and designed to adapt to current and future risks from climate change.
- c) Development proposals to retrofit measures to existing developments that reduce emissions or support adaptation to climate change will be supported.

Policy 3 Biodiversity

- a) Development proposals will contribute to the enhancement of biodiversity, including where relevant, restoring degraded habitats and building and strengthening nature networks and the connections between them. Proposals should also integrate nature-based solutions, where possible.
- b) Development proposals for national or major development, or for development that requires an Environmental Impact Assessment will only be supported where it can be demonstrated that the proposal will conserve, restore and enhance biodiversity, including nature networks so they are in a demonstrably better state than without intervention. This will include future management. To inform this, best practice assessment methods should be used. Proposals within these categories will demonstrate how they have met all of the following criteria:
 - i. the proposal is based on an understanding of the existing characteristics of the site and its local, regional and national ecological context prior to development, including the presence of any irreplaceable habitats;
 - ii. wherever feasible, nature-based solutions have been integrated and made best use of;
 - iii. an assessment of potential negative effects which should be fully mitigated in line with the mitigation hierarchy prior to identifying enhancements;
 - iv. significant biodiversity enhancements are provided, in addition to any proposed mitigation. This should include nature networks, linking to and strengthening habitat connectivity within and beyond the development, secured within a reasonable timescale and with reasonable certainty. Management arrangements for their long- term retention and monitoring should be included, wherever appropriate; and
 - v. local community benefits of the biodiversity and/or nature networks have been considered.

c) Proposals for local development will include appropriate measures to conserve, restore and enhance biodiversity, in accordance with national and local guidance. Measures should be proportionate to the nature and scale of development. Applications for individual householder development, or which fall within scope of (b) above, are excluded from this requirement.

d) Any potential adverse impacts, including cumulative impacts, of development proposals on biodiversity, nature networks and the natural environment will be minimised through careful planning and design. This will take into account the need to reverse biodiversity loss, safeguard the ecosystem services that the natural environment provides, and build resilience by enhancing nature networks and maximising the potential for restoration.

Policy 4 Natural places

a) Development proposals which by virtue of type, location or scale will have an unacceptable impact on the natural environment, will not be supported.

b) Development proposals that are likely to have a significant effect on an existing or proposed European site (Special Area of Conservation or Special Protection Areas) and are not directly connected with or necessary to their conservation management are required to be subject to an “appropriate assessment” of the implications for the conservation objectives.

c) Development proposals that will affect a National Park, National Scenic Area, Site of Special Scientific Interest or a National Nature Reserve will only be supported where:

- i. The objectives of designation and the overall integrity of the areas will not be compromised; or
- ii. Any significant adverse effects on the qualities for which the area has been designated are clearly outweighed by social, environmental or economic benefits of national importance.

All Ramsar sites are also European sites and/ or Sites of Special Scientific Interest and are extended protection under the relevant statutory regimes.

d) Development proposals that affect a site designated as a local nature conservation site or landscape area in the LDP will only be supported where:

- i. Development will not have significant adverse effects on the integrity of the area or the qualities for which it has been identified; or
- ii. Any significant adverse effects on the integrity of the area are clearly outweighed by social, environmental or economic benefits of at least local importance.

e) The precautionary principle will be applied in accordance with relevant legislation and Scottish Government guidance.

f) Development proposals that are likely to have an adverse effect on species protected by legislation will only be supported where the proposal meets the relevant statutory tests. If there is reasonable evidence to suggest that a protected species is present on a site or may be affected by a proposed development, steps must be taken to establish its presence. The level of protection required by legislation must be factored into the planning and design of development, and potential impacts must be fully considered prior to the determination of any application.

g) Development proposals in areas identified as wild land in the Nature Scot Wild Land Areas map will only be supported where the proposal:

- i) will support meeting renewable energy targets; or,

ii) is for small scale development directly linked to a rural business or croft, or is required to support a fragile community in a rural area.

All such proposals must be accompanied by a wild land impact assessment which sets out how design, siting, or other mitigation measures have been and will be used to minimise significant impacts on the qualities of the wild land, as well as any management and monitoring arrangements where appropriate. Buffer zones around wild land will not be applied, and effects of development outwith wild land areas will not be a significant consideration.

Policy 5 Soils

- a) Development proposals will only be supported if they are designed and constructed:
- i. In accordance with the mitigation hierarchy by first avoiding and then minimising the amount of disturbance to soils on undeveloped land; and
 - ii. In a manner that protects soil from damage including from compaction and erosion, and that minimises soil sealing.
- b) Development proposals on prime agricultural land, or land of lesser quality that is culturally or locally important for primary use, as identified by the LDP, will only be supported where it is for:
- i. Essential infrastructure and there is a specific locational need and no other suitable site;
 - ii. Small-scale development directly linked to a rural business, farm or croft or for essential workers for the rural business to be able to live onsite;
 - iii. The development of production and processing facilities associated with the land produce where no other local site is suitable;
 - iv. The generation of energy from renewable sources or the extraction of minerals and there is secure provision for restoration; and

In all of the above exceptions, the layout and design of the proposal minimises the amount of protected land that is required.

- c) Development proposals on peatland, carbon- rich soils and priority peatland habitat will only be supported for:
- i. Essential infrastructure and there is a specific locational need and no other suitable site;
 - ii. The generation of energy from renewable sources that optimises the contribution of the area to greenhouse gas emissions reductions targets;
 - iii. Small-scale development directly linked to a rural business, farm or croft;
 - iv. Supporting a fragile community in a rural or island area; or
 - v. Restoration of peatland habitats.
- d) Where development on peatland, carbon-rich soils or priority peatland habitat is proposed, a detailed site specific assessment will be required to identify:
- i. the baseline depth, habitat condition, quality and stability of carbon rich soils;
 - ii. the likely effects of the development on peatland, including on soil disturbance; and
 - iii. the likely net effects of the development on climate emissions and loss of carbon.

This assessment should inform careful project design and ensure, in accordance with relevant guidance and the mitigation hierarchy, that adverse impacts are first avoided and then minimised through best practice. A peat management plan will be required to demonstrate that this approach has been followed, alongside other appropriate plans required for restoring and/ or enhancing the site into a functioning peatland system capable of achieving carbon sequestration.

- e) Development proposals for new commercial peat extraction, including extensions to existing sites, will only be supported where:
- i. the extracted peat is supporting the Scottish whisky industry;
 - ii. there is no reasonable substitute;
 - iii. the area of extraction is the minimum necessary and the proposal retains an in-situ residual depth of part of at least 1 metre across the whole site, including
 - iv. the time period for extraction is the minimum necessary; and
 - v. there is an agreed comprehensive site restoration plan which will progressively restore, over a reasonable timescale, the area of extraction to a functioning peatland system capable of achieving carbon sequestration.

Policy 6 Forestry, woodland and trees

- a) Development proposals that enhance, expand and improve woodland and tree cover will be supported.
- b) Development proposals will not be supported where they will result in:
- i. Any loss of ancient woodlands, ancient and veteran trees, or adverse impact on their ecological condition;
 - ii. Adverse impacts on native woodlands, hedgerows and individual trees of high biodiversity value, or identified for protection in the Forestry and Woodland Strategy;
 - iii. Fragmenting or severing woodland habitats, unless appropriate mitigation measures are identified and implemented in line with the mitigation hierarchy;
 - iv. Conflict with Restocking Direction, Remedial Notice or Registered Notice to Comply issued by Scottish Forestry.
- c) Development proposals involving woodland removal will only be supported where they will achieve significant and clearly defined additional public benefits in accordance with relevant Scottish Government policy on woodland removal. Where woodland is removed, compensatory planting will most likely be expected to be delivered.
- d) Development proposals on sites which include an area of existing woodland or land identified in the Forestry and Woodland Strategy as being suitable for woodland creation will only be supported where the enhancement and improvement of woodlands and the planting of new trees on the site (in accordance with the Forestry and Woodland Strategy) are integrated into the design.

Policy 7 Historic assets and places

- a) Development proposals with a potentially significant impact on historic assets or places will be accompanied by an assessment which is based on an understanding of the cultural significance of the historic asset and/or place. The assessment should identify the likely visual or physical impact of any proposals for change, including cumulative effects and provide a sound basis for managing the impacts of change.

Proposals should also be informed by national policy and guidance on managing change in the historic environment, and information held within Historic Environment Records.

- b) Development proposals for the demolition of listed buildings will not be supported unless it has been demonstrated that there are exceptional circumstances and that all reasonable efforts have been made to retain, reuse and/or adapt the listed building. Considerations include whether the:
- i. building is no longer of special interest;
 - ii. building is incapable of physical repair and re-use as verified through a detailed structural condition survey report;
 - iii. repair of the building is not economically viable and there has been adequate marketing for existing and/or new uses at a price reflecting its location and condition for a reasonable period to attract interest from potential restoring purchasers; or
 - iv. demolition of the building is essential to delivering significant benefits to economic growth or the wider community.
- c) Development proposals for the reuse, alteration or extension of a listed building will only be supported where they will preserve its character, special architectural or historic interest and setting. Development proposals affecting the setting of a listed building should preserve its character, and its special architectural or historic interest.
- d) Development proposals in or affecting conservation areas will only be supported where the character and appearance of the conservation area and its setting is preserved or enhanced. Relevant considerations include the:
- i. architectural and historic character of the area;
 - ii. existing density, built form and layout; and
 - iii. context and siting, quality of design and suitable materials.
- e) Development proposals in conservation areas will ensure that existing natural and built features which contribute to the character of the conservation area and its setting, including structures, boundary walls, railings, trees and hedges, are retained.
- f) Demolition of buildings in a conservation area which make a positive contribution to its character will only be supported where it has been demonstrated that:
- i. reasonable efforts have been made to retain, repair and reuse the building;
 - ii. the building is of little townscape value;
 - iii. the structural condition of the building prevents its retention at a reasonable cost; or
 - iv. the form or location of the building makes its reuse extremely difficult.
- g) Where demolition within a conservation area is to be followed by redevelopment, consent to demolish will only be supported when an acceptable design, layout and materials are being used for the replacement development.
- h) Development proposals affecting scheduled monuments will only be supported where:
- i. direct impacts on the scheduled monument are avoided;
 - ii. significant adverse impacts on the integrity of the setting of a scheduled monument are avoided;
- or
- iii. exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated to justify the impact on a scheduled monument and its setting and impacts on the monument or its setting have been minimised.
- i) Development proposals affecting nationally important Gardens and Designed Landscapes will be supported where they protect, preserve or enhance their cultural significance, character and integrity and where proposals will not significantly impact on important views to, from and within the site, or its setting.

- j) Development proposals affecting nationally important Historic Battlefields will only be supported where they protect and, where appropriate, enhance their cultural significance, key landscape characteristics, physical remains and special qualities.
- k) Development proposals at the coast edge or that extend offshore will only be supported where proposals do not significantly hinder the preservation objectives of Historic Marine Protected Areas.
- l) Development proposals affecting a World Heritage Site or its setting will only be supported where their Outstanding Universal Value is protected and preserved.
- m) Development proposals which sensitively repair, enhance and bring historic buildings, as identified as being at risk locally or on the national Buildings at Risk Register, back into beneficial use will be supported.
- n) Enabling development for historic environment assets or places that would otherwise be unacceptable in planning terms, will only be supported when it has been demonstrated that the enabling development proposed is:
 - i. essential to secure the future of an historic environment asset or place which is at risk of serious deterioration or loss; and
 - ii. the minimum necessary to secure the restoration, adaptation and long-term future of the historic environment asset or place.

The beneficial outcomes for the historic environment asset or place should be secured early in the phasing of the development, and will be ensured through the use of conditions and/or legal agreements.

- o) Non-designated historic environment assets, places and their setting should be protected and preserved in situ wherever feasible. Where there is potential for non-designated buried archaeological remains to exist below a site, developers will provide an evaluation of the archaeological resource at an early stage so that planning authorities can assess impacts. Historic buildings may also have archaeological significance which is not understood and may require assessment.

Where impacts cannot be avoided they should be minimised. Where it has been demonstrated that avoidance or retention is not possible, excavation, recording, analysis, archiving, publication and activities to provide public benefit may be required through the use of conditions or legal/planning obligations.

When new archaeological discoveries are made during the course of development works, they must be reported to the planning authority to enable agreement on appropriate inspection, recording and mitigation measures.

Policy 9 Brownfield, vacant and derelict land and empty buildings

- a) Development proposals that will result in the sustainable reuse of brownfield land including vacant and derelict land and buildings, whether permanent or temporary, will be supported. In determining whether the reuse is sustainable, the biodiversity value of brownfield land which has naturalised should be taken into account.
- b) Proposals on greenfield sites will not be supported unless the site has been allocated for development or the proposal is explicitly supported by policies in the LDP.

c) Where land is known or suspected to be unstable or contaminated, development proposals will demonstrate that the land is, or can be made, safe and suitable for the proposed new use.

d) Development proposals for the reuse of existing buildings will be supported, taking into account their suitability for conversion to other uses. Given the need to conserve embodied energy, demolition will be regarded as the least preferred option.

Policy 13 Sustainable transport

a) Proposals to improve, enhance or provide active travel infrastructure, public transport infrastructure or multi-modal hubs will be supported. This includes proposals:

i. for electric vehicle charging infrastructure and electric vehicle forecourts, especially where fuelled by renewable energy.

ii. which support a mode shift of freight from road to more sustainable modes, including last-mile delivery.

iii. that build in resilience to the effects of climate change and where appropriate incorporate blue and green infrastructure and nature rich habitats (such as natural planting or water systems).

b) Development proposals will be supported where it can be demonstrated that the transport requirements generated have been considered in line with the sustainable travel and investment hierarchies and where appropriate they:

i. Provide direct, easy, segregated and safe links to local facilities via walking, wheeling and cycling networks before occupation;

ii. Will be accessible by public transport, ideally supporting the use of existing services;

iii. Integrate transport modes;

iv. Provide low or zero-emission vehicle and cycle charging points in safe and convenient locations, in alignment with building standards;

v. Supply safe, secure and convenient cycle parking to meet the needs of users and which is more conveniently located than car parking;

vi. Are designed to incorporate safety measures including safe crossings for walking and wheeling and reducing the number and speed of vehicles;

vii. Have taken into account, at the earliest stage of design, the transport needs of diverse groups including users with protected characteristics to ensure the safety, ease and needs of all users; and

viii. Adequately mitigate any impact on local public access routes.

c) Where a development proposal will generate a significant increase in the number of person trips, a transport assessment will be required to be undertaken in accordance with the relevant guidance.

d) Development proposals for significant travel generating uses will not be supported in locations which would increase reliance on the private car, taking into account the specific characteristics of the area.

e) Development proposals which are ambitious in terms of low/no car parking will be supported, particularly in urban locations that are well-served by sustainable transport modes and where they do not create barriers to access by disabled people.

f) Development proposals for significant travel generating uses, or smaller-scale developments where it is important to monitor travel patterns resulting from the development, will only be supported if they are accompanied by a Travel Plan with supporting planning conditions/obligations. Travel plans should set out clear arrangements for delivering against targets, as well as monitoring and evaluation.

g) Development proposals that have the potential to affect the operation and safety of the Strategic Transport Network will be fully assessed to determine their impact. Where it has been demonstrated that existing infrastructure does not have the capacity to accommodate a development without adverse impacts on safety or unacceptable impacts on operational performance, the cost of the mitigation measures required to ensure the continued safe and effective operation of the network should be met by the developer.

While new junctions on trunk roads are not normally acceptable, the case for a new junction will be considered by Transport Scotland where significant economic or regeneration benefits can be demonstrated. New junctions will only be considered if they are designed in accordance with relevant guidance and where there will be no adverse impact on road safety or operational performance.

Policy 14 Design, quality and place

a) Development proposals will be designed to improve the quality of an area whether in urban or rural locations and regardless of scale.

b) Development proposals will be supported where they are consistent with the six qualities of successful places:

Healthy: Supporting the prioritisation of women's safety and improving physical and mental health.

Pleasant: Supporting attractive natural and built spaces.

Connected: Supporting well connected networks that make moving around easy and reduce car dependency

Distinctive: Supporting attention to detail of local architectural styles and natural landscapes to be interpreted, literally or creatively, into designs to reinforce identity.

Sustainable: Supporting the efficient use of resources that will allow people to live, play, work and stay in their area, ensuring climate resilience, and integrating nature positive, biodiversity solutions.

Adaptable: Supporting commitment to investing in the long-term value of buildings, streets and spaces by allowing for flexibility so that they can be changed quickly to accommodate different uses as well as maintained over time.

Further details on delivering the six qualities of successful places are set out in Annex D.

c) Development proposals that are poorly designed, detrimental to the amenity of the surrounding area or inconsistent with the six qualities of successful places, will not be supported.

Policy 18 Infrastructure first

a) Development proposals which provide (or contribute to) infrastructure in line with that identified as necessary in LDPs and their delivery programmes will be supported.

b) The impacts of development proposals on infrastructure should be mitigated. Development proposals will only be supported where it can be demonstrated that provision is made to address the

impacts on infrastructure. Where planning conditions, planning obligations, or other legal agreements are to be used, the relevant tests will apply.

Where planning obligations are entered into, they should meet the following tests:

- be necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms
- serve a planning purpose
- relate to the impacts of the proposed development
- fairly and reasonably relate in scale and kind to the proposed development
- be reasonable in all other respects

Planning conditions should only be imposed where they meet all of the following tests. They should be:

- necessary
- relevant to planning
- relevant to the development to be permitted
- enforceable
- precise
- reasonable in all other respects

Policy 22 Flood risk and water management

- a) Development proposals at risk of flooding or in a flood risk area will only be supported if they are for:
- i. essential infrastructure where the location is required for operational reasons;
 - ii. water compatible uses;
 - iii. redevelopment of an existing building or site for an equal or less vulnerable use; or.
 - iv. redevelopment of previously used sites in built up areas where the LDP has identified a need to bring these into positive use and where proposals demonstrate that long- term safety and resilience can be secured in accordance with relevant SEPA advice.

The protection offered by an existing formal flood protection scheme or one under construction can be taken into account when determining flood risk.

In such cases, it will be demonstrated by the applicant that:

- o all risks of flooding are understood and addressed;
- o there is no reduction in floodplain capacity, increased risk for others, or a need for future flood protection schemes;
- o the development remains safe and operational during floods;
- o flood resistant and resilient materials and construction methods are used; and
- o future adaptations can be made to accommodate the effects of climate change.

Additionally, for development proposals meeting criteria part iv), where flood risk is managed at the site rather than avoided these will also require:

- o the first occupied/utilised floor, and the underside of the development if relevant, to be above the flood risk level and have an additional allowance for freeboard; and
- o that the proposal does not create an island of development and that safe access/ egress can be achieved.

- b) Small scale extensions and alterations to existing buildings will only be supported where they will not significantly increase flood risk.

- c) Development proposals will:
 - i. not increase the risk of surface water flooding to others, or itself be at risk.
 - ii. manage all rain and surface water through sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS), which should form part of and integrate with proposed and existing blue- green infrastructure. All proposals should presume no surface water connection to the combined sewer;
 - iii. seek to minimise the area of impermeable surface.
- d) Development proposals will be supported if they can be connected to the public water mains. If connection is not feasible, the applicant will need to demonstrate that water for drinking water purposes will be sourced from a sustainable water source that is resilient to periods of water scarcity.
- e) Development proposals which create, expand or enhance opportunities for natural flood risk management, including blue and green infrastructure, will be supported.

Policy 23 Health and safety

- a) Development proposals that will have positive effects on health will be supported. This could include, for example, proposals that incorporate opportunities for exercise, community food growing or allotments.
- b) Development proposals which are likely to have a significant adverse effect on health will not be supported. A Health Impact Assessment may be required.
- c) Development proposals for health and social care facilities and infrastructure will be supported.
- d) Development proposals that are likely to have significant adverse effects on air quality will not be supported. Development proposals will consider opportunities to improve air quality and reduce exposure to poor air quality. An air quality assessment may be required where the nature of the proposal or the air quality in the location suggest significant effects are likely.
- e) Development proposals that are likely to raise unacceptable noise issues will not be supported. The agent of change principle applies to noise sensitive development. A Noise Impact Assessment may be required where the nature of the proposal or its location suggests that significant effects are likely.
- f) Development proposals will be designed to take into account suicide risk.
- g) Development proposals within the vicinity of a major accident hazard site or major accident hazard pipeline (because of the presence of toxic, highly reactive, explosive or inflammable substances) will consider the associated risks and potential impacts of the proposal and the major accident hazard site/pipeline of being located in proximity to one another.
- h) Applications for hazardous substances consent will consider the likely potential impacts on surrounding populations and the environment.
- i) Any advice from Health and Safety Executive, the Office of Nuclear Regulation or the Scottish Environment Protection Agency that planning permission or hazardous substances consent should be refused, or conditions to be attached to a grant of consent, should not be overridden by the decision maker without the most careful consideration.

j) Similar considerations apply in respect of development proposals either for or near licensed explosive sites (including military explosive storage sites).

Policy 29 Rural development

a) Development proposals that contribute to the viability, sustainability and diversity of rural communities and local rural economy will be supported, including:

- i. farms, crofts, woodland crofts or other land use businesses, where use of good quality land for development is minimised and business viability is not adversely affected;
- ii. diversification of existing businesses;
- iii. production and processing facilities for local produce and materials, for example sawmills, or local food production;
- iv. essential community services;
- v. essential infrastructure;
- vi. reuse of a redundant or unused building;
- vii. appropriate use of a historic environment asset or is appropriate enabling development to secure the future of historic environment assets;
- viii. reuse of brownfield land where a return to a natural state has not or will not happen without intervention;
- ix. small scale developments that support new ways of working such as remote working, homeworking and community hubs; or
- x. improvement or restoration of the natural environment.

b) Development proposals in rural areas should be suitably scaled, sited and designed to be in keeping with the character of the area. They should also consider how the development will contribute towards local living and take into account the transport needs of the development as appropriate for the rural location.

c) Development proposals in remote rural areas, where new development can often help to sustain fragile communities, will be supported where the proposal:

- i. will support local employment;
- ii. supports and sustains existing communities, for example through provision of digital infrastructure; and
- iii. is suitable in terms of location, access, siting, design and environmental impact.

d) Development proposals that support the resettlement of previously inhabited areas will be supported where the proposal:

- i. is in an area identified in the LDP as suitable for resettlement;
- ii. is designed to a high standard;
- iii. responds to their rural location; and
- iv. is designed to minimise greenhouse gas emissions as far as possible.