

## STATEMENT ON NATIONAL PLANNING FRAMEWORK 4

<b>Application Number:</b>	22/00376/FULL
<b>Description of Development:</b>	Erection of a Dwellinghouse and Ancillary Works
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land 40M North Of Lummington Steading House, Brathinch, Brechin
<b>Grid Ref:</b>	358275:764859
<b>Applicant Name:</b>	Mr & Ms K & K Whitecross & Carnegie

At its meeting on 9 March 2023 the Development Management Review Committee requested a statement on National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) in respect of the proposed development.

Planning service statement

On 13 February 2023, National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) was published. The development plan covering this part of Angus now comprises:

- [National Planning Framework 4](#) (NPF4) (Published 2023)
- [Angus Local Development Plan](#) (ALDP) (Adopted 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.

**NPF4**Sustainable Places

Policy 1 Tackling the climate and nature crises

Policy 2 Climate mitigation and adaptation

Policy 3 Biodiversity

Policy 4 Natural places

Policy 5 Soils

Policy 6 Forestry, woodland and trees

Policy 7 Historic assets and places

Policy 9 Brownfield, vacant and derelict land and empty buildings

Policy 13 Sustainable transport

Liveable Places

Policy 14 Design, quality and place

Policy 17 Rural homes

Policy 18 Infrastructure first

Policy 23 Health and safety

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

**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.

In this case the development plan comprises: -

- NPF4
- ALDP

The NPF4 policies relevant to the determination of the application are reproduced at Appendix 1 and have been taken into account in preparing this statement.

The ALDP was adopted in September 2016 while NPF4 was published 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.

The compatibility of the proposed development with the relevant policies of the ALDP is set out in the Report of Handling for the planning application and as indicated above, this statement should be read alongside that document.

### **The principle of constructing a house on the site**

The acceptability of the principle of constructing a house on the site in relation to policies of the ALDP is set out in the Report of Handling.

NPF4 seeks to encourage the reuse of brownfield land and empty buildings to help reduce the need for greenfield development. Policy 9 indicates that development proposals that will result in the sustainable reuse of brownfield land and buildings will be supported. In determining whether the reuse is sustainable, the biodiversity value of brownfield land which has naturalised should be taken into account. Policy 9 also 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.

NPF4 also seeks to encourage, promote and facilitate the delivery of more high quality, affordable and sustainable rural homes in the right locations. Policy 17 indicates that development proposals for new homes in rural areas will be supported where the development is suitably scaled, sited and designed to be in keeping with the character of the area and the development (amongst other things) reuses brownfield land where a return to a natural state has not or will not happen without intervention.

NPF4 defines *brownfield* as land which has previously been developed. The term may cover vacant or derelict land, land occupied by redundant or unused buildings and developed land within the settlement boundary where further intensification of use is considered acceptable.

As noted in the Report of Handling, the supporting information (including the site photographs submitted) suggests that the site contains a metal shipping container, which is not a building, but a movable chattel. It has a very limited visual impact from outside of the site and could be moved and reused elsewhere without significant intervention. Beyond that, the photographs suggest that there are some limited remnants of building waste on or adjacent to the site, but (as noted in the public comment) there is no evidence to suggest that the site previously contained a building. The site does not contain a derelict building where the removal of that building would benefit the amenity of the area, and there is no planning history which suggests that permission has been granted for the deposition of waste materials nor the siting of a shipping container on the site. The site has vegetated

ground cover, does not adversely impact on the amenity of the area, and does not meet the NPF4 definition of brownfield land. The proposal would therefore not result in the reuse of brownfield land where a return to a natural state has not or will not happen without intervention.

The proposal does not satisfy any of the other circumstances where rural housing is supported by Policy 17(a). The site is not allocated for housing within the LDP. The proposal would not reuse a redundant or unused building. The proposal does not constitute an appropriate use of a historic environment asset or is appropriate enabling development to secure the future of historic environment assets. No evidence has been submitted to demonstrate the house is necessary to support the management of a viable rural business or croft with an essential need for a worker to live permanently at or near their place of work, or that the house is for the retirement succession of a viable farm holding. The proposal is not for the subdivision of an existing residential dwelling, and is not for the reinstatement of a former dwelling or the replacement of an existing dwelling.

The principle of a house on the site does not attract support from policies 17(b) to (d). While the majority of the site is located within a Category 2 Rural Settlement Unit (areas which are defined in the ALDP as *primarily* remote rural areas), the location is not particularly remote. Part of the site lies within a Category 1 Rural Settlement Unit (areas which are defined in the ALDP as generally *non-remote* areas) and nearby land to the north, east and south of the site falls within a Category 1 area.

The proposal is therefore contrary to policies 9 and 17 because it is not consistent with any of the circumstances where rural housing is permitted in NPF4 and the proposal would involve the development of a site with greenfield characteristics in circumstances where the site is not allocated for development, and the proposal is not explicitly supported by policies in the LDP (as set out in the Report of Handling).

### **Other development plan considerations**

Policy 14 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 policy provides similar considerations to ALDP policy and the conclusion on those matters contained within the Report of Handling is not altered by the approach set out in 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. Policy 4 relates to natural places and indicates development proposals which will have an unacceptable impact on the natural environment, will not be supported. It requires consideration of impacts on designated sites and protected species. Policy 3 relates to biodiversity and requires proposals for local development to include appropriate measures to conserve, restore and enhance biodiversity. The conclusions relating to impacts on the natural and built environment set out in the Report of Handling are not altered by the approach set out in NPF4. Planning condition(s) could be utilised to secure appropriate biodiversity enhancement measures were the proposal otherwise policy compliant.

Policy 13 seeks to encourage, promote and facilitate developments that prioritise walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport for everyday travel and reduce the need to travel unsustainably. It indicates that 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 18 indicates that development proposals will only be supported where it can be demonstrated that provision is made to address impacts on infrastructure. The proposed house would be sited in a location which does not benefit

from a regular public transport service or convenient access to walking, wheeling or cycling routes. It is a form of development which would increase reliance on the private car which conflicts with the sustainable travel aims of NPF4. However, the scale of the proposed development is such that it would not introduce a significant travel generating use, which reduces the policy tension created by the lack of sustainable travel options. The conclusion relating to issues around road safety and infrastructure set out in the Report of Handling is not altered by the approach set out in NPF4. Matters relating to potential impacts on the drainage infrastructure of neighbouring property could be addressed by planning condition were the proposal otherwise policy compliant.

Policy 23 indicates (amongst other things) that any advice from Health and Safety Executive that planning permission 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. The policy provides similar considerations to ALDP policy and the conclusion on that matter contained within the Report of Handling is not altered by the approach set out in NPF4.

Policy 5 relates to soils and provides limited circumstances where proposals on prime quality land will be supported. It also indicates that 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. Available information suggests that land within the site is sub-prime and the proposal raises no significant issues against Policy 5.

Policy 1 relates to tackling the climate and nature crises and indicates that when considering all development proposals significant weight will be given to the global climate and nature crises. 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. It indicates that development proposals will be sited and designed to minimise lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions as far as possible and proposals to be sited and designed to adapt to current and future risks from climate change. The proposal does not raise any significant issues against the intentions of those policies that cannot be addressed by planning condition. It is not in a location subject to flood risk from fluvial or surface water flooding. While it is a form of development that will primarily rely on use of the private car for access, it is not a significant travel generating use. The house is designed to take advantage of solar gain through the use of glass and a southerly orientation, and measures to enhance biodiversity could be secured by planning condition were the proposal otherwise policy compliant.

## **Conclusions**

As with any application, the proposal attracts support from some NPF4 policies and is not entirely consistent with others. In this case, while the proposal meets (or could be made to meet) a number of the detailed policy tests, the principle of a house on the site is not consistent with any of the circumstances in Policy 17 which supports new rural dwellings. The site does not meet the definition of brownfield land and the proposal would involve the development of land with greenfield characteristics in circumstances where the site is not allocated for development and the proposal is not explicitly supported by policies of the ALDP (as set out in the Report of Handling). The proposal is contrary to NPF4 for the reasons set out below.

## **Reasons**

1. The proposal is contrary to Policy 17 of National Planning Framework 4 because the development of a house on the site does not accord with any of the circumstances which support a new rural dwelling.
2. The proposal is contrary to Policy 9 of National Planning Framework 4 because it would involve the development of a site with greenfield characteristics in circumstances where the site is not allocated for development, and the proposal is not explicitly supported by policies in the Angus Local Development Plan (2016).

## **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 drainage features;
- 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 17 Rural homes

a) Development proposals for new homes in rural areas will be supported where the development is suitably scaled, sited and designed to be in keeping with the character of the area and the development:

- i. is on a site allocated for housing within the LDP;
- ii. reuses brownfield land where a return to a natural state has not or will not happen without intervention;
- iii. reuses a redundant or unused building;
- iv. is an appropriate use of a historic environment asset or is appropriate enabling development to secure the future of historic environment assets;
- v. is demonstrated to be necessary to support the sustainable management of a viable rural business or croft, and there is an essential need for a worker (including those taking majority control of a farm business) to live permanently at or near their place of work;
- vi. is for a single home for the retirement succession of a viable farm holding;

vii. is for the subdivision of an existing residential dwelling; the scale of which is in keeping with the character and infrastructure provision in the area; or  
viii. reinstates a former dwelling house or is a one-for-one replacement of an existing permanent house.

b) Development proposals for new homes in rural areas will consider how the development will contribute towards local living and take into account identified local housing needs (including affordable housing), economic considerations and the transport needs of the development as appropriate for the rural location.

c) Development proposals for new homes in remote rural areas will be supported where the proposal:

- i. supports and sustains existing fragile communities;
- ii. supports identified local housing outcomes; and
- iii. is suitable in terms of location, access, and environmental impact.

d) Development proposals for new homes 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 its rural location; and
- iv. is designed to minimise greenhouse gas emissions as far as possible.

#### 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 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).