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1. Introduction

1.1 This paper is one of a range of background papers that have been prepared in support of the Angus Local Development Plan (LDP) Main Issues Report. It deals with a range of challenges and opportunities in relation to infrastructure, including the future deliverability of development. The scope of this document is limited to the topics raised in paragraph 3.1 (see below). Other topic papers and background documents deal specifically with spatial strategy, housing, economy and rural development.

1.2 The aim of this document is to help identify the main issues and options for infrastructure within Angus (excluding the Cairngorms National Park area). The paper includes information that could be important for drafting the Proposed Angus Local Development Plan.

1.3 The preparation of this Background Paper has included a wide range of consultations with infrastructure providers and other key developers related to the adequacy of current provision, future needs and commitments (e.g. funding).

2. Background

2.1 The planning issues relating to infrastructure are wide-ranging, covering matters such as school capacity, roads, public transport, water supply, drainage, open space, waste management facilities and community facilities (e.g. leisure, health and social care). National policy as set out in the Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) and other documents such as Circular 1/2010 – Planning Agreements, together with the policies of the TAYplan Proposed Strategic Development Plan (June 2011), are relevant for identifying the main planning issues for infrastructure and delivering development in Angus.

2.2 Within this section, the following documents are briefly discussed in order to identify how the environment could and should be promoted as part of future development in Angus:
   - Economic Strategy, Scottish Government (2007);
   - National Planning Framework 2, Scottish Government;
   - Scottish Planning Policy, Scottish Government;
   - Scottish Transport Projects Review (2009), Transport Scotland;
   - Circular 1/2010 – Planning Agreements, Scottish Government;
   - A Guide to Development Viability, Scottish Government and GVA Grimley;
   - Development Delivery Consultation (2012), Scottish Government;
   - PAN 79: Water & Drainage, Scottish Government
   - TAYplan Proposed Strategic Development Plan (June 2011);
   - Regional Transport Strategy (RTS) 2008 – 2023, TACTRAN;

2.3 The relevant conclusions from the Angus Local Plan Review (ALPR) Monitoring Report and an overview of approaches from other planning authorities have also been considered, for the purpose of defining issues and options for infrastructure provision and the future delivery of development. This information
provides a comprehensive basis for the discussion and issues & options sections.


2.4 The Scottish Government indicates that through the investment in physical and electronic infrastructure and Scotland’s planning, development and funding framework, is critical in ensuring sustainable growth.

2.5 Enhancing Scotland’s transport services and infrastructure are key to supporting business and employment opportunities in pursuit of a wealthier and fairer Scotland. Achieving change in travel patterns and mode is one of the greatest challenges in securing sustainable economic growth and is integral to securing a greener Scotland. Connectivity also plays a key role in building safer and stronger communities. Safer and stronger communities are fundamental to the attractiveness of Scotland as a place to live and work.

**National Planning Framework for Scotland 2 (NPF2)**

2.6 The NPF2 focuses strongly on priorities for the improvement of infrastructure to support long-term development. This includes transport infrastructure, investment in energy and drainage infrastructure and the development of a strategic network of waste management installations (paragraph 5).

2.7 The competitiveness of places depends on adequate investment in infrastructure. NPF2 places particular importance on transport, waste management and water and drainage infrastructure. There are no specific projects identified for Angus in NPF2.

**Scottish Planning Policy**

2.8 Scottish Planning Policy indicates that Local Development Plans should be deliverable with an efficient use of land and good infrastructure. They should be clear about the scale of anticipated change and demonstrate the underlying reasons for the preferred location and the likely sequence of development.

2.9 Scottish Planning Policy (paragraph 16) also recognises that there may be a requirement for investment in infrastructure as a consequence of existing under provision and/or as a result of planned growth. This matter should be addressed through the Local Development Plan and not left for the development management process. It is however acknowledged that only once specific details are known will Scottish Water be able to understand what upgrades will be required. Development Plans should also have a sharp focus on land and infrastructure (paragraph 17).

2.10 In relation to the location of new development and specifically housing, SPP specifies that the majority of housing land requirements should be met within or adjacent to existing settlements as this will minimise servicing costs, reduce infrastructure pressures (e.g. waste water treatment works) and sustain local schools, shops and services. In addition, Development Plans should promote
the development of rural communities and aim to support and sustain fragile and dispersed communities through appropriate development (paragraph 84).

2.11 Scottish Planning Policy is clear in stating that rural communities should have reasonable access to good quality services, although planning authorities should be realistic about the availability or likely availability of alternatives to access by cars as not all locations, particularly in remoter areas, can be served by public transport (paragraph 96).

2.12 Scottish Planning Policy indicates that where a proposed development is considered acceptable in a location where the current water or drainage infrastructure would be insufficient, stakeholders should work together to identify the best practicable option to accommodate the development (paragraph 210). Cognisance should be taken of Scottish Water’s ‘The Elements of a Connection and Terminology’ document, which outlines who is responsible for elements of the water and wastewater infrastructure. This document can be accessed via: www.scottishwater.co.uk/assets/business/files/connections/documents/customerguide.pdf

2.13 Reducing emissions from transport sources as a contribution to achieving Scottish Government greenhouse gas emission targets requires a shift from car-based travel to walking, cycling and public transport. For goods it means a shift from road to rail and water based transport wherever possible. The planning system should support the installation of infrastructure to support new technologies, such as charging points for electric vehicles (paragraph 165).

2.14 Development Plans should identify required new transport infrastructure, including cycle and pedestrian routes. New development areas should be served by public transport accessing a range of potential destinations, or proposals should be put in place to provide public transport. Where enhancement of public transport services or infrastructure is required to serve a new development but would not be provided commercially, a contribution from the developer towards an agreed level of service may be appropriate. The intended approach to developer contributions to address the transport implications of a proposed development should be set out in the Development Plan (paragraph 170).

2.15 The strategic transport network, which includes the trunk road and rail networks is critical in supporting connectivity that facilitates sustainable economic growth. Providing for the safe and efficient movement of traffic on the strategic road network requires the implications of development proposals on traffic and road safety to be taken into account in development plans. In relation to rail, SPP seeks that making the best use of current rail services and stations to achieve optimum utilisation of the existing rail network (paragraphs 175 & 176).

2.16 Ports are considered to be important economic generators. Planning authorities and port authorities should work together to address the planning and transport issues arising from port operations, including safeguarding rail access in development plans and ensuring there is appropriate road access (paragraphs 177 & 178).
2.17 Local Development Plans or supplementary guidance should set out specific requirements for the provision of open space as part of new development and make clear how much, of what type and quality and how this can be accessed (paragraph 154). On and off site provision should be considered, depending on the specific site circumstances. In addition, the development plan should identify and protect areas of open space which are identified in the open space audit and strategy as valued and functional or with the potential of being brought into functional use to meet a need identified in the open space strategy (paragraph 153).

2.18 In relation to waste management, the Scottish Government’s Waste Policy (set out within the Zero Waste Plan (2010)), established ambitious targets as follows:

- increasing the proportion of municipal waste recycled or composted to 40% by 2010; 50% by 2013; 60% by 2020; and 70% by 2025;
- reducing the proportion of municipal waste going to landfill to no more than 5% by 2025;
- a 25% cap on energy from mixed municipal waste;
- a requirement that energy from waste plants achieve high efficiency in terms of energy recovery; and
- the preparation of a revised National Waste Management Plan which will set targets for reducing the amount of commercial and industrial waste sent to landfill.

2.19 Scottish Planning Policy indicates that in order to achieve the targets set in the Zero Waste Plan a reduction in the amount of waste produced and a significant increase in waste management infrastructure will be required. Additional capacity will also be required to treat commercial and industrial waste. Scottish Planning Policy acknowledges that the planning system has a crucial role in ensuring that installations are delivered in time to allow waste management targets to be met. This includes the allocation of specific sites, providing a policy framework whilst ensuring the design of residential, commercial and industrial properties provide for waste separation and collection (paragraph 215).

Other Scottish Government Documents

Strategic Transport Projects Review (2009)

2.20 The Strategic Transport Projects Review identifies two major road projects in the TAYplan region which aim to improve journey times between the north of Scotland and the central belt. The main project within the Angus context is the proposed A90(T) upgrade through or around Dundee. The A90(T) upgrade is the only proposal with two options but neither has been investigated. In addition, funding from the Scottish Government is not yet committed.
2.21 The Strategic Transport Projects Review also identifies the improvements of the Glasgow to Aberdeen rail line which includes the electrification of the railway line and the dualling of the railway at Usan, near Montrose. These are designed to reduce journey times and improve rail freight capabilities. Strategic park and ride schemes have also been identified for Dundee to improve strategic connectivity and help reduce city centre congestion.

Planning Advice Note 65: Planning and Open Space

2.22 Local authorities should aim to maintain or form networks of green and civic spaces which:
- Contribute to the framework for development
- Maintain and enhance environmental qualities
- Provide a range of opportunities for recreation and leisure
- Link and create wildlife habitats
- Encourage walking and cycling and reduce car use, in line with local transport strategies and core paths plans (paragraph 15).

2.23 Green and civic spaces must have a relationship with the surrounding buildings and uses, and the movements through them (paragraph 16). Open spaces should be well-located, well-designed, well-managed and adaptable (paragraph 18); although these qualities may not be suitable for natural or semi-natural green spaces (paragraph 19).

2.24 Development plans should safeguard important open spaces from development and identify spaces that require significant improvements (paragraph 37). Plans should indicate the circumstances in which new green or civic spaces will be required as part of new developments (paragraph 38). Supplementary guidance can be used to set out local standards for open space provision in greater detail (paragraph 39).

Planning Advice Note 79: Water & Drainage

2.25 PAN 79 indicates that planning authorities, Scottish Water and SEPA should work together to ensure that development plans reflect an up-to-date and accurate picture of water services infrastructure. Development Plans should be informed by a shared understanding of how new development can be accommodated. An awareness of matters such as available capacity, demographic changes, economic objectives, regulatory controls and a practical and efficient investment programme will assist in making informed choices towards future directions of growth. The Plan should evolve with all parties satisfied that the development strategy / action programme is achievable within the desired time period, through the removal of any constraints.
Scottish Government: Circular 1/2010 – Planning Agreements

2.26 The development plan should be the point at which consideration of the potential need for and use of planning agreements begins. Planning authorities should include policies on the use of planning agreements in their development plans. These create an opportunity to involve the local community and development industry in the process of policy development and associated supplementary guidance and to clarify at an early stage the expected levels of contributions that might be sought from developers (paragraph 27).

2.27 Planning agreements must relate to the development being proposed. Where a proposed development would create a direct need for particular facilities, place additional requirements on infrastructure (cumulative impact) or have a negative impact on the environment or local amenity that cannot be resolved satisfactorily through the use of planning conditions, a planning agreement could be used provided it would clearly overcome or mitigate barriers to the grant of planning permission (paragraph 16).

2.28 When drafting development plans and associated guidance planning authorities should work with infrastructure providers, other local authority departments and consultees to undertake a robust assessment of infrastructure requirements, the funding implications and the timescales involved. From this the level of developer contribution to be sought through planning agreements can be identified. The levels of contribution and method of delivery should be set out in supplementary guidance. Where appropriate standard charges and formulae should be set out in a way that helps landowners and developers to take account of the scale and types of contribution likely to be sought (paragraph 29).

2.29 Where planning authorities propose to use standard charges and formulae, they should include these in supplementary guidance along with information on how monies will be held, how they will be used and how they will be returned to the developer if applicable (paragraph 31).

2.30 Where a planning agreement requires financial contributions, staged payments in line with the construction programme can help avoid prejudicing the overall viability of a project as entering into an agreement is likely to have financial implications (paragraph 20).

GVA Grimley Study on behalf of Scottish Government: ‘A Guide to Development Viability’

2.31 The financial aspects of delivering development is fundamental to ensuring development is viable. In order for any development to be viable, it must firstly have a planning consent and secondly access to capital to fund the project.

2.32 The provision of key infrastructure and contributions to wider infrastructure are key elements within the Development Viability Appraisal. Clear, concise and up-to-date planning policy guidance and the timing of any infrastructure payments is crucial to assessing / ensuring the viability of a development (paragraphs 319 & 3.20).
The study undertaken by GVA indicates that late decisions on the request for financial contributions have added frustration, delay and cost uncertainty to the viability of a development (paragraph 3.25). A clear policy indication in the development plan or supplementary guidance can pre-empt many of these ‘unexpected’ elements (paragraph 3.26).

Scottish Government: ‘Development Delivery Consultation 2012’

The Scottish Government’s consultation paper represents the first stage of the consultation process on “Development Delivery” and seeks initial views from all sectors of the development industry, including local authorities, in relation to current issues and opportunities for facilitating development and infrastructure provision. The Scottish Government intention is to use the output/findings to inform a second consultation to investigate the detail of proposals or measures to assist in the delivery of development.

The availability of key infrastructure is essential to sustainable economic growth and community development in Scotland. There has been growing concern by all sectors of the development industry as to how this can best be achieved, particularly in the current economic climate. The Consultation Paper is the commencement of dialogue between Scottish Government and the various interest groups involved in the delivery of key infrastructure to review existing practice and consider a range of options to determine what would be the most effective future approach to secure the delivery of economic growth and community requirements.

In England and Wales, work has been developed at a national level in relation to development contributions and delivery through the Community Infrastructure Levy (the levy) which came into force in April 2010. This allows local authorities to raise funds from developers undertaking new building projects in their area. The money can be used to fund a wide range of infrastructure that is needed as a result of development.

The UK Government has decided that this tariff-based approach provides the best framework to fund new infrastructure to unlock land for growth. The Levy is intended to be fairer, faster and more certain and transparent than the system of planning obligations which causes delay as a result of lengthy negotiations. Levy rates are set in consultation with local communities and developers and are intended to provide developers with much more certainty ‘up front’ about how much money they will be expected to contribute. It is anticipated that the levy creates a fairer system, with all but the smallest building projects making a contribution towards additional infrastructure that is needed as a result of their development. It provides the basis for a charge in a manner that the planning obligations system alone could not easily achieve; enabling, for example, the mitigation of cumulative impacts from development.

Local authorities are required to spend the levy’s funds on the infrastructure needed to support the development of their area and they will decide what infrastructure is needed. The levy is intended to focus on the provision of new infrastructure and should not be used to remedy pre-existing deficiencies in
infrastructure provision unless those deficiencies will be made more severe by new development. The levy can be used to increase the capacity of existing infrastructure or to repair failing existing infrastructure, if that is necessary to support development.

2.39 In setting their proposed rates for the levy, charging authorities should identify the total infrastructure funding gap that the levy is intended to support, having taken account of the other sources of available funding. They should use the infrastructure planning that underpinned their development plan to identify a selection of indicative infrastructure projects or types of infrastructure that are likely to be funded by the levy.

2.40 Charging authorities will need to strike an appropriate balance between the desirability of funding infrastructure from the levy and the potential effects of the imposition of the levy upon the economic viability of development across their area. Charging authorities should prepare evidence about the effect of the levy on economic viability in their area to demonstrate to an independent examiner that their proposed rates, for the levy, strike an appropriate balance.

2.41 Most buildings that people normally use will be liable to pay the levy. But buildings into which people do not normally go and buildings into which people go only intermittently for the purpose of inspecting or maintaining fixed plant or machinery, will not be liable to pay the levy. Structures which are not buildings, such as pylons and wind turbines, will not be liable to pay the levy. The levy will not be charged on changes of use that do not involve an increase in floorspace.

2.42 The levy will be charged on new builds permitted through some form of planning permission. Any new build – that is a new building or an extension – is only liable for the levy if it has 100 square metres, or more, of gross internal floor space, or involves the creation of additional dwellings, even when that is below 100 square metres.

2.43 The levy is intended to provide infrastructure to support the development of an area rather than to make individual planning applications acceptable in planning terms. Therefore, the Government considers there is still a legitimate role for the development of specific planning obligations to enable a local planning authority to be confident that the specific consequences of development can be mitigated.

**TAYplan Strategic Development Plan 2012-2032**

2.44 The TAYplan vision promotes transport linkages, infrastructure improvements and network improvements and supporting the delivery of infrastructure that promotes a shift towards non-car travel and transporting freight by rail. Angus specific objectives include the safeguarding of Montrose Port as a Strategic Development Area as employment land for port related uses.

2.45 In terms of the location of new development, TAYplan’s focus is to locate most of the region’s development in principal settlements to improve accessibility to jobs and services; reduce resource consumption and reduce the need to travel
by car. In terms of the rural area, TAYplan looks to facilitate appropriate development where job and service needs exist.

2.46 The delivery of policies and proposals is set out in the Action Programme. Given TAYplan is a long-term plan a specific policy is also established for developer contributions. TAYplan acknowledges the current economic downturn and that consequently funding for new projects is difficult. However, TAYplan seeks that Local Development Plans should establish developer contributions to ensure developer mitigation on additional burdens placed on infrastructure and services.

**Regional Transport Strategy (RTS) 2008 – 2023**

2.47 TACTRAN covers the Tayside Region and Stirling and it sets out a vision and contains objectives over 10-15 years to meet the transport needs of people and businesses throughout the region.

2.48 Key objectives of the RTS are as follows:-

- To ensure transport helps to deliver regional prosperity;
- Improve accessibility for all, particularly for those suffering from social exclusion;
- To ensure that the transport system contributes to safeguarding the environment and promotes opportunities for improvement;
- To promote the health and well being of communities;
- To improve the real and perceived safety and security of the transport network; and,
- To improve integration, both within transport and between transport and other policy areas.

TACTRAN have identified 76 transport schemes or initiatives within its delivery plan. The specific projects relating to Angus are contained in Appendix 1.
3. **Discussion**

3.1 This section of the paper focuses on how the Angus LDP identifies the current infrastructure position, constraints and future requirements to ensure development is delivered. Discussion will focus on:

- identifying where there are known infrastructure constraints;
- identifying future infrastructure requirements (e.g. open space, waste management facilities);
- how development will be delivered in light of known infrastructure constraints, future infrastructure requirements and restricted public finance.

These discussions will identify main issues for the Angus LDP Main Issues Report, and will highlight possible options for future land-use development.

**School Capacities**

3.2 The ALPR Monitoring Report indicates that the population of Angus has gradually increased. Such population increases and in particular the school age population put pressure on various infrastructure components including education capacities. The capacity of Angus schools is closely monitored by the Council’s Education Department in order to plan for changes to school populations and ensure sufficient places are available within the schools in each catchment.

3.3 Extensions to existing schools, increasing the capacity or building new schools are often the only practical ways of addressing capacity pressures. These are all expensive options particularly in challenging economic circumstances. The ALPR allocated appropriate land for housing development taking into account the capacity of schools within the area. As the ALPR Monitoring Report indicates, financial contributions towards the improvement of school infrastructure (i.e. extensions to support new housing developments) have been sought through the application of Policy Imp1: Developer Contributions and obtained by means of planning agreements secured through the development management process.

3.4 There have also been circumstances however where windfall development (e.g. within the Liff PS catchment) has resulted in the request for a developer contribution towards the cost of an extension. Whilst these contributions have also been sought through the application of Policy Imp1: Developer Contributions the request, including the financial sum has been ad-hoc and not plan led as required by Circular 1/2010. Although discussions have taken place in such circumstances between Council departments and developers, SPP is clear that improvements to infrastructure should be addressed in development plans and not left to be resolved through the development management process.

3.5 The Angus Local Development Plan will therefore have to take account of issues relating to education capacity and identify how these issues may be
addressed (e.g. through appropriate land allocations and/or Developer Contributions). A detailed assessment of the current education position in Angus by Housing Market Area (HMA) is given below.

East Angus HMA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>High School Catchment</th>
<th>Current Roll (September 2011)</th>
<th>Capacity (September 2011)</th>
<th>Issues Identified by Education Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayshead PS</td>
<td>Arbroath</td>
<td>Arbroath Academy</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>School roll kept under review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverbrothock PS</td>
<td>Arbroath</td>
<td>Arbroath HS</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>No issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladyloan PS</td>
<td>Arbroath</td>
<td>Arbroath HS</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>No issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muirfield PS</td>
<td>Arbroath</td>
<td>Arbroath HS</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>Review of facilities undertaken. Further consultation with community planned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Thomas RC PS</td>
<td>Arbroath</td>
<td>Arbroath Academy</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>School roll kept under review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timmergreens PS</td>
<td>Arbroath</td>
<td>Arbroath HS</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>Review of facilities undertaken. Further consultation with community planned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wardykes PS</td>
<td>Arbroath</td>
<td>Arbroath Academy</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>No issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbirlot PS</td>
<td>Arbirlot</td>
<td>Arbroath HS</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>No issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmyllie PS</td>
<td>Redford</td>
<td>Arbroath HS</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>No issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colliston PS</td>
<td>Colliston</td>
<td>Arbroath HS</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>No issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friockheim PS</td>
<td>Friockheim</td>
<td>Arbroath Academy</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>No issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverkeilor PS</td>
<td>Inverkeilor</td>
<td>Arbroath Academy</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>No issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbroath HS</td>
<td>Arbroath</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>1088</td>
<td>No issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbroath Academy</td>
<td>Arbroath</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>No issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 There are no capacity issues with Ladyloan, Muirfield, Timmergreens or Wardykes primary schools. However the school rolls at Hayshead and St Thomas RC primary schools are close to nearing the notional capacity and are kept under review. In relation to Inverbrothock Primary School whilst the capacity is also close to nearing the notional capacity this is as a result of a large primary seven class. The number will therefore reduce once this class has moved to secondary school.

3.7 Angus Council has also been undertaking a review of the primary schools estate in Arbroath. This initially included a proposal to provide a replacement school at Hospitalfield in Arbroath to replace both Muirfield and Timmergreens Primary Schools. Further reports on the future consultation in relation to the primary schools estate in Arbroath will be brought forward by the Education Department in due course.
3.8 There are no capacity issues with Arbroath High School or Arbroath Academy.

3.9 In relation to future proposals by the Ministry of Defence at RM Condor and the potential for additional families to be based at this site, the current position remains unclear and therefore will continue to be monitored by Angus Council.

**Villages**

3.10 In the larger villages and rural area, there are no capacity issues with primary schools at Arbirlot, Carmyllie, Colliston, Friockheim or Inverkeilor.

**Future Development Options**

3.11 There are currently no education constraints on future development within the East Angus HMA.

### North Angus HMA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>High School Catchment</th>
<th>Current Roll (September 2011)</th>
<th>Capacity (September 2011)</th>
<th>Issues Identified by Education Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andover PS</td>
<td>Brechin</td>
<td>Brechin High School</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>No issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maisondieu PS</td>
<td>Brechin</td>
<td>Brechin High School</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>No issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowfield PS</td>
<td>Montrose</td>
<td>Montrose Academy</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>No issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lochside PS</td>
<td>Montrose</td>
<td>Montrose Academy</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>No issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southesk PS</td>
<td>Montrose</td>
<td>Montrose Academy</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>No issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Margarets RC PS</td>
<td>Montrose</td>
<td>Montrose Academy</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>No issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edzell PS</td>
<td>Edzell</td>
<td>Brechin High School</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Developer contributions may be sought towards cost of an extension, subject to scale of proposed development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferryden PS</td>
<td>Ferryden</td>
<td>Montrose Academy</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>No issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemount PS</td>
<td>Hillside</td>
<td>Montrose Academy</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>No issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stracathro PS</td>
<td>Inchbare</td>
<td>Brechin High School</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>No issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brechin High School</td>
<td>Brechin</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>New school planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montrose Academy</td>
<td>Montrose</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>1270</td>
<td>No issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Brechin

3.12 There are no capacity issues with Andover or Maisondieu primary schools.

3.13 There are no capacity issues with Brechin High School, although provision has been made within Angus Council’s Capital Budget to replace Brechin High School through the creation of a community campus as part of the current phase of ‘Scotland’s Schools for the Future’ programme. The replacement school would have capacity for 800 pupils. Whilst this is a reduction from the current capacity of 1060 pupils, the new capacity would still allow for significant residential development to be developed, particularly as the school roll is presently 629 pupils.

Montrose

3.14 There are no capacity issues with Borrowfield, Lochside, Southesk or St. Margarets RC primary schools.

3.15 There are also no capacity issues with Montrose Academy.

Villages

3.16 There are also no capacity issues with Ferryden, Rosemount or Stracathro primary schools. There is limited capacity at Edzell Primary School

Future Development Options

3.17 There are currently no education constraints on future development within Brechin or Montrose. However a developer contribution may be required from future residential development (including individual houses) within the Edzell PS catchment. This would contribute towards an extension to the existing school. The requirement for a contribution is dependent on the size and scale of the proposal. The school roll will continue to be monitored as a small number of houses/pupils (including placing requests) can make a significant difference.

West Angus HMA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>High School Catchment</th>
<th>Current Roll (September 2011)</th>
<th>Capacity (September 2011)</th>
<th>Issues Identified by Education Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langlands PS</td>
<td>Forfar</td>
<td>Forfar Academy</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>School roll kept under review. Long-term approach may involve catchment changes. Limited room for extension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathmore PS</td>
<td>Forfar</td>
<td>Forfar Academy</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>No issues at present, although any changes to school catchments may have implications for Strathmore PS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Name</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Academy</td>
<td>Primary Roll</td>
<td>Secondary Roll</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehills PS</td>
<td>Forfar</td>
<td>Forfar Academy</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>School roll kept under review. Long-term approach may involve catchment changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northmuir PS</td>
<td>Kirriemuir</td>
<td>Webster’s HS</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>No issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southmuir PS</td>
<td>Kirriemuir</td>
<td>Webster’s HS</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>No issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberlemno PS</td>
<td>Aberlemno</td>
<td>Forfar Academy</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>No issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airlie PS</td>
<td>Airlie</td>
<td>Webster’s HS</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>No issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortachy PS</td>
<td>Cortachy</td>
<td>Webster’s HS</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>No issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eassie PS</td>
<td>Balkeerie</td>
<td>Webster’s HS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>No issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glamis PS</td>
<td>Glamis</td>
<td>Webster’s HS</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>No issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverarity PS</td>
<td>Inverarity</td>
<td>Forfar Academy</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>No issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isla PS</td>
<td>Adjacent to Peel Farm</td>
<td>Webster’s HS</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>No issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letham PS</td>
<td>Letham</td>
<td>Forfar Academy</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>No issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lethnot PS</td>
<td>Bridgend</td>
<td>Brechin High School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>No issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tannadice PS</td>
<td>Tannadice</td>
<td>Webster’s HS</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>No issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarfside PS</td>
<td>Tarfside</td>
<td>Brechin High School</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>No issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Secondary Schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forfar Academy</th>
<th>Forfar</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>1088</th>
<th>1270</th>
<th>No issues.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Webster’s High School</td>
<td>Kirriemuir</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>No issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Forfar**

3.18 There is no capacity issue with Strathmore Primary School. However, both Langlands and Whitehills Primary Schools are close to capacity and the position continues to be monitored. The long-term approach in Forfar may involve amendments to the primary school catchment areas. This may require attention soon given development has commenced at Wester Restenneth for 209 houses.

3.19 There are no capacity issues with Forfar Academy.

**Kirriemuir**

3.20 There are no capacity issues with Northmuir or Southmuir primary schools.

3.21 There are also no capacity issues with Webster’s High School.
Villages

3.22 There are no capacity issues with Aberlemno, Airlie, Cortachy, Eassie, Glamis, Inverarity, Isla, Letham, Lethnot, Tannadice or Tarfside primary schools.

Future Development Options

3.23 There are currently no education constraints on future development within Kirriemuir or the rural villages. In Forfar, the Education Department have raised concerns regarding the capacities in relation to Langlands and Whitehills primary schools. This may have an impact on future development options to the east and west of the town and future configuration of primary school catchments.

South Angus HMA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>High School Catchment</th>
<th>Current Roll (September 2011)</th>
<th>Capacity (September 2011)</th>
<th>Issues Identified by Education Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Burnside PS</strong></td>
<td>Carnoustie</td>
<td>Carnoustie HS</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>Limited capacity within school catchment. School could accommodate a 50 house development. Location of school building make further extensions difficult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carlogie PS</strong></td>
<td>Carnoustie</td>
<td>Carnoustie HS</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>School could accommodate a 150 house development before requiring an extension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Woodlands PS</strong></td>
<td>Carnoustie</td>
<td>Carnoustie HS</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>No capacity within catchment for additional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grange PS</strong></td>
<td>Monifieth</td>
<td>Monifieth HS</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>School could accommodate a 150 house development before requiring an extension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seaview PS</strong></td>
<td>Monifieth</td>
<td>Monifieth HS</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>School could accommodate a 150 house development before requiring an extension. May be difficult to extend school on current site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auchterhouse PS</strong></td>
<td>Kirkton of Auchterhouse</td>
<td>Forfar Academy/ Monifieth HS/ Menzieshill HS</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Close to capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Schools</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Secondary Schools</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birkhill PS</td>
<td>Birkhill</td>
<td>Forfar Academy/ Monifieth HS/ Menzieshill HS</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>Close to capacity. No land suitable for further extension to capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liff PS</td>
<td>Liff</td>
<td>Forfar Academy/ Monifieth HS/ Menzieshill HS</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Close to capacity. Additional land adjacent to the school would be required to extend school (or a new site for replacement school).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattocks PS</td>
<td>Wellbank</td>
<td>Monifieth HS</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Close to capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monikie PS</td>
<td>Craigton of Monikie</td>
<td>Carnoustie HS</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Relatively close to capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murroes PS</td>
<td>Kellas</td>
<td>Monifieth HS</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Close to capacity and has already been extended. Location of school on the site make further extensions difficult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newbigging PS</td>
<td>Newbigging</td>
<td>Carnoustie HS</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Close to capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtyle PS</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Monifieth HS/Webster's HS</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>No issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathmartine PS</td>
<td>Bridgefoot</td>
<td>Forfar Academy/Baldragon Academy</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>No issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tealing PS</td>
<td>Tealing</td>
<td>Forfar Academy</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>No issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnoustie High School</td>
<td>Carnoustie</td>
<td></td>
<td>809</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>No issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monifieth High School</td>
<td>Monifieth</td>
<td></td>
<td>1069</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>Roll exceeds capacity. Roll monitored and has been managed through extensions, and refusal of placing requests.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Carnoustie**

3.24 Woodlands Primary School is nearing capacity. Although there may be scope for development within the Burnside Primary School catchment, this may be limited to approximately 50 houses. Capacity exists within Carlogie Primary School for a development of up to 150 houses. Any development over 150 houses within the Carlogie catchment may require an extension to the school. An extension to Carlogie PS would cost approximately £1m (depending on size of extension).

3.25 There are no capacity issues with Carnoustie High School.
3.26 There is currently limited capacity at Grange PS. Any development of more than 150 houses within the Grange PS catchment would require an extension to the existing school. Options would include a small four classroom extension through to rebuilding the school, depending on the scale of development. The minimum indicative cost of an extension (based on £2k per square metre) would be £1m. The Education Department have confirmed that placing requests were refused in the 2011-2012 school year for Grange PS.

3.27 The current capacity at Seaview PS is such that it would allow for only limited growth of approximately 150 houses within the catchment area. The Education Department have confirmed that there may be difficulties with extending the school given how the school has been designed and built on the current site.

3.28 Monifieth High School is currently at capacity. The situation is closely monitored by the Education Department although a number of placing requests are received each year. There are currently no proposals to further extend Monifieth High School. Despite the ongoing capacity pressures at Monifieth High School, Education Department have confirmed it may be possible to assuage capacity difficulties through further extensions, the realignment of catchment areas and the refusal of placing requests (that needs to be undertaken in accord with appropriate legislation).

3.29 It should also be noted that the Monifieth High School catchment is large and extends to settlements in the west of the South Angus HMA, including Auchterhouse, Birkhill/Muirhead, Liff and Newtyle. Approximately 50 pupils per year travel from these settlements to Monifieth High School. Notwithstanding this, these settlements also fall within the catchment areas for Forfar Academy and Webster’s High School (Newtyle PS catchment only) as well as Menzieshill High School in Dundee City.

Villages

3.30 There are no capacity issues with Newtyle, Strathmartine or Tealing primary schools. However, a potential large-scale development at Strathmartine Hospital would likely require an extension to the school. During consultation with Education Department they consider that an option of a developer providing land within the former Strathmartine Hospital Estate for a new school is not viable either educationally or financially. Their preference would for any developer at Strathmartine Hospital to acquire land adjacent to the existing school (either west or north) and contribute towards the cost of an extension. This would involve land outwith a developer’s control.

3.31 There are a number of primary schools within close proximity of each other that are at or close to capacity, including Auchterhouse PS, Birkhill PS and Liff PS (in the west of the HMA) as well as Mattocks PS, Monikie PS, Murroes PS and Newbigging PS (in the east of the HMA). The situation regarding these schools
is closely monitored by the Education Department, although there is currently no Strategic Education Review proposed for the South Angus area.

3.32 Further development within the Mattocks Primary School catchment will require the school to be extended, however the location of the school on site makes this difficult. Therefore further development within the Mattocks catchment may require a review of school catchment areas for both primary and secondary schools.

3.33 In relation to Birkhill Primary School, there is currently no land suitable for further extensions, whilst additional land adjacent to the existing school would need to be acquired in order to extend Liff PS.

3.34 The Education Department have also confirmed that placing requests were refused in the 2011-2012 school year for Birkhill and Murroes Primary Schools.

Option of New Schools in South Angus HMA

3.35 The option of providing both new primary and secondary schools within South Angus is currently not viable, both in terms of the potential development costs involved and the strategic housing land requirements for the South Angus area. In addition, partnership work would be required with neighbouring local authorities for a new school to be a sustainable option.

3.36 A new two stream primary school would cost between approximately £6m - £8m. This cost would have to be funded 100% by a developer, which would require hundreds of houses to be planned. In addition, a new school would only be feasible following the closure of an existing school(s). This would then potentially involve pupils travelling from one settlement to another which raises significant concerns in relation to accessible development and the requirement to reduce travel.

3.37 In terms of a new secondary school within South Angus, this would cost approximately £20m-£30m, with an approximate annual running cost of £4m. Again, the initial development cost would have to be funded 100% by a developer. From a sustainability perspective, the capacity of a new secondary school would require approximately 1000 pupils. A significant development of approximately 5,000-10,000 houses would be required to make this option educationally and financially viable/sustainable. This level of development is far greater and contrary to the strategic housing requirement for the South Angus HMA established by TAYplan for the next 20 years.

Future Development Options

3.38 In Carnoustie, primary school capacity constraints mean that only a small development of around 50 houses could be accommodated to the west of the town. There is more capacity to develop from an education perspective to the north and east of Carnoustie (within the Carlogie Primary School catchment), although this may require additional developer contributions if the level of development exceeds 150 houses.
3.39 There is limited education capacity for future development in Monifieth without significant investment to the existing school infrastructure (both Primary and Secondary Schools). There may, however, also be scope to modify the catchments of Grange PS and Seaview PS, in order to accommodate further development. This process would be considered and reviewed by the Education Department. Therefore the potential development capacity of the schools cannot be quantified at this stage.

3.40 There is also limited education capacity within most of the main villages to accommodate further development. Although significant investment may alleviate some of these issues the position is compounded by the fact that some of the schools are either unable to extend on their existing site or would require additional land to be purchased adjacent to the school to accommodate further extensions.

Water and Drainage Infrastructure

Water Supply

3.41 Consultation with Scottish Water has confirmed that there are no strategic issues regarding water supply and its potential impact on future development. Loch Lee has a strategic capacity of +1000 units, Backwater / Lintrathen’s capacity is also +1000 units, whilst Clatto has a capacity of +2000 units.

3.42 In support of the three main water sources in Angus, there are a number of smaller service reservoirs which store fully treated potable water close to the point of distribution. Scottish Water has confirmed that some of these service reservoirs currently have a nominal storage capacity below 18 hours. The minimum of 18hrs (at average flow) is used as this gives time for a trunk main repair in order to minimise customer interruptions. Settlements which may be affected include; Kingoldrum, Westmuir, Dykehead, Rescobie, Bowriefauld, Letham, Padanaram, Lunanhead, Lunan, Inverkeillor and Monikie.

3.43 A Development Impact Assessment should be submitted to the Scottish Water Customer Connections team for domestic developments over 10 housing units, non-domestic developments with an annual water consumption of over 1500m³ or if the development will have a significant impact on the existing infrastructure, such as in a rural area. Scottish Water will make a Reasonable Cost Contribution (RCC) to developers for the cost of the investigation and network reinforcement.

Drainage

3.44 Drainage and waste water infrastructure is an important consideration in determining the deliverability of current and future land use allocations. Over the years Scottish Water has provided significant investment to improve the quality of treatment whilst providing additional capacity at waste water treatment works across Angus.

3.45 Scottish Water is funded to provide new strategic capacity at Part 4 Water and Waste Water Treatment Works to meet all new development provided the
developer meets 5 standard criteria. Developers are responsible for funding and carrying out any network upgrades (Part 3 Assets) required to meet the demands of their new development as well as mitigating any potential impact on existing customers as a result of the new development. Developers will be able to claim a Reasonable Cost Contribution (RCC) towards the cost of this work. This would also apply to upgrades to the water network, as identified by a Water Impact Assessment.

3.46 The table below sets out the capacities of existing waste water treatment works in Angus, indicates where drainage network restrictions apply and what may be required to support future development. Information on waste water treatment works capacities is also available on Scottish Water’s website:

### Angus Settlements – Waste Water Treatment Works Capacities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>WWTW</th>
<th>Capacity Available at WWTW (at 1 March 2012)</th>
<th>Network Restriction</th>
<th>Future Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Angus HMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbroath</td>
<td>Hatton</td>
<td>1134</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>A Drainage Impact Assessment will be required as part of any future development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friockheim</td>
<td>Friockheim</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>A Growth Project has to be raised to accommodate future development, unless it is betterment to the system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverkeilor</td>
<td>Inverkeilor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Scottish Water Growth Project due to commence at this site. Completion dates and future capacity not yet available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Angus HMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brechin</td>
<td>Brechin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>A Growth Project has to be raised to accommodate future development, unless it is betterment to the system (i.e. brownfield development removing surface water). A Drainage Impact Assessment will be required as part of any future development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montrose</td>
<td>Montrose</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Pumping station currently being upgraded. A Drainage Impact Assessment will be required as part of any future development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillside</td>
<td>Montrose</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>A Drainage Impact Assessment will be required as part of any future development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edzell</td>
<td>Edzell</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## West Angus HMA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Impact Assessment Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forfar</td>
<td>Forfar</td>
<td>1461</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Quality upgrade to works will be complete by end of 2013. Drainage Impact Assessments required as part of any future development for network mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirriemuir</td>
<td>Kirriemuir</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Quality project at WWTW underway. This should allow for some additional growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letham</td>
<td>Letham</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>A Drainage Impact Assessment will be required as part of any future development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glamis</td>
<td>Glamis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>A Growth Project is required to accommodate future development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## South Angus HMA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Impact Assessment Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carnoustie</td>
<td>Hatton</td>
<td>1134</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>A Drainage Impact Assessment will be required as part of any future development to establish network mitigation as a result of known flooding issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monifieth</td>
<td>Hatton</td>
<td>1134</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>A Drainage Impact Assessment will be required as part of any future development to establish network mitigation as a result of known flooding issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birkhill / Muirhead</td>
<td>Hatton</td>
<td>1134</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>A Drainage Impact Assessment will be required as part of any future development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liff</td>
<td>Hatton</td>
<td>1134</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>A Drainage Impact Assessment will be required as part of any future development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monikie</td>
<td>Monikie</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>A Drainage Impact Assessment will be required as part of any future development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newbigging</td>
<td>Newbigging</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>A Growth Project is required to accommodate any future development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>Newtyle</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>No immediate issues highlighted, but further information will be required to establish if DIA/WIA studies will be required in relation to local flooding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellbank</td>
<td>Wellbank</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>No immediate issues highlighted, but further information will be required to establish if DIA/WIA studies will be required in relation to local flooding in Kellas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future Development Options

3.47 Table 1 identifies that there are a number of settlements within Angus with limited drainage capacity or with drainage network issues. In order to bring forward development Scottish Water confirm that growth projects will be allocated to waste water treatment works in line with committed development once one development meets the agreed five Ministerial Growth Criteria, therefore there is no ‘constraint’ on development where limited waste water treatment capacity may already exist. However, in order to bring forward new development in a timely fashion (especially in view of limitations to both public and private finances), it may be appropriate to direct future homes and businesses to areas with existing drainage and water supply capacity (see Alternative Option, paragraph 4.14).

3.48 Water and or Drainage Impact Assessments relating to strategic networks have to be funded by a developer or other interested party. Developers will be able to claim a Reasonable Cost Contribution (RCC) towards the cost of investigative work. Developers are also responsible for carrying out any network mitigation that may be required. In the Angus context, consultation with Scottish Water has confirmed that where Drainage Impact Assessments are required to address network issues this requirement applies across the whole settlement rather than individual sites.

Transport Infrastructure

3.49 Key elements of the transport network serving and linking Angus include the major A90(T) and A92 roads; the east coast rail line with railway stations at Carnoustie, Arbroath and Montrose; Arbroath Harbour and Montrose Port. The area is also served by a network of walking and cycling routes and a range of bus services.

3.50 The Angus Local Plan Review recognised the role which transport infrastructure plays in support of economic growth; improving accessibility to jobs, services and facilities; safeguarding the environment and encouraging healthier lifestyles. Guiding development to accessible locations, encouraging developments to locate in proximity to local facilities, improving the transport network, encouraging sustainable transport and reducing the need to travel were key priorities of the plan. This approach remains consistent with NPF2, SPP and TAYplan. The LDP should continue to locate new development to reduce the demand for travel and enable travel demands to be met by a choice of sustainable modes. This approach has also been endorsed by the Climate Change Paper in order to reduce travel, whilst integrating development with existing transport networks (Climate Change Paper, Page 37 refers).

Strategic Projects

3.51 Paragraphs 2.19 and 2.20 identify the two projects in the Strategic Transport Projects Review (STPR) with potential implications for Angus. These are the proposed A90 upgrade through or around Dundee and the improvement of the Glasgow to Aberdeen rail line (including the dualling of the railway at Usan, near Montrose). Both projects are referred to in TAYplan’s Proposed Action
Programme. In the period 2012-2024 an assessment of options and implementation is programmed for the A90 upgrade; whilst the dualling of the railway at Usan is not programmed until 2024-2032. At this stage there are no issues to address in the Angus LDP as funding and definitive programming for either project is not yet committed. The purpose of the STPR is to identify a series of investment priorities for the road and rail network to meet the challenges for the next 20 years, rather than provide a programme of works. Only once funding and programming has been achieved will the LDP be in a position to consider any land use planning implications for Angus.

3.52 TACTRAN identified a number of projects relating to Angus within the Regional Transport Strategy (see Appendix 1). Some of these have been completed or are currently underway. Schemes include improvements for bus, rail, multi-modal, road and freight, including park and ride facilities at Monifieth and on the A90 North of Dundee and multi-modal interchanges at Forfar and Brechin. Further clarification is required on the likely requirements and future programming for these facilities. TACTRAN have indicated through the LDP Initial Awareness Raising exercise that potential sites should be safeguarded within the LDP. In terms of park and ride facilities the LDP will have to investigate the feasibility and site options around Monifieth. It is however recognised that the investigation of a strategic park and ride facility on the A92 at Monifieth is an important strategic issues in terms of the development of Dundee Waterfront. Options for identifying a site on the A90 North of Dundee are much more restricted given the lack of grade separated junctions and landform. It should also be noted that Dundee City Council’s Main Issues Report (published September 2011) provided no site information in relation to a park and ride facility north of Dundee. In terms of multi-modal interchanges, at this stage it is unclear whether this remains feasible particularly in relation to demand from bus operators. Consultation with relevant stakeholders, including TACTRAN will continue during preparation of the Proposed Plan.

### Option: Park & Ride Facilities

The LDP will investigate the feasibility of and safeguard sites for park and ride facilities where appropriate at the following locations:
- A90 North of Dundee; and
- A92 at Monifieth

### Ports & Harbours

3.53 Montrose Port has an important role in the Angus economy and forms an important link in the wider transport network. The Port provides modern facilities for the handling and storage of commercial and oil related cargoes and imports/exports significant volumes of freight per year. Development plan policy has for a number of years sought to maintain the long term future of the Port for sea transport by supporting port related uses.

3.54 TAYplan’s Proposed Plan, Policy 3, indicates that land should be safeguarded at Montrose Port for port related uses in order to support freight, economic
growth and tourism (see paragraph 2.43). This approach is consistent with previous development plan policy in Angus. The Local Development Plan will therefore continue to support Montrose Port and will be required to consider the future implementation of the South Montrose Study/Masterplan.

3.55 Arbroath Harbour is a historic harbour located to the south west of the town centre. The harbour has been an important feature of the Arbroath economy for hundreds of years as a result of the fishing industry. Although the fishing industry is still an important feature of the harbour additional economic activity including boat building, sea angling and tourism can be found.

3.56 Policy A13 in the Angus Local Plan Review encourages additional tourism and leisure use development opportunities in and around Arbroath harbour whilst retaining the needs of the traditional fishing and boat building industries. The Local Development Plan will have to consider whether this policy is sufficient or whether additional flexibility is required in order to provide limited opportunities for modern industries e.g. the renewables sector to potentially make additional use of the harbour facilities.

Road Network

3.57 A number of improvements to the local road network in Angus have been completed in recent years, including the upgrading of the A92 Dundee to Arbroath road to dual carriageway standard and improved junctions and linkages to Carnoustie and Monifieth. Route improvements on the A92 north of Arbroath and on the A935 Brechin to Montrose road are currently ongoing.

3.58 In relation to the A90(T), Scottish Ministers had previously established a policy of closing central reserve gaps on road safety grounds when finance was available or when the opportunity arose. Although not pertaining to a full central reserve closure, the Lochlands junction, Forfar was partly closed in 2011 to prevent the crossing of traffic towards the northbound carriageway. This was a consequence of a number of accidents over the years.

3.59 A number of other planned road network improvements have not been implemented, including the realignment of the A930 at Carlogie, Carnoustie (proposed through land allocation C7: Working – Land at Carlogie). This proposal continues to be desirable to improve road safety and linkages to Carnoustie. The future implementation of this project will be considered by the LDP, in relation to the options for future housing and employment development. Following the outcome of a feasibility study by consultants in 2009, it is unlikely that the provision of a new road linking the A935 to the A90(T) at Brechin to improve connectivity between Montrose and the strategic road network will be implemented. Options to improve accessibility in and around the south Montrose area are currently being considered through the South Montrose Study/Masterplan, whilst route improvements on the A935 Brechin to Montrose road are ongoing. The future implementation of the South Montrose Study/Masterplan will also be considered by the LDP.
Rail

3.60 Angus is located on the northern leg of the main East Coast Rail line, linking stations at Montrose, Arbroath and Carnoustie to the national rail network. In addition, there are also rail halts at Golf Street (Carnoustie), Barry Links and Monifieth.

3.61 In recent years, a number of improvements have been made to the rail station infrastructure in Angus, including improved cycle, car parking and passenger waiting facilities at Arbroath, Carnoustie and Montrose railway stations. The Angus Local Plan Review (Policy SC42) sought the improvements of these facilities in conjunction with partners, such as Network Rail and TACTRAN.

3.62 The Angus Local Plan Review currently safeguards two sites for rail related uses adjacent to Arbroath and Montrose stations. Notwithstanding this, existing capacity constraints (see paragraph 3.51) on the rail network restrict the potential for transporting freight by rail and neither site has yet been developed for rail freight use. Although the sites currently safeguarded in the ALPR for rail freight are not designated by Network Rail as strategic sites, SPP requires development plans to safeguard suitable locations for new rail freight interchanges including facilities allowing road to rail or water transfer where appropriate (paragraph 180). TAYplan’s Proposed Plan, Policy 3 also indicates that land should be safeguarded for future infrastructure provision which is essential to support a shift from reliance on the car and road based freight. This would include the safeguarding of land for the purposes of rail freight. The Local Development Plan will have to consider whether the sites at Arbroath and Montrose should continue to be safeguarded in whole or part for rail related uses. TACTRAN have indicated support for the continuation of these sites with a presumption against them for non-rail related uses.

3.63 Following consultation during the Initial Awareness Raising Exercise, Network Rail indicated that in addition to providing support for rail infrastructure the Local Development Plan should avoid locating development required to use level crossings. Local Development Plan site assessments must take cognisance of the impact of development proposals affecting level crossings. There are relatively few level crossings in Angus, including two in Carnoustie, one located at Arbroath Golf Course (on the outskirts of the town) and one within Arbroath. The location and geography of these level crossings are such that additional development identified by the Local Development Plan will not significantly increase their usage and therefore the concerns raised by Network Rail are not considered to be an issue for the LDP.

Public Transport

3.64 The Angus Local Plan Review provided opportunity to improve the network of bus routes and related services to link communities throughout Angus. Bus services provide connectivity between the seven Angus burghs, connecting the burghs with Dundee, whilst inter-city services stop in Angus enroute to Aberdeen, Glasgow, Edinburgh etc (see paragraph 3.52 regarding proposed multi-modal interchanges).
In addition to this, Angus Council has continued to provide new infrastructure such as bus stops, shelters and to upgrade existing sites. This includes a significant redevelopment of Arbroath Bus Station in 2010, which brought much improved facilities for passengers and bus operators alike. A further two real time information sites have also been added since February 2009 at Stracathro Hospital and on the A90 at Tealing Road End. These are solar powered units which are also capable of providing community information to waiting passengers. In addition, a programme to install raised kerbs and bus boarders has been on-going which has facilitated easier access on and off buses for those with disabilities and parents/carers with prams and buggies. Where significant residential and business developments have taken place, the Council has sought developer contributions to provide bus passenger infrastructure.

Angus Council’s Transport Team have confirmed that the support for bus transport provided in Policy SC41: Bus Transport remains relevant and public transport infrastructure should continue to be provided on any new road building project.

The current financial climate and its resulting pressure on budgets is a key factor on the future provision of public transport, including bus services in Angus. The budget for local bus services in Angus remains fully committed. Additional finance has been found each year since 2009 and only a handful of very lightly used services have been withdrawn with no significant impact to date on the supported bus service network. Bus companies remain under pressure with regard to rising fuel prices and proposed changes to the BSOG (Bus Service Operators Grant) scheme and reimbursement rates to the National Concessionary Travel Scheme.

In light of increasing economic pressures Angus Council adopted a revised Public Transport Policy Statement in April 2010. This sets out the Council's policies in respect of the provision of bus services. A scoring mechanism is used in the event of expenditure exceeding budgetary provision, the bus services can be ranked and the poorer performing services identified for potential withdrawal. In implementing these criteria, no withdrawal of service would be made without careful consideration, including any potential hardship that they would cause.

Whilst Angus Council has sought improvements to public transport, its infrastructure as well as walking and cycling networks through previous development plan policy, land allocations and development briefs, no specific policy or guidance has been provided for public transport developer contributions. Given the budget pressures facing public transport operators and the public sector an option for the LDP would be to consider developer contributions towards the provision and/or enhancement of bus services. This approach, whilst currently not undertaken in Angus is consistent with SPP, TAYplan, Circular 1/2010 and TACTRAN's Regional Buses Strategy & Action Plan.
**Option: Public Transport**

The existing policies of the ALPR will be consolidated and updated in the LDP. The LDP will continue to support the provision of public transport infrastructure, where appropriate, as part of new development. The LDP will also consider whether developer contributions should be sought in relation to the provision and/or enhancement of bus services. This would be set out in supplementary guidance.

**Walking & Cycling**

3.70 In recent years, a number of walking and cycling projects have been completed in Angus, including the provision of a segregated cycle track along the A92 between Dundee and Arbroath; new and improved safe routes to schools; the development of burgh path networks; the development of the Angus Coastal Path (which also forms part of the National Coastal Network Route 1); restoration of mountain paths in the Angus Glens and the adoption of the Angus Core Paths Plan in November 2010.

3.71 Completion of these actions are important in meeting the accessibility needs of everyone in the Angus towns, villages and countryside whilst promoting a healthy and environmentally friendly means of transport as an alternative to the car. Some respondents to the LDP Initial Awareness Raising and Consultation exercise identified that reducing the need to travel, ensuring development is located close to existing services and facilities and the promotion of accessible development in order to reduce the need to travel by car should be important considerations during the preparation of the Local Development Plan. The promotion of walking and cycling in Angus in previous development plan policy is considered to be in accordance with SPP and TACTRAN's Regional Walking & Cycling Strategy.

3.72 The Local Development Plan will continue the promotion of walking and cycling in order to further enhance accessibility, whilst contributing towards the priority within SPP to shift from car-based travel. This will also contribute towards achieving the Scottish Government’s greenhouses gas emission targets.

3.73 An additional consideration for the LDP is ensuring that new development is accessible to the public transport network and can also be easily accessed by walking and cycling. These are key considerations established in national policy. Scottish Government’s Planning Advice Note 75: Planning for Transport indicates that the guidelines for accessibility to public transport services from housing is less than 400 metres to bus services and 800 metres to rail services. For accessibility to local facilities by walking and cycling the maximum threshold is 1600 metres. These principles will form key considerations in the evaluation of development options.

3.74 The financial constraints on transport providers and the public sector make implementation of this aspiration increasingly challenging. SPP does however indicate that where enhancement of public transport services or infrastructure is required to serve a new development but would not be provided
commercially, a contribution from the developer towards an agreed level of service may be appropriate. The intended approach to developer contributions linked to the transport implications of a proposed development should be set out in the Development Plan (SPP, page 35, paragraph 170).

3.75 As discussed in the Climate Change Paper (page 14, paragraph 3.5), the Scottish Government is supportive of hydrogen fuelled vehicles, to help reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Whilst infrastructure requirements such as a transition from petroleum to hydrogen fuelled vehicles and electric charging systems may be required (see paragraph 2.13) there is no timescale on when this infrastructure would be required, therefore there is no issue for the LDP.

Waste Management

3.76 In contributing towards meeting national Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) targets for landfill diversion, Angus Council has over the years introduced segregated kerbside collection within the main towns and villages for household, garden and dry recycle wastes. Recycling centres have been established in the seven burghs primarily for a wide range of materials. In addition, there is also a network of neighbourhood recycling points. The Council also has a limited commercial collection for glass, paper and cardboard. A number of established private waste management operators/companies also operate within Angus. These complement the existing MSW waste management facilities in Angus, handling a range of commercial, industrial, construction and demolition waste.

3.77 Green waste from household and recycling centres across Angus is composted at the new centralised ‘open window’ facility at Restenneth. The Council also has a contract to send general waste to Dundee Energy Recycling Limited (DERL) in Dundee, which is an incineration plant as part of the Energy from Waste scheme. DERL currently processes some 18k to 20k tonnes of residual waste from Angus Council under this agreement.

3.78 All of the above has contributed towards reducing the tonnage of waste going to final landfill at Restenneth (operated by Angus Council), which was initially established with a life expectancy of around 15 years. With waste diversion through recycling, composting and utilisation of DERL, it is considered that the Restenneth site may last for another 15 years (i.e. until 2025). The Zero Waste Plan targets for recycling of 50% by 2013, 60% by 2020 and 75% by 2025 will further reduce the amount of waste going to landfill.

3.79 Whilst the recycling rate of municipal solid waste (MSW) in Angus has been increasing over the past five years and as of March 2011 stood at 36.07%, this still falls below the Scottish Government recycling target of 40% by 2010 established in the Zero Waste Plan (Annexe A – Zero Waste Target, page 20). The target by 2013 increases to 50%.

3.80 The Angus Local Plan Review currently provides scope to ensure appropriate recycling facilities are provided with new development to ensure all new development contributes towards minimising waste. Where development briefs have been prepared these have also signalled the need to provide relevant waste management infrastructure.
3.81 The Angus Local Development Plan (LDP) will consider the implications of the Zero Waste Targets established by the Scottish Government. This may include looking into the following:

- The use of anaerobic digestion as a way of managing waste. This also has benefits of reducing landfill gas into the atmosphere, whilst being a potential source for renewable energy;
- Developers could also agree with Angus Council a Waste Management Plan detailing how generated waste will be dealt with, including how waste will be reduced, re-used and recycled, and
- The LDP may look to establish specific waste management requirements from different types of development. This option would also contribute towards better and/or more innovative design solution in relation to the provision of waste management facilities as the infrastructure requirements would be established at an early stage – an approach favoured by SPP

### Option: Waste Management

The existing waste management policies of the ALPR will be consolidated, updated and supported through supplementary guidance. This will establish Angus Council’s requirements in relation to waste management for prospective developers in order to address the Zero Waste Targets.

3.82 An alternative option would be to continue with the existing approach to waste management as set out in the ALPR. This would not ensure that waste management has been considered in the early consideration of a proposal or in the design and layout of the development. Importantly it is not clear how such an approach would help the Council address the targets of the Zero Waste Plan.

**Future Development Options**

3.83 In relation to recycling within the main towns and villages and future development options, the Council continues to actively look at replacing the existing recycling centre at Monifieth to avoid large Council vehicles accessing the current recycling centre via Ministry of Defence land at Barry Buddon. A suitable site has yet to be found. In addition, Angus Council’s Neighbourhood Services Department have indicated that the recycling centres at Kirriemuir and Brechin are too small given the different number of items being segregated and collected. As a result of this and given the current budget restrictions, the Council may have to consolidate Kirriemuir and Forfar into one large centre servicing both towns, similar to the proposal for a combined centre covering Carnoustie and Monifieth. The future status of the Brechin recycling centre is unknown given the distance from other towns and recycling centres.
Open Space / Green Networks

3.84 Angus benefits from an extensive range of green spaces including public parks, play areas, woodlands, path networks and amenity areas which are currently protected by Policy SC32: Open Space Protection in the Angus Local Plan Review (ALPR). Policy SC32 protects all open spaces in Angus. Development proposals affecting these are required to undertake a review of existing provision to demonstrate that any loss would not result in a deficit. This policy approach remains consistent with SPP.

3.85 Policy SC33: Open Space Provision in the ALPR requires open space to be provided as part of new residential development proposals. This policy approach is also consistent with SPP. The provision of open space can be achieved through on site or off site provision or a financial contribution towards providing or improving open space in the local area. Open space provision in Angus has been provided in association with residential development which has been secured through the development management process or through developer contributions. The Angus Local Development Plan (LDP) will continue to provide guidance in relation to the circumstances for which open space should be provided; how much and the type of open space required and, the standards to be met in terms of design and maintenance. This can be achieved through clearly stated requirements in Supplementary Guidance or Development Briefs. The preparation and completion of the Open Space Audit and Strategy is vital in order to assist the LDP in identifying future open space requirements.

3.86 There is clear national policy guidance regarding green infrastructure and green networks. In the Angus context, although the ALPR seeks to retain or enhance the landscape setting, or important trees on proposed development sites, the ALPR does not take a strategic approach to green infrastructure. A main issue for the LDP is therefore how to adopt a strategic approach to the provision and improvement of green infrastructure, for purposes of habitat creation and for increasing access to the countryside and opportunities for recreation (see Environment Topic Paper, Page 17, Paragraph 3.12). The Environment Topic Paper also indicates that the LDP evaluation of options for growth at a settlement level will include a consideration of the potential to safeguard and create new green spaces (such as woodlands) and link them together with existing networks of paths and open spaces in and around settlements. In this way, the general importance of linking the edge of Angus towns with the rural area will be taken into account when identifying the preferred and alternative strategic options for new development (see Environment Topic Paper, Page 17, Paragraph 3.13).

3.87 There is currently no policy direction or guidance in relation to the potential provision of open space in relation to other uses, such as retail and employment. This may be an option for the LDP to explore through the Main Issues Report.

3.88 The current financial climate is likely to have an impact on the future provision and maintenance of open space and recreational facilities in Angus including path networks. This may require rationalisation to provide fewer but better
quality and better maintained facilities. Future investment priorities and shortfalls in open space provision should be identified in the Open Space Audit and Strategy. The LDP must protect valuable areas, identify where new and improved space is required and provide clear guidance on the requirement for developer contributions. The option for open space / green networks is as set out in the Environment Topic Paper:

**Option: Promoting and Enhancing Green Infrastructure**

The potential for improving and creating green networks in and around the Angus towns will be identified using an open space strategy, produced in support of the Proposed Local Development Plan. The open space strategy together with the Angus Woodland Forestry Framework will inform or complement the development strategy for each of the seven Angus towns. The requirements for the provision of all forms of green infrastructure will be integrated with the requirements for other design issues, to ensure that a concerted approach to place-making is adopted on all new development sites. Where developer contributions may be required in order to provide open space the specific requirements will be established in supplementary guidance.

**Community Facilities in Rural Angus**

3.89 Although the profile of Angus shows that since 2004 there have been year-on-year population increases, the Angus Local Plan Review (ALPR) Monitoring Report indicates that a number of services and facilities have closed. This has largely been confined to the rural area and includes rural schools, libraries, local shops, post offices, hotels/pubs and petrol outlets.

3.90 The decline in rural facilities can likely be attributed to changes in accessibility and communications as well as the recent economic downturn. For example, increased car ownership and improvements to public transport (particularly bus service provision) make it easier to travel to the main towns in Angus where there is a greater range of services and facilities, including supermarkets. In addition, improved accessibility to the internet enables consumers in the rural area to access a much wider range of goods and services.

3.91 The development strategy in previous local plans has focused on guiding the majority of new development to the towns and villages, whilst enabling appropriate rural development. Whilst monitoring of the ALPR indicates that this approach has been successful in directing the majority of growth to the main towns and villages, the rural area has also seen an increase to the population. Although the increase and stabilisation of the population in the rural area is positive in terms of the previous development strategy, this has not resulted in the retention of rural facilities. It is therefore important to consider what, if anything, the LDP can do to halt the continuing decline in rural services and facilities.
3.92 SPP clearly specifies that development plans should promote the development of rural communities and aim to support and sustain fragile and dispersed communities through appropriate development (paragraph 84). SPP also states that rural communities should have reasonable access to good quality services (paragraph 96). The TAYplan Proposed Plan (June 2011) sets the broad strategic requirements for the Angus Local Development Plan, in terms of the desired location of future development (see TAYplan Policy 1: Location Priorities). TAYplan Policy 2: Shaping better quality places, also specifies that new development should be integrated with existing community infrastructure.

3.93 The approach towards protecting existing community facilities in the ALPR focuses on Healthcare Facilities, School Facilities and the Safeguarding of Land for Cemetery Provision (Policies SC37, SC38 and SC39 refer). There is no specific policy protection for a wider range of community facilities which may be important in terms of quality of life and convenience. This may include shops, petrol stations, post offices and doctor’s surgeries.

3.94 Whilst the promotion and protection of key services and facilities in the rural area may be desirable, changes in society, such as the increased availability of private and public transport and the use of the internet make this objective challenging. The LDP could therefore look at these societal changes in terms of rural facilities and services and look at the development of “community hubs” (see Climate Change Paper, Pages 17 & 18, paragraph 3.4). Whilst it remains unclear whether the development of these facilities would be a feasible option, there is national policy support for improvements in internet connectivity and the use of digital technologies to reduce energy usage and carbon emissions. The potential of developing community hubs could however be investigated through the MIR. More generally, it would be possible to enhance the support offered to live-work accommodation in the rural area, through amendments to the countryside housing and rural employment policies of the ALPR.

Conclusion

3.95 There are clearly a number of issues relating to infrastructure provision, both existing and potentially as a result of new development in the LDP. The issue of development delivery is particularly important as there may be a requirement for developer contributions in order to relieve existing constraints or to ensure there is adequate infrastructure provision to accommodate development. The issue of development delivery is addressed in Section 4.
4. **Development Delivery**

4.1 One of the key issues arising from infrastructure constraints in section 3 of this paper is the impact on development delivery. The economic downturn and associated restrictions on public and private sector finance make the delivery of development and required infrastructure more difficult. In recognition of these challenges, the Scottish Government has recently published a consultation paper on Development Delivery to seek views in relation to current issues and opportunities for facilitating development and infrastructure provision (see paragraphs 2.33 & 2.34).

4.2 There are two options for development delivery in the LDP. The first option is to seek developer contributions to meet infrastructure needs arising from development.

**Option: Development Delivery (Preferred)**

The LDP will identify / indicate the improvements to infrastructure provision and the level of investment required to facilitate development delivery across Angus. Where appropriate the Council will seek developer contributions towards this infrastructure provision. The details of developer contributions will be set out in supplementary guidance.

4.3 SPP requires planning authorities to use the Development Plan and supplementary guidance to set out their approach to planning agreements. Circular 1/2010 highlights the importance of identifying infrastructure requirements early to ensure financial contributions which are sought from developers are reasonable and proportionate to the development. Each planning application should be considered on its own merits within a plan led system. However, developer contributions can be used where they are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. They must serve a planning function related to the proposed development or arising from cumulative impact of development in the area. This may include potential contributions towards strategic transport infrastructure which addresses cross-boundary travel generated by development provided for within Strategic Development Plan’s and Local Development Plan’s.

4.4 Whilst previous development plan policy has identified infrastructure requirements, the current policy approach in Angus does not specify the level of contributions sought or what infrastructure developers will be required to contribute towards. Under the preferred option, developers can anticipate financial implications for development projects thereby adding certainty to the planning process. This approach is consistent with SPP and recent studies in relation to development viability (see paragraphs 2.29 & 2.30).

4.5 In terms of how this might be implemented, Circular 1/2010 specifies that methods and exact levels of contributions should be included in supplementary guidance. Standard charges and formulae should be set out in a way that helps landowners and developers predict the size and types of
commitments likely to be sought. Clearly there are potentially different methodologies in dealing with Developer Contributions. The current economic climate will be a key influence in determining the most appropriate methodology in Angus, whilst ensuring development options are viable and effective. This is acknowledged within the supporting text of TAYplan’s Proposed Plan Policy 8: Delivering the Strategic Development Plan which specifies that Local Development Plans will need to establish a mechanism(s), which may require new financial models to ensure that contributions are achieved and a thorough understanding of infrastructure, service and amenity capacity issues when allocating land for development to implement the development strategy.

4.6 Current low levels of development activity, primarily in the house building sector, are considered to be primarily the result of financial pressures brought about by the current financial climate, with evidence that the availability of commercial finance to the development industry and personal mortgage finance to prospective house purchasers is suppressing house building activity in Angus and elsewhere in Scotland. Even though there remains a plentiful supply of development land available across Angus, house building rates and general development activity remain suppressed.

4.7 Continuing pressure on public sector finance/ funding has increased the requirement for housebuilders and developers to fund or deliver new or upgraded infrastructure. In the current climate of financial constraint and low demand this burden has increased pressure on the viability of development. Any requirement, applied through the planning process, to fully fund new or improved essential infrastructure upfront is likely to have a particularly negative effect on overall project viability in the current economic climate.

4.8 Even if the requirement for house builders and developers to fund new or improved infrastructure provision to support or facilitate development were either scaled back or removed, there would still remain the need for the improved infrastructure to be provided. This would inevitably require the provision of additional public sector funding to provide up front delivery of essential infrastructure. This is particularly the case where the scale of investment required, say for major off-site drainage connection, road improvements or provision of increased education capacity, cannot be funded from proposed development.

4.9 Where, for example, such investment is required for road improvements or improvement to local education provision this would inevitably increase pressure on current local authority budgets. In the case of the provision or improvement of essential water and wastewater infrastructure, it is likely that additional funding would require to be made available to Scottish Water to allow front funding of projects to facilitate development delivery. Any such investment would require to be supported by a mechanism allowing these costs to be recovered as development proceeds. While such costs are likely to be passed on to house purchasers etc, this would allow development to proceed without involving developers in laying out substantial finance before any income is derived from the development through house sales.
4.10 In general the process of seeking and securing developer contributions through Section 75 Planning Obligations functions well in Angus.

4.11 It has been common practice in Angus to use this mechanism to secure developer contributions to offset or mitigate the impact of proposed development including contributions to provide essential infrastructure. These are normally used (along with use of agreements under Section 69 of the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973) where it is considered to be inappropriate or impractical to rely solely on planning conditions attached to a planning permission. Section 69 Agreements are normally used to secure upfront payment of money or transfer of assets to assist the Council to discharge its functions. Section 75 Agreements can be (although do not have to be) registered against the title deeds for the land/property concerned and can therefore be used to secure payment of contributions towards the provision or upgrading of essential infrastructure on a staged or phased basis in line with progress on the development, as the obligation remains a burden on the land/property and transfers to any subsequent owners. This represents a robust means of securing developer contributions than using planning conditions.

4.12 The recent change which allows landowners/developers to submit an application to vary a previously agreed planning obligation has introduced an additional step to the process and is likely (prompted by the effects of the recession) to result in additional applications to reduce or dispense with a previously agreed obligations, negotiated to offset or mitigate the impact of the proposed development – often as contributions to improve or extend existing infrastructure (open space, education facilities, public transport, road improvements, etc.). Such applications if successful may impact on Angus Councils ability to provide or extend essential services, or secure the delivery of much needed affordable housing.

4.13 In principle the introduction of some form of “Development Charge” system in Scotland, similar to the approach adopted in England and Wales (see paragraphs 2.35-2.42) could have significant benefits if it was allied to public sector front funding of the provision of essential infrastructure. The volume of development in areas like Angus is often too low to use such a mechanism to build up sufficient funds to meet the costs of infrastructure provision in any reasonable timescale. It would be more appropriate to use such a mechanism to recoup any investment made by local authorities and/or other public bodies to front fund infrastructure provision. Such a mechanism may also have the benefit of providing certainty to developers and their customers on what their contribution to delivering improvements to essential infrastructure would be. This was highlighted in the GVA Grimley study on development viability (see paragraphs 2.30-2.32). At this stage it is still too early to define options in relation to such funding mechanisms, particularly as the Scottish Government will use the outputs/findings of its initial consultation on development delivery to inform a second consultation to investigate the detail of proposals or measures to assist in the delivery development. It should be noted however that Scottish Water has confirmed that they are currently not able to front fund infrastructure for developers.
The alternative option is to only allocate land where there are no known infrastructure restrictions. Whilst this option may have benefits from an economic viability prospective, outstanding infrastructure restrictions and future requirements will not be addressed.

**Option: Development Delivery (Alternative)**

The LDP will only allocate land where there are no limited infrastructure restrictions.
5. **Summary of Main Infrastructure Issues in Angus**

5.1 The provision of physical infrastructure is key in ensuring new development is delivered in the LDP period. A summary of the main infrastructure issues highlighted in this paper is provided below:

**School Capacities**

5.2 The position in relation to school capacities fluctuates across Angus. Whilst the Council’s Education Department continue to monitor school rolls to ensure sufficient places within each catchment are available, the LDP will have to take account of particular problems and how these might be addressed.

5.3 In terms of primary schools, there are particular capacity pressures on schools in Forfar and in South Angus (including Carnoustie). The greatest pressure in relation to secondary schools is at Monifieth High School. The restricted capacities within some schools may have an impact on future development options within the principal settlements.

5.4 The preferred option to deal with capacity issues within primary and secondary schools is through extensions to existing schools, the realignments of catchments and refusal of placing requests. Developer contributions will be required to fund the cost of extensions as there is no additional finance within Education Department’s budget for further extensions to the school estate. The option of a new primary or secondary schools in Angus is not financially viable at this time.

**Water and Drainage Infrastructure**

5.5 There are currently no strategic water supply issues in Angus with the three main water sources:- Loch Lee, Backwater / Lintrathen and Clatto. Drainage Impact Assessment will be required for settlements where service reservoir capacities fall below 18 hours. A Water Impact Assessment is also required when considering service reservoir capabilities.

5.6 There are a number of settlements in Angus with limited drainage capacities or network issues. Scottish Water has confirmed that they will allocate growth projects (i.e. provide additional drainage capacity) to waster water treatment works in line with committed development. Growth projects will be initiated once one development meets the 5 agreed Ministerial Growth Criteria, providing confidence that the development is going ahead. This will then allow all other development potentially being delivered during our current and subsequent investment period to be considered for inclusion in the growth project, not just developments meeting the 5 Criteria.

5.7 There is no issue for the LDP in this respect. In terms of settlements with known network constraints, Water and/or Drainage Impact Assessments will be required. These assessments are funded by a developer or other interested party who are also responsible for undertaking network mitigation.
Strategic Transport Projects

5.8 Strategic transport projects, with potential land use implications for Angus are identified, including the Strategic Transport Projects Review (STPR) and TACTRAN’s Regional Transport Strategy (RTS). Whilst a number of the RTS projects have been completed, funding and definitive programming has yet to be committed for Angus based projects in the STPR. These include the dualling of the railway at Usan, near Montrose and the A90 upgrade around/through Dundee. As a result there are no land use planning implications for Angus at this stage. The LDP will however have to consider the feasibility and potential sites for park and ride facilities and multi-modal interchanges identified in TACTRAN’s Park & Ride Strategy.

Road Network

5.9 A number of improvements to the local network have taken place, including the upgrading of the A92 Dundee to Arbroath road to dual carriage. A number of other road improvement schemes have not progressed including the realignment of the A930 at Carlogie, Carnoustie and a new link road between Brechin and Montrose. In terms of the improvements to Carnoustie, this remains desirable and its future delivery will be considered through the development strategy for Carnoustie. The improved road linkages between Brechin and Montrose is unlikely to be implemented, however options to improve accessibility are being considered through the South Montrose Study, whilst the Council is currently undertaking route improvements on the A935 Brechin to Montrose road.

Ports & Harbours

5.10 In relation to ports and harbours, the LDP will continue to support the important economic role of Montrose Port and Arbroath Harbour. This will include the future implementation of the South Montrose Study/Masterplan which looked at options to improve accessibility in and around the South Montrose Area.

Rail

5.11 Angus is located on the main East Coast Rail line and has a number rail stations along its route at Montrose, Arbroath and Carnoustie. In addition, there are rail halts at Golf Street (Carnoustie), Barry Links and Monifieth. Previous development plan policy sought improvements to the main rail station in Angus. These improvements have been implemented in recent years. In addition, previous development plans have safeguarded sites for rail related uses adjacent to Arbroath and Montrose stations. Neither site has been implemented. The LDP will have to consider whether these sites should remain safeguarded in accordance with SPP and TAYplan requirements.

Public Transport

5.12 Previous development plan policy has provided opportunity to improve the network of bus routes (which provide connectivity between the seven burghs)
and related services across Angus. New infrastructure, including bus stops and shelters have been provided by the Council, whilst developer contributions to provide improved bus passenger infrastructure have been sought where significant residential and business development has been proposed. The support for bus transport and associated infrastructure should continue to be provided in the LDP.

5.13 The current financial climate and its resulting pressure on budgets is a key factor on the future provision of public transport, including bus services in Angus. Both Angus Council and bus operators are working within much tighter financial budgets. Whilst improvements to public transport, its infrastructure as well as walking and cycling networks have been sought through previous development plan policy, land allocations and development briefs, no specific policy or guidance has been provided for public transport developer contributions. Given the budget pressures facing public transport operators and the public sector an option for the LDP would be to consider developer contributions towards the provision and/or enhancement of bus services. This approach, whilst currently not undertaken in Angus is consistent with SPP, TAYplan and Circular 1/2010.

Walking & Cycling

5.14 Walking and cycling is important in reducing the need to travel by car and when considering new development options by ensuring public transport is accessible by foot. These priorities have been endorsed in previous development plan policies. A number of walking and cycling projects have been completed in Angus in recent times, including the provision of a segregated cycle track along the A92 between Dundee and Arbroath; new and improved safe routes to schools; the development of burgh path networks; the development of the Angus Coastal Path; restoration of mountain paths in the Angus Glens and the adoption of the Angus Core Paths Plan in November 2010.

5.15 The Local Development Plan will continue to promote walking and cycling in order to further enhance accessibility, whilst contributing towards the priority within Scottish Planning Policy to shift from car-based travel. This will also contribute towards achieving the Scottish Government’s greenhouses gas emission targets.

Waste Management

5.16 In terms of waste management in Angus, the key issue for the LDP is how to consider the implications of the Zero Waste Targets and how land use planning will help to contribute towards the Council achieving these ambitious recycling rates established by Scottish Government. At March 2011 the recycling rate of Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) in Angus stood at 36.07%, which falls below the Scottish Government recycling target of 40% by 2010 established in the Zero Waste Plan (Annexe A – Zero Waste Target, page 20). The target by 2013 increases to 50%,
5.17 There are a number of initiatives the LDP could explore to contributing towards achieving the targets set out in the Zero Waste Plan; in its broadest sense the LDP will have to consolidate and update the existing policies in the Angus Local Plan Review and should look to establish supplementary guidance on waste management to set out clearly the requirements prospective developers will have to take account of to address the Zero Waste Targets.

Open Space / Green Networks

5.18 Angus benefits from an extensive range of green spaces including public parks, play areas, woodlands, path networks and amenity areas. Development plan policy has sought to protect all open spaces in Angus and to provide new open space as part of residential proposals. This approach is consistent with Scottish Planning Policy. The LDP will continue to protect and provide guidance in relation to the circumstances for which open space should be provided; how much and the type of open space required and, the standards to be met in terms of design and maintenance. The preparation and completion of the Open Space Audit and Strategy is vital in order to assist the LDP in identifying future open space requirements.

5.19 National policy establishes guidance on green infrastructure and green networks. Development plan policy in Angus has sought to retain or enhance the landscape setting, or important trees on proposed development sites, however the ALPR does not take a strategic approach to green infrastructure. A main issue for the LDP is therefore how to adopt a strategic approach to the provision and improvement of green infrastructure, for purposes of habitat creation and for increasing access to the countryside and opportunities for recreation. The potential for improving and creating green networks in and around the Angus towns will be identified through the open space strategy, produced in support of the Proposed Local Development Plan. The open space strategy together with the Angus Woodland Forestry Framework will inform or complement the development strategy for each of the seven Angus towns. The requirements for the provision of green infrastructure will be integrated with other design requirements, to ensure that a concerted approach to place-making is adopted on all new development sites. Developer contributions may be required in order to provide open space with the specific requirements on this established in supplementary guidance.

Community Facilities

5.20 The Angus Local Plan Review (ALPR) Monitoring Report indicates that a number of services and facilities have closed largely within the rural area. Facilities which have closed include rural schools, libraries, local shops, post offices, hotels/pubs and petrol outlets.

5.21 The decline in rural facilities can likely be attributed to changes in accessibility and communications as well as the recent economic downturn. For example, increased car ownership and improvements to public transport (particularly bus service provision) make it easier to travel to the main towns in Angus where there is a greater range of services and facilities, including
supermarkets. In addition, improved accessibility to the internet enables consumers in the rural area to access a much wider range of goods and services.

5.22 Whilst the promotion and protection of key services and facilities in the rural area may be desirable, changes in society, such as the increased availability of private and public transport and the use of the internet make this objective challenging. The LDP could therefore look at these societal changes in terms of rural facilities and services and look at the development of “community hubs”. Whilst it remains unclear whether the development of these facilities would be a feasible option, there is national policy support for improvements in internet connectivity and the use of digital technologies to reduce energy usage and carbon emissions. The potential of developing community hubs could however be investigated through the MIR. More generally, it would be possible to enhance the support offered to live-work accommodation in the rural area, through amendments to the countryside housing and rural employment policies of the previous development plan.

Development Delivery

5.23 One of the key issues arising from infrastructure constraints in Angus is the impact on development delivery. The economic downturn and associated restrictions on public and private sector finance make the delivery of development and required infrastructure more difficult. In recognition of these challenges, the Scottish Government has recently published a consultation paper on Development Delivery to seek views in relation to current issues and opportunities for facilitating development and infrastructure provision. The outcome of this consultation will be a key consideration in how development delivery will be dealt with in Angus, particularly in relation to funding mechanisms for developer contributions.

5.24 At this stage, there are two options for development delivery in the LDP. The first option is to seek developer contributions to meet infrastructure needs arising from development. This is the preferred option. Whilst previous development plan policy in Angus has identified infrastructure requirements, the current policy approach does not specify the level of contributions sought or what infrastructure developers will be required to contribute towards. Under the preferred option, developers can anticipate financial implications for development projects thereby adding certainty to the planning process. This approach is consistent with Scottish Planning Policy and recent associated studies regarding development viability (see paragraphs 2.29 & 2.30).

5.25 The alternative option is to only allocate land where there are no known infrastructure restrictions. Whilst this option may have benefits from an economic viability prospective in the short-term, outstanding infrastructure restrictions and future infrastructure requirements will not be addressed during the plan period.
APPENDIX 1

TACTRAN – Angus specific Transport Schemes & Initiatives

Bus-Based Measures
• Improved bus stop infrastructure, lighting and mobility improvements on a number of bus routes;

Rail Based Measures
• Tay Estuary Rail Study (TERS) Rail service from Arbroath – Glasgow;

Measures Associated with Improving Multi-Modal Interchange
• Arbroath Bus Station Improvements (work completed);
• New Park & Ride facility – A92 East of Dundee, near Monifieth;
• New Park & Ride facility – A90 Dundee North, near Fintry;
• A90 Forfar multi-modal Interchange to facilitate essential interchanges at long distance bus stops;
• A90 Brechin multi-modal Interchange to facilitate essential interchanges at long distance bus stops;

Road Infrastructure
• Programme of road safety measures for the A90;

Freight Specific Measures
• Inter-modal Regional Rail Freight Facilities at Montrose to build on existing proposals at Montrose Port for inter-modal transfer between road, rail and sea freight;
• Improved Road Links to Montrose Port – A92 north of Arbroath Route Action Plan;
• Improved Road Links to Montrose Port – A935 Montrose to Brechin Route Action Plan (Council project currently underway);
• Improved Road Links to Montrose Port – A90(T) to A935 East of Brechin Link Road (project unlikely to proceed following feasibility study)