

APPENDIX 1: PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE REGULATIONS (DMPR)

SHEP 2009, 3.66 indicates that the policy for battlefields will come into effect by amending the DMPR regulations. Proposals for amendment are set out below:

1. CONSULTATION WITH HISTORIC SCOTLAND BY PLANNING AUTHORITY (DMPR SCHEDULE 5)

1.1 Proposal

Introduce consultation with Historic Scotland on significant developments proposed for land within the area of an Inventory battlefield that currently has no buildings on it. The general expectation is that this will apply to proposals that will have a significant impact on the overall character of the battlefield landscape or on its specific qualities.

Historic Scotland would **not** want to be consulted on the following types of development:

- developments that involve the alteration or extension of an existing dwelling house or development within the curtilage;
- the alteration or extension of existing buildings within built up areas, such as industrial or retail parks.

1.2 An alternative approach is for HS to play no role in the decision-making process and for responsibility to rest entirely with the planning authority.

1.3 Possible wording

- Option 1 (wide criteria): consult Historic Scotland on “development within an Inventory battlefield that would have a significant impact on the specific qualities and overall character of the battlefield landscape”.
- Option 2 (narrower criteria): consult Historic Scotland on “development within an Inventory battlefield that would have a significant impact on the specific qualities and overall character of the battlefield landscape; excluding development within the curtilage of a dwelling house or within existing industrial/retail parks.”
- Option 3 (no consultation): no requirement to consult Historic Scotland.

Question:

5. What are your views on these proposals and which is your preferred option?

2. DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENTS (DMPR S13)

2.1 Proposal

Historic Scotland does not consider it necessary to add battlefields to the historic environment categories set out in Regulation 13(2) that require local development to be accompanied by a design statement other than alteration/extension to existing building. It is not clear that such statements would have added value for the consideration of local developments within battlefields, while major developments will require such statements in any case.

Questions:

6. Do you think this is a reasonable approach?

7. If not, what alternative would you propose and why?