



The Scottish Parliament  
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba

## Official Report

# MEETING OF THE PARLIAMENT

Wednesday 12 June 2013

Session 4

---

© Parliamentary copyright. Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body

Information on the Scottish Parliament's copyright policy can be found on the website - [www.scottish.parliament.uk](http://www.scottish.parliament.uk) or by contacting Public Information on 0131 348 5000

---

Wednesday 12 June 2013

## CONTENTS

	Col.
<b>PORTFOLIO QUESTION TIME</b> .....	20999
<b>HEALTH AND WELLBEING</b> .....	20999
Family Nurse Partnerships .....	20999
NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde (Meetings) .....	21000
Community Transport (Older People) .....	21001
Alcohol (Harm to Others) .....	21003
Swimming (Cumbernauld and Kilsyth) .....	21005
Heart Disease .....	21005
Multiple Sclerosis National Therapy Centres .....	21007
Waiting Time Target (Accident and Emergency) .....	21008
Cardiac Rehabilitation .....	21009
Care Inspectorate (Recommendations) .....	21010
20:20 Vision (National Health Service) .....	21011
Individual Patient Treatment Requests .....	21011
Waiting Times (Forth Valley Royal Hospital) .....	21012
Motor Neurone Disease .....	21013
Cost of Drugs (Prisoners) .....	21014
<b>NATIONAL PLANNING FRAMEWORK 3 AND SCOTTISH PLANNING POLICY</b> .....	21015
<i>Motion moved—[Derek Mackay].</i>	
<i>Amendment moved—[Sarah Boyack].</i>	
<i>Amendment moved—[Margaret Mitchell].</i>	
<i>Amendment moved—[Patrick Harvie].</i>	
The Minister for Local Government and Planning (Derek Mackay) .....	21015
Sarah Boyack (Lothian) (Lab) .....	21021
Margaret Mitchell (Central Scotland) (Con) .....	21025
Patrick Harvie (Glasgow) (Green) .....	21027
Mike MacKenzie (Highlands and Islands) (SNP) .....	21030
John Pentland (Motherwell and Wishaw) (Lab) .....	21032
Chic Brodie (South Scotland) (SNP) .....	21034
Anne McTaggart (Glasgow) (Lab) .....	21036
John Wilson (Central Scotland) (SNP) .....	21038
Jim Hume (South Scotland) (LD) .....	21040
Stuart McMillan (West Scotland) (SNP) .....	21042
Kenneth Gibson (Cunninghame North) (SNP) .....	21045
Malcolm Chisholm (Edinburgh Northern and Leith) (Lab) .....	21047
Clare Adamson (Central Scotland) (SNP) .....	21050
Nigel Don (Angus North and Mearns) (SNP) .....	21052
Patrick Harvie .....	21054
Alex Johnstone (North East Scotland) (Con) .....	21057
Sarah Boyack .....	21059
Derek Mackay .....	21062
<b>BUSINESS MOTION</b> .....	21066
<i>Motion moved—[Joe FitzPatrick]—and agreed to.</i>	
<b>PARLIAMENTARY BUREAU MOTIONS</b> .....	21068
<i>Motions moved—[Joe FitzPatrick].</i>	
<b>DECISION TIME</b> .....	21069
<b>CHALLENGING STEREOTYPES</b> .....	21074
<i>Motion debated—[Hanzala Malik].</i>	
Hanzala Malik (Glasgow) (Lab) .....	21074
Malcolm Chisholm (Edinburgh Northern and Leith) (Lab) .....	21076
Dennis Robertson (Aberdeenshire West) (SNP) .....	21077

Anne McTaggart (Glasgow) (Lab) .....	21078
Annabel Goldie (West Scotland) (Con) .....	21079
Mary Fee (West Scotland) (Lab) .....	21081
The Minister for Community Safety and Legal Affairs (Roseanna Cunningham) .....	21082

---

# Scottish Parliament

Wednesday 12 June 2013

[The Deputy Presiding Officer opened the meeting at 14:00]

## Portfolio Question Time

### Health and Wellbeing

#### Family Nurse Partnerships

**1. Gil Paterson (Clydebank and Milngavie) (SNP):** To ask the Scottish Government what impact family nurse partnerships have on people's wellbeing. (S4O-02232)

**The Minister for Public Health (Michael Matheson):** Studies have shown that the family nurse partnership programme has an impact not only on parents' confidence in their parenting ability by developing their self-efficacy but on the whole family's long-term wellbeing. That is demonstrated by outcomes such as reduced smoking in pregnancy, reduced accident and emergency attendance, increased workforce participation and partner involvement.

**Gil Paterson:** What progress has the Government made in rolling out the family nurse partnership programme and what benefits has it had so far?

**Michael Matheson:** Family nurse partnerships have been implemented by seven of our territorial boards including NHS Lothian, NHS Tayside, NHS Fife, NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde, NHS Highland and NHS Ayrshire and Arran, and we will see some delivery from NHS Lanarkshire by early this summer. The other seven territorial boards are taking forward work to establish family nurse partnerships and we have given a commitment that the partnerships will be available in all 14 territorial health boards by 2015.

We are also about to commence work on measuring the impact of family nurse partnerships through a natural experiment using comparator sites. In other words, sites with a family nurse partnership will be compared against those with similar characteristics that do not have such partnerships in place to evaluate the impact of partnerships on the clients—families—the nurses and the organisations involved.

**Drew Smith (Glasgow) (Lab):** As members of the Health and Sport Committee, Mr Paterson and I recently heard evidence about family nurse partnerships, particularly their roll-out in NHS Lothian, during our inquiry into teenage pregnancy. Although I believe that we are all supportive of the initiative, I was concerned to

hear that recruitment into the partnerships is having an impact on health visitor numbers because health visitors are applying to be family nurses. Does the minister share those concerns and what action will he take to ensure that there is no detrimental effect on overstretched health visitor provision?

**Michael Matheson:** It is important that health boards take forward family nurse partnerships in a way that allows them to continue to provide their other broad services for children. It is worth bearing in mind that the family nurse partnership is a licensed programme and that all family nurses have to undertake a programme of training over a period of time to ensure that they have the required skills to implement the model effectively. I am sure that Drew Smith will recognise the importance of having staff who have the right skill set to deliver the partnerships effectively and who are supported with the necessary training. However, it is important that, alongside that, health boards ensure that they meet their other commitments to support children in the community through the use of health visitors.

#### NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde (Meetings)

**2. Stuart McMillan (West Scotland) (SNP):** To ask the Scottish Government when it last met the chief executive of NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde and what issues were discussed. (S4O-02233)

**The Cabinet Secretary for Health and Wellbeing (Alex Neil):** Ministers and Government officials meet representatives of NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde regularly to discuss matters of importance to local people.

**Stuart McMillan:** Will the cabinet secretary assure me that, with regard to any future discussions he might have, the provision of maternity and accident and emergency services both north and south of the river will be given the utmost importance in any reviews that take place and that every single option will be considered in such reviews?

**Alex Neil:** The member will be aware that NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde is conducting a comprehensive review of local services. It is right that health boards keep their services under review to ensure that they are consistent with national policy such as the 20:20 vision and that they continue to offer the highest-quality services to local people. Obviously, any recommendations that arise from that review need to be widely consulted on and will eventually come to me for approval. I will look at any recommendations in detail, including the provision for the local area and the extent to which there has been proper consultation. I will also ensure that all possible options have been examined.

**Jackie Baillie (Dumbarton) (Lab):** Glasgow's A and E waiting performance times are among the worst in Scotland. That is a matter for concern across the chamber. Some have suggested that the problem is in part due to staffing shortages; others point to a lack of beds. What does the cabinet secretary think the problems are and what action has he put in place to resolve them?

**Alex Neil:** We have a £50 million unscheduled care and emergency action plan in place, which obviously includes Glasgow. I think that we will see a major improvement—not just in Glasgow but in many other board areas—in the weeks and months to come. There are two streams to that work: one is in hospital and the other one is external. We are looking at the profile of demand in A and E services and at the internal resourcing of those services.

Earlier this week, I announced substantial additional resources for A and E consultants, who will be appointed throughout Scotland. We are looking at the issue of earlier discharge and at a range of other issues. Greater Glasgow and Clyde NHS Board is looking at all those issues and I am sure that we will see a major improvement in the official statistics of turnaround times in the period ahead.

**Jackson Carlaw (West Scotland) (Con):** Even as it moves towards completion, is the cabinet secretary discussing with the chief executive the progress of the new Southern general hospital? Are they continuing to review the provision of services there? Does the cabinet secretary share the concerns that some clinicians and consultants have expressed to me over whether the new children's hospital, which is planned to have significantly fewer beds than there are currently at Yorkhill hospital, will be able to meet the emerging demand that will be required of that facility?

**Alex Neil:** It so happens that I was at Yorkhill hospital this morning. As a result of a range of initiatives that have been taken to address the balance between capacity and demand, in particular since January this year, the performance of Yorkhill—with regard to accident and emergency, for example, and the reduced number of breaches, and so on—has improved quite dramatically in the past four or five months. Before the move to Southern general, we will want to ensure that there will be adequate bed capacity in the new Yorkhill at the Southern general.

### **Community Transport (Older People)**

**3. Claudia Beamish (South Scotland) (Lab):** To ask the Scottish Government what its position is on the health and wellbeing benefits of community transport for older people across rural South Scotland and the rest of the country as

noted in Age Scotland's report on still waiting. (S4O-02234)

**The Cabinet Secretary for Health and Wellbeing (Alex Neil):** Age Scotland's still waiting campaign calls for the national concessionary travel scheme arrangements to be extended to all community transport services. There are some practical issues around that, over and above affordability, but ministers are listening to the points that are being made as the campaign progresses.

Scottish ministers recognise the important role that community transport services play as part of the transport network in Scotland and we recognise that they play a major part in reducing isolation and increasing social inclusion. We recognise that they allow people to play a greater part in their local community, thus helping them to be independent, have a more active lifestyle and have less reliance on social care and health services. Local authorities are provided with resources to support community transport services through the local government finance settlement.

We have no current plans to extend the national concessionary travel scheme to include all community transport services. Nevertheless, changes to bus registration legislation from 1 April last year allow demand-responsive transport services that are available to the general public to qualify for concessionary travel and bus service operators grant. Changes to that grant from 1 April last year benefit many rural bus operators, including eligible community transport operators.

**Claudia Beamish:** I thank the cabinet secretary for his very full answer. It is most encouraging and I take it that he has had a good look at the summary at least of the still waiting report.

I went to Peebles last week to support the launch of Age Scotland's local campaign about community transport. I was astounded at how few older people are able to get to where they want to go. The difficulties in getting from their door to their group are partly due to accessibility and disability issues. In rural areas, it is often the case that older people can get to a group on statutory transport but cannot get back.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer (John Scott):** Will the member ask her question, please?

**Claudia Beamish:** Will the cabinet secretary and the Minister for Transport and Veterans take a cross-cutting look at the research and address the points other than affordability that are of concern?

**Alex Neil:** Claudia Beamish makes a fair point. The Minister for Transport and Veterans, Keith Brown, and I have agreed that we must take a cross-cutting approach to the matter. We are very conscious of the issue and of the level of unmet

demand. I expect the health board and the relevant transport partnership to work together to reach local solutions for local problems, where they are identified, including in the Borders.

**Aileen McLeod (South Scotland) (SNP):** The cabinet secretary may be aware that Dumfries and Galloway Council participated in the European Union-funded rural transport solutions project, which was piloted in Wigtownshire. That brought together various public and third sector partners, including the south-west of Scotland transport partnership, NHS Dumfries and Galloway, the Scottish Ambulance Service and Wigtownshire community transport, to address transport issues in a vast rural area, particularly with regard to health and social care services. Will the cabinet secretary look at the project's evaluation report, which was published in February, to assess whether it could be rolled out on a larger scale?

**Alex Neil:** Absolutely—we will look with interest at that and at the experience in Dumfries and Galloway with the rural transport solutions project to see what lessons we can learn more generally on how to tackle transport issues, including those relating to health and social care in rural areas.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** I encourage members to make their questions and answers succinct. We will then have a chance to get through more of them.

### Alcohol (Harm to Others)

**4. Kenneth Gibson (Cunninghame North) (SNP):** To ask the Scottish Government what its position is on “The Range and Magnitude of Alcohol's Harm to Others”, which was commissioned by the Foundation for Alcohol Research and Education in Australia. (S4O-02235)

**The Minister for Public Health (Michael Matheson):** We welcome the research report. It further highlights a truth that is sadly only too evident in communities the length and breadth of Scotland: alcohol misuse does not only impact on the individual but impacts negatively on the people around them. We know that alcohol misuse impacts on children living with parents with a drink problem; that heavy drinking is a common factor in family break-up; and that the impact of our excessive consumption of alcohol is estimated to cost Scots £3.6 billion each year—that is £900 for every adult in Scotland.

We need to understand the full extent of alcohol-related harm in our communities in order to tackle this complex and ingrained problem. We therefore welcome the new research study by Alcohol Focus Scotland, which seeks to investigate the harm caused by alcohol to people other than the drinker. The study commenced in

September 2012, with the Scottish Government contributing grant funding towards the overall costs. The findings of the report, which we will study closely, will be released in September 2013.

**Kenneth Gibson:** “The Range and Magnitude of Alcohol's Harm to Others” is the most detailed study of alcohol's impact ever, drawing on and analysing a wide variety of existing and newly developed data for the police, health services, treatment and child protection agencies, helplines and so on. The work enumerated the types of harm that can occur due to another's drinking and the different types of relationship between the drinker and the person harmed. Australia is not Scotland, but I am sure that we can see parallels between our two societies. Given the scale of Scotland's problems with alcohol, are there policy implications that we can consider deriving from the study?

**Alex Neil:** The study confirms a number of factors that we are aware of and that are similar to the alcohol problem that we have in Scotland. I have studied the Alcohol Focus Scotland report that I mentioned. That will help to give us a wider understanding of the impact that alcohol has not only on a minority of individuals who may misuse alcohol, but on the wider community who are impacted. That was recognised at the time when we took forward our alcohol framework—the framework has more than 40 measures in it—in which we have taken a whole population approach. That approach recognises that alcohol misuse affects the whole community and not just individuals. We must build on that in order to deal with a complex and harmful part of our society.

**Graeme Pearson (South Scotland) (Lab):** In light of the minister's response, will he undertake to revisit the proposals in the member's bill consultation “Shifting the Culture”, which Dr Simpson and I published last year, which addressed many of the issues to which he has alluded?

**Michael Matheson:** Over a number of years now, the Scottish Government has taken bold action to address our alcohol problem in Scotland. Those important measures include minimum pricing for alcohol, which attracted a large degree of support from across the chamber, although not, unfortunately, from the Labour Party. We believe that minimum pricing is an important measure that can assist us in tackling the issue, but we are always prepared to look at other constructive ideas. If Graeme Pearson and Dr Simpson feel that they have constructive ideas to contribute towards this whole agenda, I can assure them that those will always be considered in detail by the Government.

### **Swimming (Cumbernauld and Kilsyth)**

**5. Jamie Hepburn (Cumbernauld and Kilsyth) (SNP):** To ask the Scottish Government what steps it is taking to encourage young people to learn to swim in Cumbernauld and Kilsyth. (S4O-02236)

**The Minister for Commonwealth Games and Sport (Shona Robison):** We are committed to providing all children with the opportunity to learn to swim. The top-up swimming programme, which started in 2010, supports the improved delivery of swimming lessons to schoolchildren throughout Scotland. To date, £1.2 million has been invested in the programme, and I hope shortly to announce what additional support will be made available. I understand that North Lanarkshire Council, which previously participated, is not participating in this year's top-up swimming programme.

**Jamie Hepburn:** As if that was not bad enough, North Lanarkshire Council is shutting six swimming pools at six high schools, five of which are in my constituency. That will affect organisations that have regular lets of those pools. Does the minister agree that the decision by North Lanarkshire Council not to participate in the top-up swimming programme and to shut those school swimming pools is counterintuitive and runs totally counter to encouraging local young people to learn to swim?

**Shona Robison:** Whereas, obviously, local authorities are responsible for the management of their school estate, they also have a statutory responsibility to ensure that there is adequate provision of sports facilities for local residents. Swimming is not only one of the best forms of physical activity but a way of giving young people confidence in the water as well as being a fun way of keeping active. The top-up swimming programme was particularly aimed at those children who had not learned to swim, a disproportionate number of whom come from more deprived backgrounds. Therefore, the top-up swimming programme is good at helping those children from more deprived backgrounds to be confident in the water and to be able to swim. I would hope that every local authority would want to be part of that excellent programme.

### **Heart Disease**

**6. Jim Hume (South Scotland) (LD):** To ask the Scottish Government how the national health service supports people with heart disease. (S4O-02237)

**The Minister for Public Health (Michael Matheson):** Through delivering the actions in our comprehensive heart disease action plan, we are seeing significant improvements in outcomes for people with heart disease. The plan focuses not

just on providing the best possible hospital care, but on supporting people's longer-term recovery in their communities.

Since 2002, there has been a 43 per cent reduction in premature coronary heart disease deaths—there was an 8 per cent drop between 2010 and 2011. An important point is that we are seeing reductions in health inequalities, with heart disease mortality dropping fastest in the most deprived areas.

**Jim Hume:** Jeff Holt from Galston had a heart attack last summer. Thankfully, he has since recovered, both physically and mentally, and he has returned to work thanks to the exceptional period of support that he received following his referral for cardiac rehab—

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** Question?

**Jim Hume:** Unfortunately, not all patients like Jeff benefit from cardiac rehab. Will the minister confirm whether the Scottish Government is prepared to introduce a health improvement, efficiency and governance, access and treatment—HEAT—target for cardiac rehab, following the referral of the matter to the national advisory committee on heart disease? When does the cabinet secretary next plan to discuss the matter with the chief medical officer and the British Heart Foundation?

**Michael Matheson:** As the member is aware, many of our health boards provide cardiac rehabilitation for patients who, following a cardiac episode, can benefit from it. Many health boards work in partnership with a range of third sector organisations to deliver that type of programme to patients in a controlled way in order to maximise their recovery.

If the member wishes to write to me setting out the details of the specific programme that he wishes to see expanded, I will be more than happy to respond to him on that. However, I am sure that he will recognise from the statistics that I outlined in my initial answer that significant progress has been made in the area. We need to ensure that we maintain that progress and build on it, and we have a Government that is prepared to do that.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** I call Neil Findlay. Please be brief.

**Neil Findlay (Lothian) (Lab):** In West Lothian, heart disease patients and others who have used the accident and emergency services at St John's are extremely unhappy that NHS Lothian's A and E contingency plan contains proposals that include as one of the options an end to 24/7 doctor-led services at St John's. Will the minister join me in demanding that that option is removed from NHS Lothian's contingency plan?



**Michael Matheson:** These matters are always best dealt with through facts rather than by misinterpretation of proposals that are put forward by boards. It is extremely important that patients receive the best quality clinical care that they can receive close to their home. Over a number of years, the Scottish Government has shown determination to ensure that we provide the best possible clinical care close to individuals in their communities. The cabinet secretary will ensure that we continue to pursue that with all our NHS boards, including NHS Lothian.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** I call Nanette Milne. Please be brief.

**Nanette Milne (North East Scotland) (Con):** I know from last week's meeting of the cross-party group in the Scottish Parliament on heart disease and stroke, which he attended, that the cabinet secretary is supportive of the excellent work that is done in my region by the Grampian Cardiac Rehabilitation Association and the equivalent organisation in Angus. Will the minister speak to the cabinet secretary about the possibility of voluntary organisations like that being rolled out across Scotland? Those two organisations do a fantastic job.

**Michael Matheson:** I agree. I am more than happy to talk to the cabinet secretary about that, as the member suggests. In my constituency, I have witnessed the quality of service that can be provided by third sector organisations such as Braveheart, which runs walking programmes for patients who are recovering from cardiac episodes. Real benefit can be gained. The way in which the NHS can best affect that in communities is to work in partnership with third sector organisations to deliver such programmes effectively for patients.

#### Multiple Sclerosis National Therapy Centres

**7. Jean Urquhart (Highlands and Islands) (Ind):** To ask the Scottish Government what support it makes available to multiple sclerosis national therapy centres. (S4O-02238)

**The Minister for Public Health (Michael Matheson):** Although policies, frameworks and resources are provided by the Scottish Government, individual national health service boards are responsible for planning and funding services in their areas and securing the staff to deliver them. It is for NHS boards to determine their workforce requirements, including training, based on the clinical needs and service developments in their areas. That includes multiple sclerosis services. However, we have supported centres through funding and given grants from the self-management fund, which is administered through the Health and Social Care Alliance Scotland. For example, the Multiple

Sclerosis Centre Mid Argyll received more than £200,000 and the Multiple Sclerosis Therapy Centre Lothian received £68,000.

**Jean Urquhart:** I recently visited the Multiple Sclerosis Centre Mid Argyll and I was impressed by the services on offer. However, given that Scotland could be seen as the MS capital of the world and that this serious condition is particularly common in the west Highlands and the islands, which I represent, will the minister detail any work that is being done to incorporate such services into NHS provision for individuals with MS?

**Michael Matheson:** As I mentioned in my initial reply, we have provided more than £200,000 to the MS centre in mid-Argyll to allow it to develop an outreach programme to support patients in remote areas. In taking forward such initiatives—this is similar to the issue around cardiac rehabilitation—it is not for the NHS to take over third sector organisations and the services that they provide, but the NHS should work in partnership with them and help them to extend the services that they provide to patients who can benefit from them. *[Interruption.]*

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** Can we have Mr Matheson's microphone on, please?

**Michael Matheson:** I am sure that it is nothing personal.

We are taking forward initiatives to do exactly that, as in the case of the funding for the MS centre in mid-Argyll.

#### Waiting Time Target (Accident and Emergency)

**8. Jackie Baillie (Dumbarton) (Lab):** To ask the Scottish Government when it last met its national accident and emergency waiting time target. (S4O-02239)

**The Cabinet Secretary for Health and Wellbeing (Alex Neil):** The 98 per cent four-hour accident and emergency performance level—to be treated, admitted, transferred or discharged—was set by the previous Administration in 2004 and was never met by that Administration. An Information Services Division sample survey for April 2006 shows that the performance standard at that time was 87.6 per cent. ISD statistics show that the 98 per cent standard was first exceeded in May 2008 and last exceeded in September 2009.

Through the £50 million three-year unscheduled care action plan, the national health service will be reshaping and enhancing services to ensure that the 98 per cent standard is met sustainably in the future.

**Jackie Baillie:** Well, that was succinct. Clearly it is the case that the Scottish National Party has not met the A and E target across Scotland since

2009. By current performance, it would fail to meet its new improved and reduced target.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** In the interests of being succinct—

**Jackie Baillie:** Indeed. Numerous reasons are given for the difficulties and commentators observe that winter pressures are now faced all year round.

Does the cabinet secretary agree that as trolley waits increase, we need to address the problem urgently? Will he therefore agree to my call for Audit Scotland to consider the crisis in A and E so that we can learn lessons urgently?

**Alex Neil:** As a supporter of an Administration that never once achieved a target that it set and a member of a party that made no promise to sustain the budget for the national health service, Ms Baillie is not in a very strong position to criticise others. It is highly irresponsible to describe the situation in accident and emergency in Scotland as a crisis. She is referring to the position south of the border, where the Tories are implementing Labour's cuts of £20 billion in the health service.

### Cardiac Rehabilitation

**9. Dennis Robertson (Aberdeenshire West) (SNP):** To ask the Scottish Government what guidance it has given to national health service boards in relation to cardiac rehabilitation. (S4O-02240)

**The Minister for Public Health (Michael Matheson):** NHS boards should provide cardiac rehabilitation in line with the published clinical standards for heart disease, which were published in April 2010. Those standards state that people with heart disease should be assessed and have access to a menu-based cardiac rehabilitation programme.

**Dennis Robertson:** I thank the minister for that answer and for his previous answers to Mr Hume et al.

I have had correspondence from constituents in my area who are concerned that there could be a possible reduction in the number of cardiac specialist nurses in Grampian in spring 2014. I am sure that the minister will agree that that is a very important service. Will he agree to speak to NHS Grampian to find out its plans for future cardiac rehab and specialist nurses in the area?

**Michael Matheson:** I agree that cardiac rehabilitation nurses have a very important role to play in helping to support patients with cardiac disease. That is set out in our heart disease action plan, which makes it very clear that cardiac specialist nurses have that role. It is important that all NHS boards, such as NHS Grampian, have

services in place and ensure that they have sufficient specialist cardiac nursing provision to meet the needs of their local patient group.

If the member wishes to write to me detailing the nature of his constituents' concerns, we would be more than happy to explore with NHS Grampian what its plans are and to seek assurance that it will continue to have a range of cardiac nurses available to meet the needs of patients in the Grampian area who could benefit from them, given that they have heart disease.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** Question 10 has not been lodged and an explanation has been provided.

### Care Inspectorate (Recommendations)

**11. Mary Scanlon (Highlands and Islands) (Con):** To ask the Scottish Government what its position is on the adequacy of the enforcement of requirements and implementation of recommendations by the Care Inspectorate for the care of older people. (S4O-02242)

**The Cabinet Secretary for Health and Wellbeing (Alex Neil):** The Scottish Government is satisfied that the current regulation and enforcement powers of the Care Inspectorate are appropriate and allow it to discharge its statutory responsibilities, but obviously we will keep that under review.

**Mary Scanlon:** I am delighted to know that that is being kept under review.

In a letter to Highland Senior Citizens Network, the Cabinet Secretary for Health and Wellbeing stated:

"20% of care homes for older people have been assessed as being high risk and in need of closer and more regular scrutiny."

The Highland Senior Citizens Network has asked me to ask why one in five care homes for the elderly is graded as high risk and whether the cabinet secretary has confidence in the Care Inspectorate's ability to ensure that the quality care standards will be met in order to provide care for vulnerable elderly people.

**Alex Neil:** I believe that the chief executive of the Care Inspectorate has met the Highland Senior Citizens Network to discuss these issues. She has reassured the network and me that whatever action is necessary to deal with any risk in any care home, in the Highlands or anywhere else, the Care Inspectorate's full panoply of powers will be employed appropriately to deal with that situation. As the member knows, the Care Inspectorate ultimately has the power to seek the closure of a care home when it fails to satisfy the implementation of any recommendations. The

Care Inspectorate also has emergency powers that it can employ as and when required.

### **20:20 Vision (National Health Service)**

**12. Rob Gibson (Caithness, Sutherland and Ross) (SNP):** To ask the Scottish Government what elements of its 20:20 vision for the NHS will focus on improved healthcare in Wester Ross, north-west Sutherland and other remote areas. (S4O-02243)

**The Cabinet Secretary for Health and Wellbeing (Alex Neil):** I expect all national health service boards to work towards delivering the 20:20 vision by providing sustainable, safe, effective and person-centred services that are designed to meet the healthcare needs of their resident populations.

**Rob Gibson:** What part of NHS funds can aid the provision of day facilities and respite care in remote communities such as Torridon, Kinlochbervie and Tongue? There are deep concerns in those places that the merger of health and social care is not working as smoothly as it could.

**Alex Neil:** If the member has specific concerns, he can write to me and I will certainly address them. More generally, the Public Bodies (Joint Working) (Scotland) Bill was introduced to Parliament on 29 May to provide the legislative framework for integration of health and social care services. Integration is a prerequisite to providing the quality and range of services required and the co-ordination required to ensure that we deliver the best possible services in healthcare and social care. If the member has specific concerns, I will certainly investigate them.

### **Individual Patient Treatment Requests**

**13. Graeme Pearson (South Scotland) (Lab):** To ask the Scottish Government whether it considers that the individual patient treatment request system meets the needs of patients. (S4O-02244)

**The Cabinet Secretary for Health and Wellbeing (Alex Neil):** The review that I commissioned into individual patient treatment request processes was carried out by Professor Swainson. The review recently identified unacceptable patient experiences, such as that of the member's constituent, and has demonstrated that there is clearly room for improvement. A recurring theme is the lack of good communication between the national health service board and the patient, an issue that we must address when we consider the outcomes of the Health and Sport Committee's on-going inquiry.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** Question 14 is from Bruce Crawford. [*Interruption.*] I beg your

pardon, Mr Pearson. Please ask your supplementary question.

**Graeme Pearson:** I do not take it personally, Presiding Officer.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** Please do not.

**Graeme Pearson:** I am pleased that, in his response, the cabinet secretary acknowledges that Mrs Rankin did not receive the service that she deserved. Can he now identify the means by which she can achieve justice and obtain the treatment that she requires from the NHS to combat her bowel cancer?

**Alex Neil:** I understand that the chief executive of NHS Ayrshire and Arran has recognised the failings in the way in which Mrs Rankin's case was dealt with, and has reiterated his offer to her to carry out a very short-term expert review to hear all the evidence in her case so that a clinical decision can be reached in relation to the availability of the medicine that she has requested. I am not aware of whether she has agreed to that, but I know that on Monday, when the Healthcare Improvement Scotland report was agreed—it was published on Tuesday—the chief executive was going to make that offer.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** Many thanks, and my apologies to Mr Pearson.

Question 14 is from Bruce Crawford.

### **Waiting Times (Forth Valley Royal Hospital)**

**14. Bruce Crawford (Stirling) (SNP):** Thank you, Presiding Officer. It was not quite as big a surprise this time.

To ask the Scottish Government what action NHS Forth Valley has taken to improve waiting times for accident and emergency patients at Forth Valley royal hospital in Larbert. (S4O-02245)

**The Cabinet Secretary for Health and Wellbeing (Alex Neil):** A detailed delivery plan to improve capacity and flow across the health and social care system has been in development for some months. That work will inform the basis of the board's local unscheduled care plan, which includes both a workforce framework and a financial investment framework.

**Bruce Crawford:** I thank the cabinet secretary for his constructive answer.

Does the cabinet secretary agree that the most recent performance figure published by NHS Forth Valley against the four-hour target is encouraging? The most recent figure is 96.2 per cent, which shows that the board's performance has improved significantly since the published figure in March of 87.6 per cent. However, does he also agree that the board must continue to demonstrate

improvement? When is the board's local unscheduled care plan expected to be published?

**Alex Neil:** The unscheduled care programme team is working closely with the Forth Valley team to support its performance improvement. All national health service boards, including Forth Valley, will submit their strategic plan for sustained unscheduled care performance improvement at the end of June. That will be reviewed by the national programme team and signed off by it and the respective NHS board by the end of July. The sign-off of each strategic board plan will see the second tranche of the 2013-14 national unscheduled care programme investment funds being released to boards. I totally agree with Bruce Crawford that while Forth Valley has made significant improvements, there is still much to be done.

### Motor Neurone Disease

**15. Christina McKelvie (Hamilton, Larkhall and Stonehouse) (SNP):** To ask the Scottish Government what support it gives to people with motor neurone disease. (S4O-02246)

**The Minister for Public Health (Michael Matheson):** Our top priority for people with motor neurone disease is to ensure that the neurological standards published by Healthcare Improvement Scotland are implemented. They offer the best mechanism for achieving safe, effective, person-centred care.

The standards will help to ensure that people get not only the earliest and most appropriate treatment locally but access to specialist services when needed. That is why we previously provided boards with £1.2 million to develop improvement groups as the main vehicle to take the standards forward.

Progress is being monitored by the national neurological advisory group. We will continue to work with NHS boards and the third sector to improve services for people with motor neurone disease in Scotland.

**Christina McKelvie:** The minister will be aware that June is motor neurone disease awareness month and that families are attending an event in Parliament tonight. The minister mentioned safe and effective care. Will he give us his thoughts on the negative impact on the health and life chances of people with MND when they are forced to deal with the stress of the insidious welfare reforms?

**Michael Matheson:** I recognise that June is motor neurone disease awareness month. I am aware that the cabinet secretary is attending an event this evening as part of a programme in Parliament to raise awareness of motor neurone disease.

Like most other members, I recognise the real difficulty that many individuals face as a result of the welfare reforms that are being introduced by the United Kingdom Government. It presents particular problems for those who have conditions that can deteriorate fairly rapidly and those who have fluctuating conditions. I recognise that patients with motor neurone disease experience particular difficulties as a result of the welfare changes. That demonstrates to me that the Parliament needs to have control over welfare policy so that we can ensure that we have a policy that is more suited to the people of Scotland.

### Cost of Drugs (Prisoners)

**16. Mary Fee (West Scotland) (Lab):** To ask the Scottish Government what the annual cost is of prescribing drugs for prisoners with depression. (S4O-02247)

**The Minister for Public Health (Michael Matheson):** That information is not available from routine prescribing data held by the national health service's Information Services Division. The prescribing and dispensing activity that takes place in prisons is the responsibility of the Scottish Prison Service and local NHS boards.

**Mary Fee:** I am disappointed that there are no centrally held records. NHS Health Scotland and the Scottish Government class depression as a mental illness. However, the Scottish Prison Service does not, stating that only 14 per cent of the prison population has an enduring mental health issue, despite the wealth of information suggesting that the percentage is far higher. Will the minister re-examine the mental health strategy for Scotland's prisons, with a view to including in it depression as an enduring mental illness to ensure that prisoners can access the correct level of help and support?

**Michael Matheson:** We have no plans to review the strategy, which was published only last year. However, the member will be aware that it was only in the past year or so that responsibility for the provision of healthcare services for prisoners in Scottish Prison Service establishments was transferred to NHS boards. We need to ensure that boards provide a range of services that are appropriate to those prisoners. It is the responsibility of the local territorial boards, if treatment to support those who have a condition such as depression is to be included, to ensure that they have appropriate services in place to support those prisoners.

## National Planning Framework 3 and Scottish Planning Policy

### **The Deputy Presiding Officer (John Scott):**

The next item of business is a debate on motion S4M-06933, in the name of Derek Mackay, on progress towards national planning framework 3 and the Scottish planning policy.

14:41

**The Minister for Local Government and Planning (Derek Mackay):** This debate is about the Scottish Government's two key planning policy documents: the national planning framework, which is our long-term spatial plan for the development of Scotland; and the Scottish planning policy, which sets out what we want the planning system to deliver at the strategic and local levels.

I will highlight some key aspects of our proposals and touch on the extensive consultation process that we are currently engaged in, of which this debate is a key part. First, however, I want to set the policies in the wider context of planning reform.

The central purpose of the Scottish Government is to make Scotland a more successful country, with opportunities for all to flourish through increasing sustainable economic growth. Planning can and must do more to contribute to that. I want the planning system, now more than ever, to focus on delivering jobs and growth; I want it to facilitate the investment in infrastructure that will be crucial as we make the transition to a genuinely low-carbon economy; and I want the outcome of the planning process to be better places—places that are better for us, which are more sustainable and which attract investment.

**Patrick Harvie (Glasgow) (Green):** It is very clear what the minister wants: he wants growth to be the central purpose of the planning system. However, does the legislation that was passed in the second session of the Scottish Parliament not suggest that a different objective—sustainable development—should be the criterion that ministers have in mind at all times in relation to their decisions on the planning system?

**Derek Mackay:** I am sure that Mr Harvie will be relieved to hear that we have greater protection of the environment at our core at the same time as encouraging sustainable economic growth. It is for those reasons that he can have the certainty that we are very mindful of our obligations.

It is only through a well-functioning planning system—efficient, inclusive and focused on delivering high-quality development—that we can

fully realise our ambitious plans. I will therefore briefly outline the next steps that I have identified for our planning reform.

I want to underline our commitment in Scotland to a plan-led system. I do not mean a slavish adherence to lines on a map at the expense of good judgment and common sense; I mean forward-looking, place-based, visionary development plans that support growth and are produced on time. We need to focus on performance and resources. That is why we, with the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities, have convened a high-level group to look at planning performance and work in partnership to improve it.

I believe that an adequately resourced planning system is a fair expectation if we are to have a high-quality service and continual improvement. That is why in April, with the Parliament's support, we increased by 20 per cent the cost of planning fees. It is also why we introduced the e-planning system, which has been such a great success, making the planning system more efficient and more inclusive, and allowing online access to planning information across the country. Five years since its launch, it is on track to deliver financial savings of £50 million during its first 10 years, all for an initial investment of £11 million. Today, some 45 per cent of all planning applications in Scotland are submitted through the e-planning website.

The expectation cuts both ways, though, because an adequately-resourced planning authority must deliver the level of service that we all want to see. We are progressing that through the Regulatory Reform (Scotland) Bill.

Margaret Mitchell has lodged an amendment that would have the Scottish planning policy underline the crucial role of enforcement in the planning system. In cases in which a failure to comply with planning requirements causes real problems for communities or risks serious environmental harm, it is absolutely right that the planning authority has the power to take timely and effective action to remedy the problem. I am therefore happy to accept the amendment in Margaret Mitchell's name.

I am convinced that ambitious policies and a well-performing planning system go hand in hand. That is why, throughout the spring and early summer, I have been leading an intensive engagement programme with people who have an interest in planning. I am delivering a series of workshops for front-line planning staff around the country that focus on our agenda of improved performance and culture change. In support of our consultation on national planning framework 3 and the Scottish planning policy, we are looking at holding a series of stakeholder events across Scotland—from Orkney to Edinburgh and from

Dundee to Dumfries. I will visit many of the national developments that are proposed in our report, "Scotland's Third National Planning Framework: Main Issues Report and Draft Framework".

On the first comprehensive review of the Scottish planning policy, a recurring theme in our stakeholder engagement has been that the SPP is serving us well for the most part. However, I want to make the SPP much clearer on the specific outcomes that we want planning to deliver.

First and foremost, I want the SPP to be much clearer about how important it is that the planning system delivers jobs and growth. Development plans must be deliverable and informed by sound economic evidence, particularly the local economic strategy. The economic benefits of a proposed development need to be a material consideration. Significant weight should be placed on economic benefits and in particular on jobs.

I intend to bring key policy messages on place making into the heart of Scottish planning policy. Our proposed policy reflects the issues that are being considered in our review of town centres, which will report shortly. In particular, we have widened the town-centres-first approach, so that not only retail and leisure developments but other developments that generate significant travel, such as schools, hospitals and offices, should be in the town centre wherever possible.

Members might think from recent press coverage that the SPP and NPF3 are all about wind farms. That is far from the case, of course, but let me be absolutely clear: the Scottish Government's support for renewable energy, including onshore wind, remains as strong as ever. Alongside that, we want to see more community benefits from new wind farms and more community-owned developments.

We need the right developments in the right places. We are strengthening protection for our finest landscapes, including greater protection for wild land. We do not want to see new wind farms in our national parks and national scenic areas—our most scenic and iconic landscapes.

**Patrick Harvie:** I am grateful to the minister for giving way a second time. He said that there will be no wind farms in national parks or scenic landscape. Will he say precisely what that provision means? Will such a presumption against wind farms cover individual wind turbines? What is the definition of "wind farm"?

**Derek Mackay:** We are working on the definition of "wind farm", but any reasonable person would understand that it means a number of wind turbines in a particular area. The policy in relation to group 1, "Areas where wind farms will not be acceptable", constitutes an outright ban, for

the first time, on wind farms in national parks and national scenic areas. I will be happy to get back to the member on wind turbines. I say again that individual planning applications are determined on their merits.

I welcomed the engagement of the renewables industry, which will continue as we approach 23 July—the end of the 12-week consultation. I am convinced that we can deliver on our renewables targets, providing greater opportunities and greater protection where that is required.

The challenge of climate change compels us to make the transition to a sustainable, growing, low-carbon economy. That is a key focus of our proposals for the third national planning framework. Sarah Boyack's amendment notes that the climate change target for 2011 was missed, and it suggests that policies and investment are required to cut emissions further. We agree. The Government's climate change second report on proposals and policies gives details of a package of measures to enable us to achieve our targets. We have already committed more than £1.1 billion over the current spending review period, specifically for action on emissions.

The amendment in Sarah Boyack's name highlights the importance of the planning system to sustainable development and the importance of sustainable communities in helping to achieve Scotland's climate change targets. We agree on those matters, too. I am pleased that Sarah Boyack appears to be so closely aligned with the Government, and I am happy to accept the amendment in her name.

I have already touched on what we propose for onshore wind energy through Scottish planning policy, but our ambitions for low-carbon energy infrastructure amount to far more than that. Grid enhancement is essential if we are to make the most of our natural energy resources, and NPF2 identified a suite of electricity grid enhancements as a national development. We propose to retain that in NPF3, updated to take account of current plans, particularly for offshore and international connections.

If we are to reap the maximum economic benefits from the low-carbon revolution, we must ensure that we have the necessary infrastructure and a welcoming environment for the design, manufacture, installation and servicing of renewable energy generation in Scotland. That is why we want to give support to some of our best opportunities to do so—to our low-carbon enterprise areas, sites in the national renewables infrastructure plan, and other clusters of energy-related activity in places such as Aberdeenshire, Ayrshire and the three island authority areas.

As part of our balanced energy mix, we very much want to see carbon capture and storage applied to gas and coal-fired power stations in Scotland. We have a number of projects in Scotland in which, with the right financial support, we can make that happen. The Peterhead carbon capture and storage project is an opportunity to develop the world's first commercial-scale full chain carbon dioxide capture, transportation and storage project. It has secured preferred bidder status by the United Kingdom Government Department of Energy and Climate Change, and proposals for a new power station with CCS at Grangemouth remain on the reserve list.

**Alex Johnstone (North East Scotland) (Con):**

Will the minister clarify what the status of the Peterhead proposal would be should his party's policy of independence be successful?

**Derek Mackay:** I am sure that Scotland's excellent record on energy and on ambitious climate change targets will continue with independence. In fact, I am sure that it will be enhanced with independence and that any on-going discussions with the UK Government, if they are mature, pragmatic and realistic, will benefit Scotland's position as we reach the ambitions that we have laid out. I do not buy into the idea that the UK Government would be reckless if Scotland achieves independence. We see a pragmatic opportunity, and I am sure that the UK Government will see sense.

As I have talked to people about what should be in NPF3, one thing that has been striking has been the support for green infrastructure. The central Scotland green network has been a very popular national development from NPF2. Therefore, there is no doubt that we want to continue to support it.

We have also had much interest in the walking and cycling infrastructure. I therefore propose that the development of a national network of long-distance routes for walking and cycling be a national development.

**Claudia Beamish (South Scotland) (Lab):**

Twenty years ago, I helped to set up Loudon pond community nature reserve in Clydesdale. That was the result of site regeneration, and it is now regarded as a community asset for biodiversity. On the policies on brownfield sites, will the minister reflect on the importance of some brownfield sites for biodiversity and public green spaces, as highlighted by Buglife and others?

**Derek Mackay:** That is an excellent point, with which I agree. I have been very impressed by work by, for example, the Scottish Wildlife Trust, which I visited in Cumbernauld, in looking at the pathways that connect urban communities with the environmental aspect and showing how we can connect ecosystems with economics. The central

Scotland green network is a great example of where that has been done on a strategic basis. I am delighted to say that it is proposed that support for that should continue with national planning framework 3. The very important point about the understanding of the environment is central to the documents, and we want to bring that alive locally as well as nationally.

On our proposed spatial strategy, we must of course recognise the role of our cities as drivers of economic growth, and we will do further work in both the cities and the towns to support economic regeneration, as I mentioned earlier.

Examples of good planning that are supported through our proposals include the projects, which have been designated as national developments for the first time, at Ravenscraig and Dundee waterfront, where we were able to launch the proposals. There are further comments on the decarbonisation of the economy, alternative fuels, decarbonising transport, support for rail and modal shifts, and further energy aspects that relate to our low-carbon ambitions.

We have also taken cognisance of how some NPF2 projects that have been developed and delivered no longer require the same consenting regime, and they therefore no longer feature in NPF3. Other changes will include the long-term ambitions at Scapa Flow and Hunterston, which other members may talk about.

I believe that our policies represent something for every part of the country. They focus on sustainable economic growth while giving greater protection to the environment. We have to strike that balance for the right reasons and to achieve the Government's overarching objective in consultation with communities across Scotland. I commend the motion and the policy documents to Parliament.

I move,

That the Parliament welcomes the publication of *Scotland's Third National Planning Framework: Main Issues Report and Draft Framework* and the *Draft Scottish Planning Policy*; recognises the ongoing innovative work to engage the public in the development of the proposals; supports their focus on economic recovery, balanced growth and creating a low-carbon place; further supports the aspiration to ensure that Scotland is a natural place to invest in, by making best use of natural resources and protecting national assets; recognises the importance of placemaking and the opportunities to ensure that Scotland is a successful, sustainable place by supporting economic and regeneration priorities; believes that planning can play an important role in facilitating a planned approach to transport and digital infrastructure to make Scotland a connected place, and endorses the positive steps being taken to ensure that national planning policy plays a proactive role in supporting economic recovery.

14:55

**Sarah Boyack (Lothian) (Lab):** I thank the many organisations that have sent us briefings today. I realise that they had a very short time to pull together their key observations, and their briefings have been really helpful to me—and I suspect others—in preparing for this debate.

At its heart, planning is a democratic process that enables communities and their representatives to shape change. The purpose of the Labour amendment is to flag up our concerns about the increasing use of the term “sustainable economic growth” rather than “sustainable development”. We are concerned because a more sustainable Scotland will be created not just by willing it to happen but by the many incremental day-to-day decisions that are taken through the planning system and by infrastructure development.

Leadership is absolutely crucial and there is much to welcome in both the draft NPF3 and the draft SPP, but definitions are important. I will take the opportunity today to push the minister on the way that he has framed the purpose and objectives in the NPF, because the minister's suggestion that economic benefit should trump other considerations would be a step backwards.

There has been a healthy debate on that issue in discussions on the Regulatory Reform (Scotland) Bill. Third parties such as the Law Society of Scotland, Scottish Environment LINK and Unison have flagged up their concerns that, whereas the term “sustainable development” has been used throughout the lifetime of the Scottish Parliament, is in our own legislation and has international status, European Union status and UK status, the term “sustainable economic growth” potentially means all things to all people and could justify short-term change that would have long-term negative impact. To put “sustainable economic growth” above “sustainable development” in the SPP is to put them the wrong way round.

I accept that, as the minister said, we are in a recession and are experiencing a severe economic downturn, and I understand the ambition to ensure that NPF3 and the SPP contribute to economic recovery—that is absolutely essential. However, we need to take a long-term perspective, too. If we are to deliver the sustainable, low-carbon Scotland that the Scottish Government motion refers to, we need to ensure that all development contributes to both the social and environmental objectives that are encompassed by sustainable development, alongside contributing to our economic objectives.

That is why we have flagged up that we are still not on the right trajectory to deliver either our short

or long-term commitments on climate change. If we are being honest, we all know that some of the big gains that we have made on climate change emissions have been as a result of the recession. We need to make sure that, as we come out of recession, we do so without sacrificing those gains, as that would leave future generations with even harder challenges.

Planning is fundamental to delivering the vision of a sustainable Scotland. NPF3 will enable national priorities to be established that can be the basis of public and private investment. It should be a long-term commitment by the Scottish Government that gives a degree of certainty for business investment.

Identifying sites is not sufficient. Articles about rising house prices have begun to appear, suggesting to us that things are getting better on housing, but that is an indication of housing shortage rather than of a healthy housing market. There is an increasing premium on existing housing because there is a severe shortage of new build. In fact, we are at a historic low. Not since the second world war have we had so few new housing starts. There is a huge economic cost to the country and to the construction industry from the small number of housing starts: there is the economic cost of a lack of jobs and there is a cost to our capacity to grow. There is a major social price to pay, too.

Last month, the minister spoke at an Association of Women in Property event, at which he questioned whether we could expect the private sector to continue to contribute in the hard times to some of the infrastructure that local authorities now routinely expect to come as part of the planning process. There is a debate to be had on that. On one level the minister is right—private house-building companies are facing immense challenges in developing sites—but if we simply say that the requirements to contribute infrastructure should be reduced, that leaves the basic question of how that shortfall will be made up.

In the current economic climate, local authorities are already strapped for cash. Although many are pursuing innovative investment strategies—through tax incremental financing schemes, for example—if contributions to roads and schools do not come alongside new development, we will not get the high-quality communities to which we aspire. There is simply no straightforward alternative, and the Scottish Government needs to understand that.

**Derek Mackay:** I have said repeatedly that section 75 benefits should relate to the application and mitigation of a development, and not to the added extras that we know the public sector has sometimes acquired in more generous and



plentiful times. Section 75 is still appropriate, but it should relate to the development in hand.

**Sarah Boyack:** That could mean roads, public transport infrastructure, schools or energy, and we need to be much more specific. For example, because of the lack of investment from the Scottish Government, the City of Edinburgh Council is having to put its own money into housing associations in order to get any new investment for social housing, and there is a massive crisis in the city. If the Scottish Government is not requiring private development to put in the money, and is not itself prepared to put in the money, it is requiring local government to do so. The Government needs to be honest about that and to accept the impact that it will have on community development.

Local authorities and housing associations have been hit by a double whammy of cuts in housing investment from the SNP Government and the impact of welfare reform from the Tory Government, which together have completely undermined the economics of affordable social rented housing.

We are in the middle of a crisis, and the policy that is on paper in the SPP is not going to happen in reality. If we factor in the changing demographics highlighted by the Christie commission, we see that there are even more challenges to local planning authorities in relation to new models of community development that meet the needs of a growing elderly population. I do not believe that what is written on the pages of the SPP will deliver on the minister's ambitions, because investment will be key.

One of the issues highlighted in the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 was low-carbon housing, which is relevant to the intervention that the minister has just made. The act did not simply address the issue as one of individual house design; it was about the need for community renewable heat and power schemes. Given the massive increases in costs for domestic energy and heat, that is an issue not for NPF4 but for now.

Given the carbon emissions that come from housing, I wondered when reading the Government motion why energy infrastructure is not on the list alongside transport and digital infrastructure, because there is a market failure not only in housing but in affordable heat and power as well. It is only when local authorities such as Aberdeen City Council have gone out to make things happen that such schemes have worked. That issue is not flagged up in the housing section and, although there is a section on energy, we have all been so focused on renewables from wind farms that the fundamental issue of sourcing heat and power for urban

communities and for housing has not been joined up.

If community renewables are to be part of our vision for our towns, villages and cities, they will not just happen by accident. They do not simply have to be planned for; they need political leadership from the Scottish Government.

I have a couple of minutes left, so in my closing remarks I want to list a couple of other important issues.

The Royal Town Planning Institute is right to welcome a renewed focus on town centres. We have all seen the report published in the past week or so showing that there is a possibility that, over the next four years, 25 per cent of retail units in town centres will go. The ambition of the SPP is good, but we need a bit more oomph. We need to put more emphasis on housing and residential developments in our city centres, because there has been a flight of people from our city centres. People want to live in city centres but, if all our developments are mixed commercial developments, our town centres will not survive. We must ensure that they are sustainable in the long run.

I also want to say something about green infrastructure receiving huge support for tourism, nature conservation and low-carbon lifestyles generally. There are references in the SPP to long-distance walking and cycle routes. That is great, but it must be complemented by investment, which means the Scottish Government investing more on national routes and greenlighting investment in local communities too.

We saw the ambition at the pedal on Parliament demonstration last month. The key point being made there was that people need to be able to use their bikes from their house to wherever they are going, but our streets are simply not safe enough. The issue is not just about long-term routes; it is about local routes, as well.

My final point is that there is a total absence of any proposals for new national parks. Even if a new national park were suggested in NPF3, it would still be years and years away. Surely it is time for our national parks in Loch Lomond and the Trossachs and the Cairngorms to be joined by another national park. What about our first marine and coastal national park? There is a lot in the NPF about our seas, coastal communities and ports development, which is welcome, but that makes the absence of a national park in our coastal and marine areas even more striking.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer (Elaine Smith):** I must ask you to close.

**Sarah Boyack:** The SPP is about the how and the NPF is about the where, as the RTPi says. I

have focused on the purpose of planning and what should be in the purpose as set out by the SPP. Sustainable development must be the driver, not an afterthought, and at the moment the SPP does not have it the right way round.

I move amendment S4M-06933.3, to insert at end:

“, however notes that the Scottish Government has failed to meet its second climate change target; understands that the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 sets a clear need for policies and investment; further understands that the planning system plays a key role in helping to ensure that Scotland achieves sustainable development and that sustainable communities are essential to deliver on the targets adopted by the Scottish Government.”

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** I should say at the outset that we are quite tight for time in the debate.

15:06

**Margaret Mitchell (Central Scotland) (Con):** I welcome today's debate on the publication of the main issues report for the third national planning framework and the consultation draft of the Scottish planning policy.

The framework and policy documents have a vital role to play in supporting and promoting sustainable economic growth throughout Scotland. That view is reflected in the Scottish Government's motion, which is why the Scottish Conservatives will vote in favour of the motion this evening. The fact that an amendment has been lodged in my name does not indicate any significant disagreement with the sentiments that are expressed in the motion. Rather, we seek to ensure that the importance of enforcement is highlighted.

The minister may recall that, during a similar debate in January, the Scottish Conservatives emphasised that enforcement is a crucial part of an effective planning system. In that debate, the minister and other members acknowledged and agreed with that point. It is encouraging that the draft SPP consultation document states that enforcement is a core value of the planning service, and the minister has confirmed that he supports our amendment.

In reality, our planning system is only as good as the level of enforcement that is carried out to ensure compliance once decisions have been made. It is essential, therefore, that in determining the final SPP the Scottish Government ensures that councils have robust, transparent and detailed planning enforcement charters that reflect modern conditions in order to safeguard the effectiveness of the planning system.

If we are to achieve that objective, there is an urgent requirement for more meaningful data on

enforcement and how it currently operates. It is a matter of concern that, since the end of 2011-12, served planning enforcement notices are no longer broken down by type, which makes it impossible to monitor properly the extent to which enforcement is working. As MSPs know only too well, examples of failure in enforcement are legion. The situation must be addressed if the public are to have confidence in the system. There cannot be proper scrutiny of enforcement without the collection of hard empirical evidence and meaningful data.

**Mike MacKenzie (Highlands and Islands) (SNP):** Will the member take an intervention?

**Margaret Mitchell:** I am pressed for time. I will perhaps give way later.

I turn to some major aspects of the NPF3 main issues report. As an MSP for Central Scotland, I am heartened by the number of projects in my region that are designated as national developments. They include the central Scotland green network, which covers all three of the local authorities in Central Scotland; the Grangemouth investment zone; the Grangemouth and Peterhead carbon capture and storage project; and Ravenscraig. All of that is very good news.

It is expected that the development of Ravenscraig will lead to the creation of 12,000 jobs and make a significant contribution to the local economy, creating new opportunities in housing, education and leisure. There are clearly significant opportunities for regeneration and renewal at the Ravenscraig site, which will complement the new Motherwell College campus and the regional sports facility. In view of that, I sincerely hope that Ravenscraig remains one of the 14 new designations following the consultation.

When the minister gave evidence to the Local Government and Regeneration Committee on NPF3 and the SPP, one issue that was raised was the removal of the term “brownfield site” from the draft SPP. Among the possible connotations of the term are that the land in question might be contaminated or in poor condition. That is often not an accurate assessment of the land, and the term “previously developed” might make such sites sound more attractive. However, as the term “brownfield site” is widely understood by the general public to mean land that can be developed and which is quite distinct from a greenfield site, I think that, on balance, it would be helpful to retain the term.

In the same evidence session, the minister indicated that the town centres review would report “shortly”. Given the town-centres-first approach that has been taken in the draft SPP, as well as the importance of the review to many other

policy areas, I would be grateful if he could confirm when the external advisory group will report. I hope that that will happen prior to the close of the consultation so that it can help to inform stakeholder responses to the draft SPP.

In the Scottish Conservatives' most recent energy policy review, a Scotland-wide zoning exercise was suggested, with the resulting zoning plan to be included in the SPP. The zoning plan would clearly identify areas in which wind farms or other renewables projects could never be granted planning permission and areas in which they might be suitable. Given that, we cautiously welcome the suggestion in the draft SPP that a more rigorous zoning system be adopted for onshore wind developments than currently exists.

That said, although around a third of the countryside will potentially be protected by the proposed guidelines, there is no commitment from the Scottish National Party to reduce the overall number of turbines and no sign that its enthusiasm for wind energy is beginning to wane. In such circumstances, the fear is that zoning might simply result in more pressure being put on the remaining two thirds of the country that will not be spared in the guidelines. In addition, I am afraid that it comes too late for many communities in Scotland.

The Scottish Conservatives agree with much of the NPF3 main issues report and the consultation draft of the SPP, as well as the commendable aims that those documents seek to achieve.

I move amendment S4M-06933.1, to insert after fourth "place":

"; notes the crucial role that effective enforcement structures and mechanisms play in the planning system and believes that this should be stressed in the final Scottish Planning Policy".

15:12

**Patrick Harvie (Glasgow) (Green):** I thank Margaret Mitchell for giving me the opportunity to begin by commending the Government for not allowing the suggestion that there will be a reduction in wind turbines in Scotland. That would be a terrible situation to face were it to come about.

I welcome the debate and the draft documents that we have in front of us. The topic is vital. When I served in session 2 on the Communities Committee, which considered the Planning etc (Scotland) Bill, it became clearer and clearer with every piece of evidence that we heard that the planning system is one of the most important—if one of the less sexy—areas of Government policy. It is crucial to our country's future, regardless of the various views that exist about what that future should be.

I find the Government's motion a wee bit curious. It uses the term "balanced growth", not even the Government's favourite contradiction, "sustainable economic growth". I had a wee look, but I could not find anywhere on the Scottish Government's website any document or ministerial speech in which the term "balanced growth" is used—not, that is, since Jim Mather was in office. I suspect that he used every bit of economic jargon ever invented in the history of the discipline.

As far as I am aware, there are at least two established meanings of the term "balanced growth" in the magic circles of economics, but it is completely unclear to me which one the Government intends to use and when that radical change in economic policy was adopted. It was certainly not announced in any of the economic documents that the Government published recently on the future of an independent Scotland, for example. Perhaps it is just a cobbled-together phrase that is in the motion without really meaning anything. The Government needs to be clear about what it really means when it uses such phrases.

**Mike MacKenzie:** Having listened very carefully to Patrick Harvie's speech, I am completely unclear about what he means.

**Patrick Harvie:** Well, I am not in government. Mike MacKenzie might be grateful for that, but I hope that one day I will have the chance to disappoint him.

Whether the Government has a definition of balanced growth or whether it simply means sustainable economic growth, which is its favourite buzz phrase, it is clear that growth, dressed up in whatever jargon we like, amounts to plain old gross domestic product growth and has been placed as the planning system's central purpose. As I listened to the minister's speech, it became very clear to me that that is foremost in his mind.

I am sure that some members will be comfortable with that. After all, some members still imagine that everlasting economic growth on a planet of finite resources is possible or desirable and that economic growth in a wealthy country does not increase inequality or environmental destruction to benefit a few.

However, what the legislation says—in black and white and as passed by the Parliament—is not a matter of debate. It says:

"Sustainable development: exercise of functions by Scottish Ministers

(1) This section applies to the Scottish Ministers in the exercise of their functions of preparing and revising the National Planning Framework.

(2) The Scottish Ministers must exercise those functions with the objective of contributing to sustainable development."

It is pretty clear that the Government has decided that, instead of the objective of sustainable development, there will be a range of objectives that start with economic growth and put sustainability some way down the list. I find that deeply disappointing and out of keeping with the legislation.

**Derek Mackay:** Surely any reasonable person who reads the priorities in NPF3 will come to the clear conclusion that the transition to a low-carbon economy is a central driver in our planning policies.

**Patrick Harvie:** Climate change is indeed mentioned, but I wonder whether a national planning framework and SPP that focus on sustainable development would have at their heart certain proposals, particularly on energy, that are out of keeping with the climate change objectives that the whole Parliament has signed up to on paper. I am referring in particular to coal gasification, fracking and the suggestion on page 23 of NPF3 that unconventional fuels are not a threat but an opportunity. The idea that a world that has several times more fossil fuel known and stored as reserves than it can afford to burn and that we should just go chasing after ever-more fuel through deepwater drilling one day, opencast mining the next and in the future fracking or other unconventional gas extraction is incompatible with sustainable development and the Government's climate change objectives.

My amendment reflects my welcome for certain things in the minister's documents, and there is also much to welcome in the other two amendments. For example, I welcome the Labour Party's CO<sub>2</sub> target arguments and I am happy to support the priority that the Conservative Party has given to enforcement.

I suspect that democratic accountability and participation have been improved since the court case over the coal-fired power station at Hunterston. Although 26 people responded to the consultation on its status as a national development, 22,000 objected to the development when it was proposed. Parliament will enter into a more formal period of scrutiny of the new NPF, but local accountability must remain a priority, and I urge the Government to consider that in revising the draft.

I move S4M-06933.2, to leave out from first “; recognises” to end and insert:

“but notes that section 3D of the Planning (Scotland) Act 2006 places a duty on ministers to exercise their functions of preparing and revising the National Planning Framework with the objective of contributing to sustainable development; calls on the Scottish Government, in keeping with this statutory duty, to place sustainable development at the heart of planning rather than economic growth; welcomes the stated focus on climate change and creating

‘a low-carbon place’, but remains concerned at the likely climate impact of certain energy and transport proposals; believes that planning should also contribute to creating resilient communities, decarbonising the economy and protecting the environment; is pleased that the Hunterston coal-fired power station is no longer designated as a national development; is concerned that the extraction of unconventional fossil fuels is regarded as an opportunity; values the role of national policy and spatial planning, but calls on the Scottish Government to ensure that there is local democratic control over land use and meaningful public participation in decision-making.”

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** We move to the open debate. As we are quite tight for time, I must ask for six-minute speeches.

15:19

**Mike MacKenzie (Highlands and Islands) (SNP):** I am delighted that we have received many briefings for the debate from many interested organisations. After all, one of the problems that the planning system suffers from is public apathy, especially during the earlier consultation phases of planning policy. That is why I am glad that the Scottish Government is leading the way with the main issues report for NPF3 and the SPP consultation, especially as the associated documents are in plain and clear English, are uncluttered and are free from planning jargon.

There is a lesson for local planning authorities in that, because early public engagement and meaningful consultation depend on such documents being accessible to the wider public. Too often, reading local planning policy documents is an exercise in forcing our way through a dense lexicon of tortured and ambiguous terms; it is an exercise that is reminiscent of attempting to read some of our more esoteric post-modernist literature, which is meaningless to absolutely everyone—except, perhaps, the author.

I am glad, too, that the Scottish Government is forging ahead in a journey of continuous improvement for our planning system, because that system has too often in the past let us all down—applicants and the public—and has not delivered the outcomes that any of us would wish for in efficiency or fairness. Most important, it has not delivered on quality of development.

I am particularly glad about the emphasis in the draft SPP on design-led development, with its attendant themes of place making, designing better streets, the architecture and place policy statement and high-quality development. I welcome the new planning performance framework, but I am sorry that the first planning performance annual report suggests that less than a third of local planning authorities have stated that design improvements are negotiated during the application process. That is a disappointment.

Too much of the focus has been on answering the question whether to build rather than asking questions about the quality of design. That part of the planning system needs to improve, because nimbyism is often an expression of a lack of public confidence in the planning system as a vehicle for delivering well-designed and high-quality development.

I am glad, too, about the renewed focus on sustainable economic growth. Not thinking about that in our hierarchy of considerations is not to live in the real world; it is not to recognise the profound economic difficulties that many people face in communities throughout Scotland and not to recognise that we have one of two possible futures—one in which we face continuing poverty, or a better, well-designed one, in which we can all share the prosperity that sustainable economic growth will deliver.

**Claudia Beamish:** Will the member take an intervention?

**Mike MacKenzie:** I am sorry; the Presiding Officer has told us that we are short of time, so I think that I should move on.

The planning system should be the midwife of that well-designed, better future. I am surprised, therefore, by Patrick Harvie's amendment, because I would have thought that the word "sustainable" as the constant prefix to economic growth would answer all his concerns.

**Patrick Harvie:** Can Mr MacKenzie do what no Scottish Government minister has ever done and give a clear, unambiguous definition of what the hell sustainable economic growth even is?

**Mike MacKenzie:** I think that you are deliberately misunderstanding that. It is difficult to say in a few words precisely what the meaning is but, nevertheless, I think that we all understand exactly what the term means.

I would have thought that Patrick Harvie would welcome NPF3, with its ambitious programme of infrastructure projects that are necessary to secure our renewable energy generation opportunities, which are especially required if we are to take Professor Stiglitz's advice about the opportunities for moving towards a green economy.

I have long been a fan of another Patrick—Patrick Geddes, the father of modern planning. He saw planning as the means of dealing with many of our socioeconomic problems, and I am glad that the Scottish Government is following that philosophy.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** I assure members that they can have their full six minutes—we just do not have a lot of time in hand to compensate for interventions. I remind

members to speak through the chair and to be mindful of the language that they use in the chamber.

15:25

**John Pentland (Motherwell and Wishaw) (Lab):** As the minister is well aware, I have welcomed the inclusion of Ravenscraig as a national priority in NPF3. I hope that its redevelopment is not only consolidated in NPF3 but boosted significantly as a consequence of its enhanced status, through the extension of Scottish Government support and by attracting increased investment from the private sector.

When I think back to the works that once lit up the night sky, I think that it is worth noting that Ravenscraig has the potential to be a shining beacon again, but this time as an exemplary new community where sustainable development has been built in as part of the design process, with a town centre that is integrated with workplaces, homes, schools, shopping, leisure and community facilities, parks and wildlife areas that are all linked by state-of-the-art environmentally friendly public transport. Given the low-carbon, sustainable and connected objectives that the national planning framework seeks to pursue, it is appropriate that Ravenscraig should be a prominent part of NPF3.

The minister will be aware of my concern that the Scottish planning policy needs to make it clear that planning authorities should be prepared and able to abandon excessively strict adherence to planning by numbers in balancing the competing needs of communities. That is not to say that there should be a free-for-all that ignores carefully considered planning objectives; rather, we should not allow the resulting rules to become fixed in tablets of stone that get in the way of pursuing the objectives.

I welcome the general thrust of NPF3 and the SPP, but I have concerns about the interpretation of the vision that is being presented and the mechanisms and resources that will be available to support it. Significant concern has been raised in several of the briefings that we have received—and is likely to be repeated in submissions to the consultation—about whether a change in language reflects a change in policy. Does referring to sustainable economic growth, which is a poorly defined concept compared with the legally defined term "sustainable development", mean that economic considerations will be given greater weight than the social and environmental consequences of development? That is the fear.

The Local Government in Scotland Act 2003 requires local authorities to discharge their duty to seek best value

“in a way which contributes to the achievement of sustainable development.”

The statutory guidance for the act defines sustainable development as

“development which secures a balance of social, economic, and environmental well-being in the impact of activities and decisions; and which seeks to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.”

Of course, that definition builds on the one given in the Brundtland commission report “Our Common Future”. How are we to interpret the emphasis on sustainable economic growth in comparison with those definitions?

**Derek Mackay:** Will the member take an intervention?

**John Pentland:** I will do so in a wee minute.

The worry is that, by emphasising the need for maintaining economic growth, we are discounting or undervaluing resources that do not contribute directly to the economic growth statistics. Will we take proper account of social and environmental aspects of development? Will we ensure the protection and growth of our natural, human and social capital, in addition to the financial variety?

Those questions could be settled easily in the debate were the Scottish Government to clarify its interpretation of sustainable economic growth and were it to promise to reaffirm its commitment to sustainable development when the final documents are published.

**Derek Mackay:** I thank the member for giving me the opportunity to say that, yes, the Scottish Government is just as committed as it ever was to sustainable development. Furthermore, the very project that Mr Pentland wants us to deliver in Ravenscraig—it involves brownfield regeneration and the creation of jobs, housing, industry and employment opportunities—is a wonderful example of that planning in practice. We are just as committed as ever. I hope that, once and for all, that puts the matter to bed.

**John Pentland:** That is why I allowed the minister to intervene.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** John Pentland has one minute remaining.

**John Pentland:** Of course, making commitments to low-carbon places and economies is one thing, but backing up those commitments with action is another. It remains to be seen whether the Scottish Government will move from wishful thinking to firm commitments in its final report on proposals and policies, but the failure to meet the targets for the second year in a row does not augur well.

Getting the right policies on transport and housing is crucial to meeting our climate change targets. As I said in our debate on housing associations last week, current support does not make it easy to build good-quality low-carbon social housing. Relying on using up reserves is not very sustainable and nor is that the sort of prudential policy that the Scottish Housing Regulator has called for.

Overall, I agree with the direction of travel that we are offered in the documents, but I would like a greater commitment to speedier implementation and resources to match the commitments. I know that the minister will say that NPF3 is a planning document rather than a spending document, but the danger is that, like the draft RPP2, NPF3 will become just a wish list of things that we would like to do rather than a firm commitment to what will be achieved and a road map telling us how we get there.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** You must conclude.

**John Pentland:** The minister has clearly put a lot of effort into NPF3 and into getting his Cabinet colleagues on board—

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** I am afraid that you really need to finish.

**John Pentland:** Can the minister be sure that he will get the same buy-in from his Cabinet colleagues when they need to provide the necessary resources to put the plan into practice? Perhaps he can answer that in summing up.

15:31

**Chic Brodie (South Scotland) (SNP):** I welcome the intention behind today's motion and have some sympathy with the Labour and Conservative amendments. As the motion states, the consultations on NPF3, which builds on NPF2, and on the SPP are very much welcome, and I congratulate the minister and his team on producing them.

However, let me mention one caveat, on which I have not spoken to my friend Mike MacKenzie, before I enter the general fray of the debate. Given that the proposals in the consultation will affect everyone in Scotland, in producing such reports—this applies not just to the reports that we are considering today—can we put them within the linguistic reach of the people who will be affected by them? For example, paragraph 164 of the draft Scottish planning policy states:

“Proposals that would result in or exacerbate a deficit of green infrastructure should include provision to remedy that deficit with accessible infrastructure”

and so on. I appeal to the minister and his colleagues for a simpler and more linguistically inclusive reporting method.

The principal policy objective in the motion refers—rightly—to our aim that Scotland should flourish through increasing sustainable economic growth. On that point, let me help Mr Harvie and others who are struggling with the shorthand. We are saying that, before we can do all the other things that we want to do, including providing a greener infrastructure, we need sound financial and planning systems that enable us to build all the elements of our productive environment and to find and build new ones. We must, as a priority, simultaneously harness a fairer, healthier nation that secures with substance—

**Patrick Harvie:** Will the member give way?

**Chic Brodie:** No. We could go on all day debating what the term means, but I do not intend to do that.

We also need to attain meaningful further planned sustainable development that, as I said, will provide the greener environment that we all seek. In that context, let me address two areas in which the planning framework and the SPP will rightly deliver improvement. We are nothing if we do not consider our communities, our town centres and the people in them. I have no doubt that Scotland will attain its target of producing 100 per cent of its electricity needs from renewables by 2020.

I suggest, however, that one of the vehicles that has been adopted to achieve wind farm developments, namely community benefits—or benefits that developers might offer voluntarily to communities that are likely to be affected by a development—is not the only right vehicle, as is proposed in the planning document. That vehicle has been exaggerated by the London Government's recent threat to quadruple community benefits from developers. Irrespective of how we dress up those benefits, they are inducements—some might even say that they are bribes—to communities. Sometimes, and in only a few cases, inducements are offered to the select few elected members of community councils, who can then disburse the largesse as they see fit, thus embellishing and exaggerating their perceived power in the community. Sometimes, that process creates animosity.

I ask the minister to amend that portion of the plan and to add an element in favour of greater community ownership of developments—certainly for wind farms, although not only for them—in a form that provides profit sharing by developers or dividends from a community's equity share in a development. I applaud the recent development in which, after many discussions with more

progressive wind farm developers, a domestic-fuel discount scheme has been introduced to reduce fuel bills in communities to which wind farms are attached.

**Alex Johnstone:** Will the member take an intervention?

**Chic Brodie:** I am sorry, but I do not have time.

The planning system and our future land systems might address the financial benefits that flow from developments to landowners, some of whom would not know Scotland if they landed on it.

I turn to paragraphs 54 to 67 of the draft planning policy, which are on the principles and plans for development of our town centres, and delivery of those plans. The proposal is that local authorities should prepare strategies that are predicated on the long list that has been drawn up in paragraph 56 of the draft Scottish planning policy. We are supposed to have done that already in some areas, and we have even pumped in substantial moneys to assist the renaissance of our town centres. The challenge is that the last point in that long list of proposed actions in the SPP calls for

“monitoring against the baseline provided by the health check to assess the extent to which it has delivered improvements.”

I invite and appeal to the minister to ensure that there is a meaningful regular review strategy and an audit of the strategy and finance of the groups that are responsible for development of town centres and their planning outcomes.

NPF3 and the draft Scottish planning policy provide meaningful frameworks to establish sustainable growth and betterment for our people, our economy and our nation.

15:37

**Anne McTaggart (Glasgow) (Lab):** As a member of the Local Government and Regeneration Committee, I am delighted to contribute to this debate on Scotland's third national planning framework and to consider how best we ensure that planning contributes to wider economic recovery.

I am keen for the third framework to build on the commendable principles that were contained in previous planning strategies, and I encourage the Scottish Government to be aspirational in confronting some of the biggest challenges that we are likely to face in the decades ahead.

The Minister for Local Government and Planning, Derek Mackay, has stated that the key priority of NPF3 will be supporting sustainable economic growth. Like other members who have

spoken in the debate, I feel that the Scottish Government's focus on the phrase "sustainable economic growth" is somewhat ambiguous, as it is much less clearly defined than the previously used phrase, which was "sustainable development", which already has a legal basis. I am sure that the Scottish Government wishes to be clear in its aims.

**Kenneth Gibson (Cunninghame North) (SNP):** Just for clarification, I point out that the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development defines "sustainable economic growth" as

"the upward trend in environmentally adjusted net domestic product (EDP) under certain conditions and assumptions".

Ergo, it is the rate of growth that can be maintained without exhausting natural resources and creating problems for future generations. I hope that that clarifies it for everyone.

**Anne McTaggart:** Well, we have all learned something new today.

I would like to extend my support to the themes of supporting sustainable development and the transition to a low-carbon economy. I acknowledge the benefits that are brought to the overall strategy through the close working relationships that have been developed with VisitScotland, the Scottish Wildlife Trust, ClimateXChange and other key stakeholders throughout the consultation process.

In such challenging economic circumstances, it is necessary that we prioritise infrastructure projects that will encourage tourism and inward investment in Scotland, thereby safeguarding jobs and promoting growth. I back the move to decarbonise our transport network and to improve key transport links between our cities.

However, Parliament will be aware that the Scottish Government has already missed its targets for carbon reduction, with expert analysts predicting that every annual target from 2014 onwards will also be unachievable. Bearing it in mind that 40 per cent of emissions are from transport and housing, we can clearly see that the issue is an incredibly important aspect of the planning debate. That is why we need more than just hollow commitments from the Scottish Government on what it is able to deliver, and assurances about the resources that will enable the public and voluntary sectors to achieve the long term-aspirations in the national planning framework.

I am, however, also concerned by suggestions that one in four of our high street stores will disappear over the coming years, as was stated last month in the "Retail Futures 2018" report from the Centre for Retail Research. We must look to our high streets and start the debate on how we

can use the planning system to regenerate our town and city centres, in order to address the ever-changing face of our high streets. I am sure that the Minister for Local Government and Planning will be aware of that report and will acknowledge that the figure represents almost 5,800 individual stores, and probably more than 100,000 workers who will be made redundant if no effective intervention is put in place to speed up the recovery of our town centres.

It is because of those facts that I urge the Scottish Government to ensure that it does not take a short-term view of the planning system, because that could have long-term consequences. I truly hope that the third framework will continue in the same vein as the previous planning strategies, and that the Scottish Government will listen to the concerns about the finer points of the strategies that have been placed before Parliament this afternoon.

15:42

**John Wilson (Central Scotland) (SNP):** I welcome today's debate on the Scottish planning policy and the national planning framework 3. I have a particular interest in the subject as a member of the Local Government and Regeneration Committee, which recently took evidence from the minister on the issue. During the meeting with the committee, the minister gave some insight into the finer detail of the proposals and was able to offer us some useful assurances on the direction and focus of the development of the SPP and NPF3.

I want to take this opportunity to praise the minister on the decision to consider NPF3 and the SPP in tandem. I am sure that I am not the only one who has become bogged down in the ever-more confusing raft of planning legislation and guidelines when dealing with constituency cases. Efforts to co-ordinate guidelines will undoubtedly—I hope—bring greater clarity.

With regard to NPF3, I commend the focus in the draft that has been placed on economic benefits and jobs during consideration of proposed developments. It is important to place economic factors at the heart of all major decisions, particularly during this time of austerity.

I also welcome the nod to the regeneration of town centres, although, as I highlighted to the minister during a committee meeting in May, I caution that proposing major new developments might conflict with the Scottish planning policy's focus on existing town centre regeneration, which Anne McTaggart has just highlighted. In particular, I note that the proposals for Ravenscraig, for example, might conflict with the Scottish planning policy. In fact, the developments would effectively



create a new town that would bridge the geographical gap between the existing towns of Motherwell and Wishaw, which could create greater problems for those towns. I raised that point with the minister at the committee meeting in May, and noted that the current proposals for the Ravenscraig development include housing, education facilities and the possibility of a new retail centre.

I appreciate that the proposed developments will bring massive benefits to communities throughout the central belt, but so too would developing areas that have, throughout recent years, suffered significant decline. I am not suggesting that we halt all major new developments, but any potential conflict should be ironed out in the new framework, and a better balance found.

During the minister's appearance at the committee, I also sought assurances that the guidance that was issued in December will be more precise about how planning authorities make decisions. For example, I noted that autonomous decision-making between local authority areas has, at times, been inconsistent, particularly around the erection of wind turbines. That leads to confusion and uncertainty for people who live in communities on the borders of neighbouring authorities. Clarity for all concerned is crucial as NPF3 and the SPP are taken forward.

I was pleased to hear from the minister that the Scottish Government will work with community council liaison officers and Planning Aid for Scotland to ensure that communities are provided with the help and support that they need to engage fully in the planning system. We are, however, not just talking about communities. It is essential that all who are involved in the planning process, from the Scottish Government to local authority planning departments and developers, work closely together to bring about the speedy disposal of planning applications. The creation of a more cohesive and inclusive approach to the planning process will bring about better efficiency and decision making with minimal delays.

I highlight that point by talking about a discussion that I had with a developer last Friday about an area that has been identified as a community growth area. The developer has been having problems in meeting not the planning department of a local authority but other departments to identify the community gain and obligations that will be on the developer when they go ahead. That is leading to delays in building houses. We need to ensure that local authorities work collectively with developers so that such developments can go ahead speedily for the economic benefit of all concerned.

A good approach to planning can bring many benefits at national and local levels. Bringing

planning policy back to communities is an important step forward. The publication of the "National Planning Framework 3—Main Issues Report and Draft Framework" in April 2013, prior to NPF3 being put out for consultation, is a step in the right direction that provides an avenue through which communities that will be affected by proposed national developments can at an early stage make known their opinions.

The fact that NPF3 and the SPP are being put out to consultation simultaneously will, I hope, prove to be cost effective and might limit consultation fatigue, as well as going a long way towards ensuring a more cohesive approach as we move forward. The minister must bring confidence to all those who are affected by planning decisions that their views are heard and taken on board prior to decisions being made.

I thank all the organisations that have contributed to the debate and look forward over the coming months to further discussions on the issues that have been raised today.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** Some members have not used up their full allocation of time, so there are a few seconds in hand if members wish to take interventions from this stage onwards.

15:48

**Jim Hume (South Scotland) (LD):** I welcome this opportunity to debate the Scottish Government's on-going work in producing a third national planning framework and updated Scottish planning policy. The third national planning framework is a vital document for two reasons. The first is obvious: it serves as the long-term strategy for the development of nationally important projects that are central to the Scottish Government's key objectives.

The second reason is that this is the first NPF that has been produced against a backdrop of a difficult financial climate. As a result, the document must have a strong focus on economic growth and on increasing the attractiveness of Scotland for global investment opportunities. To do so, the Scottish Government must ensure that our infrastructure and environment are fit for purpose, so I welcome the consultation process.

The main issues report rightly highlights that housing is a key policy concern because of the projected increase in the number of Scottish households during the next two decades, with the strain being felt particularly in certain areas. One such area is East Lothian in the South Scotland region, and I know that there are particular challenges in sourcing appropriate land for development there due to much of it being high quality arable land. Nonetheless, the land will need to be sourced.

The Scottish Government has blamed the economic downturn for the much lower than expected level of housing development since NPF2 was published. That cannot be overlooked as a factor, but nor can the reduction in the subsidy that is available to housing associations, which has fallen from £70,000 to £40,000 per home. That was a decision entirely of the Scottish Government's making that has, as was revealed last week, contributed to a 32 per cent reduction in housing association completions.

**John Wilson:** Would Mr Hume agree that some of the delays to housing developments are the result of local authorities not acting as speedily as they could have to resolve issues regarding development decisions?

**Jim Hume:** I am sure that that is quite correct, but it is also quite correct that housing associations are having difficulty with funding.

When we consider the sharp decline in approvals and starts for homes for social rent, it is clear that attempts to achieve the Scottish Government's flagship housing target will be further complicated in the coming years of this session of Parliament. I absolutely accept that developers have had difficulty in securing finance, but the Government cannot absolve itself of all responsibility.

I was particularly keen to see onshore wind developments discussed in both documents. As a South Scotland member, my inbox is dominated by concerns about developments throughout my region, some of which are clearly in inappropriate locations. On Monday, I was in Straiton in Ayrshire speaking to constituents who are concerned about plans to erect more than 130 giant turbines in their stunningly beautiful valley.

Local authorities and my constituents are crying out for clear national guidance from the Scottish Government to help to ensure a fairer and more robust planning process. Unfortunately, the draft Scottish planning policy is somewhat weak on that when it insists that

"We remain of the view that planning authorities are best placed to plan for onshore wind at the local level".

To establish the commendable target of

"at least 100% of gross electricity consumption from renewables by 2020",

then to tell councils to get on with it, when they are inundated with onshore wind applications, is an example of buck passing. I see more and more of the larger developments go straight to the Scottish Government.

**Derek Mackay:** If Jim Hume believes that it is not for local authorities to find the right sites, it must be for someone else. Does he suggest that

we centralise all decisions on wind farm locations in Edinburgh, or at the reporters unit in Falkirk?

**Jim Hume:** No. We should have a broad consultation and find a good strategy for Scotland, in which we can best decide where wind farms should be, rather than property developers leading the way.

I agreed with the minister when he gave evidence to the Local Government and Regeneration Committee that developments need to be in the right places. However, it is not enough for the Scottish Government to state its "wish" that national parks and national scenic areas remain untouched. That is not a definitive statement. It is time that clear national guidance was produced.

I was pleased to see as a national development the creation and improvement of long-distance paths and trails. Coincidentally, a joint report by Sustrans Scotland and Transform Scotland yesterday highlighted that cycling tourism is worth £240 million annually. I hope that with the plans that are outlined in the document, that could be improved upon significantly. As well as the obvious tourism marketing potential of a walking and cycling network across Scotland's outstanding landscapes, it would help to promote active travel among Scots and have the dual benefit of promoting healthier and less polluting forms of travel.

There is no doubt that the main issues report has some worthwhile national objectives, such as Ravenscraig, electricity grid reinforcements, the central Scotland green network and improvements to our ports. Those will make Scotland more competitive and should assist in meeting our climate change obligations, which I regret to say we are not currently fulfilling. The failure to achieve our climate change targets for a second time should be a serious concern not only for the Scottish Government but for all of us.

I welcome the focus on transitioning Scotland towards a low-carbon economy, but of course talk is cheap, so the objectives in the document must be followed through with greater commitment and energy than has been displayed thus far, if we are to achieve our legally binding emissions obligations.

15:55

**Stuart McMillan (West Scotland) (SNP):** The debate is about an important issue: developing policies, plans and frameworks that will determine the future development of Scotland. As the topic is so wide ranging and our time for the debate somewhat limited, I will restrict myself to discussing a few key issues, including the regeneration of previously developed sites, the role of public involvement in the planning system,

and the future of tourism as a growth sector in our economy.

I thank the minister for his appearance at the Local Government and Regeneration Committee in May at which the national planning framework 3 and Scottish planning policy were discussed. Members of the committee, including me, were able to question the minister on key aspects of the future of the planning system in Scotland. During that evidence session, I was pleased to hear the minister state that he wanted a planning system that would

“focus on delivering jobs and growth”

and

“facilitate investment in infrastructure”.

That reflects the Scottish National Party's 2011 manifesto commitment, which said that

“a more efficient and effective planning system will be good for investment and growth.”

I am sure that that approach will be welcomed by many here today.

At the Local Government and Regeneration Committee, the minister also said that the Scottish Government is committed

“to making a transition to a sustainable, growing, low-carbon economy ... the primary focus of”

its

“proposals for the third national planning framework.”—  
[*Official Report, Local Government and Regeneration Committee*, 22 May 2013; c 2151-2.]

As part of that, there must be a focus on areas that were previously developed but which are now, in effect, economically challenged communities. Regeneration is vital for such areas. I was therefore delighted to hear John Pentland's comments about Ravenscraig and his welcome for Ravenscraig's inclusion as one of the national development areas.

There are too many such sites in Scotland as a whole, and far too many in the west of Scotland in particular. I am happy that the Firth of Clyde area has been identified in the national planning framework as an area in which major change is happening or anticipated to guide the implementation of the national strategy. Regeneration is one of the key issues for the Firth of Clyde area; the others include green infrastructure and supporting investment in key economic sectors.

As I said, there are far too many areas in the west of Scotland in which regeneration is an issue. We need to encourage investment and development in such areas to breathe new life into their communities. I hope that the focus of the new planning framework and planning policy on

economic growth will result in developments in such areas that will stimulate their local economies and bring much-needed employment. It is good to hear the minister talk of removing barriers to planning to help the economic development of our country. I know that, as other members have said, in some local authority areas in the west of Scotland, those barriers have been significant.

It is important that the public's view is not ignored. I am pleased that the use of charettes in promoting early engagement and intervention is to be rolled out. I am sure that that will help to improve community involvement in the planning process, and I hope that it will ensure that those involved in the local economy and local elected representatives will have significant input in future developments that promote jobs and growth.

We in the Local Government and Regeneration Committee started our regeneration inquiry today, and community involvement is a key issue that arose not only in our discussion today but when we have done other pieces of work. Rather than things being done to a community, we must ensure that the community genuinely has a full and thorough input into what is going on in its area. Without such input, communities will not fully progress.

Public involvement in the planning system is crucial. Enabling local communities to have a say at the pre-application stage, through charrettes or some other process, will help to allay fears and will enable developers to adjust their plans so that local objections are minimised. Such an approach can help to make planning a more consensual activity than it has been in the past, when communities have felt that their views have been ignored.

Tourism is an important element of the Scottish economy and there is scope for more investment and jobs throughout the sector. The main issues report explores how the framework can support sustainable tourism.

I raised with the minister at the Local Government and Regeneration Committee the huge success of the cruise ship market. During the past year, more than £42 million came into the Scottish economy as a consequence of cruise ship tourism. In May, more than 10,000 cruise ship passengers visited Greenock, which demonstrates the extent of the tourism potential in Inverclyde. The industry plays a huge role in bringing in additional revenue to the Scottish and Inverclyde economies, but the port of Greenock will turn vessels away this year, due to a lack of capacity. Discussions are going on between the Scottish Government and the port's owners and operators, to ascertain whether assistance can be provided. I welcome those discussions. I was pleased with

the minister's response to my questions, and I hope that there will be a successful outcome.

I welcome this debate on the national planning framework 3 and Scottish planning policy, which will help to set the context for a modern planning system, with a focus on regeneration and growth. I am sure that that approach will be successful for Scotland.

16:01

**Kenneth Gibson (Cunninghame North) (SNP):** First, I apologise to Anne McTaggart for not thanking her for accepting my intervention earlier.

In the current economic climate, it is more important than ever to ensure that we have a well-considered and detailed planning framework, which will help to support recovery, attract investment to Scotland, create the maximum number of jobs and bring the greatest benefit to our society.

Of course, economic benefits, although they are vital, must not be allowed to undermine Scotland's natural environment. We must also be mindful of our commitment on and contribution to the reduction of harmful greenhouse gases. The draft national planning framework meets both key requirements—more so than NPF2 did.

I am the member for Cunninghame North, and for my constituents the most important aspect of NPF3 is the removal of any possibility that a coal-fired power station will be built at Hunterston. I have campaigned against the proposal, along with community and environmental groups, for a number of years. Indeed, I contacted every adult in the communities that would have been affected, detailing how they could register their opposition to the proposal, and I submitted a 28-page objection to the Scottish energy consents unit in August 2010.

The application to build the power station generated some 21,000 objections—more than any other application has generated in Scottish planning history. I am happy to say that in the face of such vociferous opposition, and as a result of funding uncertainty, Ayrshire Power Ltd withdrew its application to build the unwanted power plant.

SNP councillors on North Ayrshire Council supported, and delivered, the removal of the potential coal plant from the local development plan. For a host of other reasons, it is now highly unlikely that a similar application will be submitted. However, the possibility remained of great concern to local residents and environmental groups.

Of course, such a decision should not be taken purely on the basis of local opposition. If we consider the proposal in the national context, we

can see that its continued inclusion would be contrary to the Scottish Government's stated objectives.

Paul Wheelhouse MSP, the Minister for Environment and Climate Change, recently reaffirmed the Scottish Government's commitment to combating climate change:

"A low carbon economy is not only essential to address our need to reduce global emissions, but it will bring significant economic benefits and opportunities for our communities, businesses and industry and our environment—that is why we are committed to working with the people of Scotland to maximise those opportunities and address possibly the greatest challenge facing society today."

I completely agree. Scotland's emissions have fallen by 24.3 per cent since 1990. We are ahead of the rest of the UK and are now more than half way towards achieving our world-leading target of reducing emissions by 42 per cent by 2020. Therefore, allowing, let alone encouraging, the construction of a coal-fired power station at Hunterston would have been a step in the wrong direction.

On 9 November 2012, I submitted a detailed response to the consultation on NPF3, requesting that a new power station at Hunterston be removed from the framework. I also corresponded and discussed the power station's removal with the Minister for Local Government and Planning, the Cabinet Secretary for Finance, Employment and Sustainable Growth and the Minister for Energy, Enterprise and Tourism. I am particularly pleased that the Scottish Government has listened to my concerns and the concerns of my constituents, and that it now does

"not consider there to be a need to retain a new power station at Hunterston as a national development in NPF3."

Taking the decision to remove any potential for a coal-fired power station at Hunterston from NPF3 will reassure my constituents and will be a great relief to them.

**Patrick Harvie:** I strongly commend Mr Gibson for his work on the Hunterston coal-fired power station issue, but is not there still a difficulty? We consult on what should be designated as national priorities and he, as one of only 26 individuals, responds to oppose the Hunterston coal-fired power station proposal. However, it takes 22,000 individual objections to oppose the development. Do not we still need to do better on local democratic accountability?

**Kenneth Gibson:** We can always do better—there is a lot of truth in that. To be fair, the application took a very long time to come to fruition. There was a public inquiry and the application was withdrawn before the inquiry concluded. We should, of course, always work towards more democratic accountability.

Regarding energy production and the environment, I was pleased to note that proposals that are being brought forward may outlaw the construction of wind farms in Scotland's national parks and designated scenic areas. Onshore wind energy is clearly an important part of Scotland's progressive blend of energy production, but that step is certainly a welcome development that will do much to ensure that Scotland retains its place as one of the world's most scenic nations.

I attempted to bring forward a member's bill to protect Scotland's regional parks from such developments, but found after two years of deliberations and discussions with the non-Executive bills unit that the reserved provisions of the Electricity Act 1989 made that impossible. I am therefore keen to hear from the Government about how that protection for national parks will be achieved and whether it will consider extending such protections to regional parks, which surely should be classified as scenic areas and deserve to be safeguarded.

On another matter that relates to my constituency, I am pleased to note that the updated airport enhancements incorporate wider plans for investment, including improvements to surface access, airport facilities and the creation of master plans for Glasgow and Prestwick airports. I am confident that improvements to both those key transport hubs will help to ensure that Scotland continues to punch above its weight in relation to foreign direct investment, will help to mitigate the adverse impact of air passenger duty on those airports, and will create and sustain jobs.

Commitments to high-speed rail between Glasgow and Edinburgh and south to London are also extremely welcome. When they are delivered, they will offer Scotland a competitive advantage by creating a rail service to serve those who wish to do business in Scotland as well as the general public.

Against the backdrop of cuts to public spending and reduced private investment, the measures in NPF3 are to be welcomed. They set out a clear and ambitious development strategy for the next 20 to 30 years. The framework delivers on a number of fronts. It will help to create jobs and make Scotland an attractive place in which to do business and invest. Further, it is conscious of Scotland's unique scenic landscapes and mindful of our global responsibility to help to protect our environment for ourselves and future generations.

16:08

**Malcolm Chisholm (Edinburgh Northern and Leith) (Lab):** I should first confess that, over the past seven years, I have probably done less on planning than on any other policy area, apart from

rural affairs, but I enjoyed reading the national planning framework 3, the Scottish planning policy consultation document and the *Official Report* of the minister's appearance before the Local Government and Regeneration Committee.

I certainly welcome much in the documents. I think that it is generally admitted that the most significant change in Scottish planning policy relates to onshore wind and that everybody welcomes what is proposed. I also welcome what the national planning framework says about the need to develop infrastructure for the expansion of offshore wind. I particularly thank the minister for giving Leith a mention on page 25, and certainly look forward to offshore wind manufacturers starting in Leith—I hope before too long.

In general, the new national developments should be welcomed, because nearly all of them seem to be related to renewable energy and climate change. That does not take away from some of the wider concerns about climate change that Patrick Harvie and Sarah Boyack have raised.

The issue of housing has been raised. The more generous allocation of land that is recommended for housing is another important part of Scottish planning policy.

Although in general I welcome the documents, it is one thing to have a policy and another thing to implement it. When the minister gave evidence, he said that the

"interpretation of planning policy across the country is too variable."—[*Official Report, Local Government and Regeneration Committee*, 22 May 2013; c 2163.]

That raises the issue that always runs through planning debates of the tensions between different players in the planning system, which featured strongly in debates around the Planning etc (Scotland) Act 2006. There are tensions between the community, local authorities, the Government—and, in 2006, there were also the relative powers of the Government and Parliament. I should tell the minister that, at the time, his back benchers, including Bruce Crawford, argued that the Parliament should have the final say on the national planning framework—I am not sure whether Bruce Crawford would say that today.

I suppose that my own prejudice would be to give communities a bit more power and influence. There was progress on early involvement in the 2006 act, with the participation statement in the NPF and a lot of engagement, but communities would probably like a bigger say.

Perhaps it will surprise the minister and others if I say that—possibly—a bit more power should sometimes be given to the Government. I was concerned when the current Government weakened the requirements on local government

to notify the Government, which were quite strong in 2006. Such requirements keep a check on what can sometimes be an arbitrary local government power. Perhaps Sarah Boyack will forgive me for reminding members—I suppose that I am telling a lot of people who were not here at the time—that in 2006 she supported a community right of notification. Indeed, she voted against me and the Government of the day on that very matter—something that I know would never happen with SNP back benchers these days. However, she had a point, because we need checks and balances in the system, and it worries me that nobody can really stop local government doing something that it wants to do.

The other tensions are around land use. I have only time to mention tensions around economic development, housing and green space.

Patrick Harvie and Sarah Boyack made good points about the way in which “sustainable economic growth” has replaced “sustainable development”, which is the term that is used in the 2006 act. Economic growth is also a stronger material consideration in Scottish planning policy. Obviously, economic growth is important—I am not altogether with Patrick Harvie on that one—but there is a fear about economic growth crowding out other interests. I am slightly nervous about that, along with Sarah Boyack and Patrick Harvie. I am not quite sure why we had to change the language.

I very much welcome the strong statement about green space on page 39 of the Scottish planning policy document. However, interestingly, there is sometimes a tension between housing and green space. I have an example of that in my constituency, at city park, which used to be the football ground of the Spartans Football Club. It is hard for me to oppose a housing application, because we need more housing. However, although there is all the land at the waterfront in my constituency that could be used for housing, it looks as if a very highly valued piece of green space might disappear. I think that the words on page 39 are important—it is really a presumption against developing open space. However, how do we make sure that local government follows Scottish planning policy? That leads back to the point that if there are no notification requirements and there is no community right of notification, how do we enforce Scottish planning policy?

I have only one minute left, but I want to mention Margaret Mitchell's amendment. Enforcement is very important: it is key to maintaining public confidence. I have another issue in my constituency—this time on enforcement. Recently, one of the tram contractors used Shrub Place, which is part of Leith Walk, to dump all sorts of materials, which

caused local residents great distress. It had no planning permission for that activity so, as is routine, it was asked to put in a planning application. In the meantime, the work continued. That concerns me. The public would feel much better if work had to stop when someone did something without planning permission. I seem to remember from the 2006 act that a stop notice can be put on, but that never seems to happen. Enforcement is very important. I am glad that the minister has accepted Margaret Mitchell's amendment.

I was going to say something about unconventional gas extraction, but I see that my six minutes are up. I tend to agree with what Patrick Harvie said about that.

16:14

**Clare Adamson (Central Scotland) (SNP):** I am very glad to speak in the debate on the draft national planning framework and the draft Scottish planning policy document.

I grew up in Lanarkshire. Of course, New Lanark is one of the most famous successes of place making in not only Scotland but, possibly, the world. It was Robert Owen's vision and included a factory, workers' housing, schools, a place of worship, shops—which were at the forefront of the co-operative movement—and the very first workplace nursery in the world.

Today, New Lanark is acclaimed as a world heritage site and Lanarkshire is proud of its heritage and of New Lanark's place in our industrial history. Everyone in the chamber would recognise that it is highly unlikely that an enterprise such as that could get planning permission in Scotland today, as it was built on an undeveloped and unspoilt site, but it is right that that is so.

National planning framework 3 should give us the balance of needs in our country, and I do not have a problem with the phrase “balanced growth” in the motion. I do not have a problem with balance at all. If planning is about anything, it is about balancing our economic and environmental needs and the future of our country.

I welcome the themes in the policy document, which focuses on sustainable economic growth, with more emphasis on economic benefits.

The proposed planning system will support well-designed, successful, sustainable places where people want to live, visit and invest. The national planning policy and framework will support ambitions for a low-carbon economy, which is crucial for our country's future, and the planning system will support ambitions to respect, enhance and make responsible use of our natural and

cultural assets. The policy should be one that continues to focus on sustainable economic growth, but with more emphasis on economic benefits. That is key. I do not have a problem with the wording around this issue; it is clear that both draft documents give us the opportunity to achieve the right balance for our country's future.

The Government has mentioned taking a holistic approach to considering the relationship between buildings, natural resources, movement and utilities, all of which are key to getting the balance right. The focus should be on positive place making, of which New Lanark is one of the most famous and most successful examples. The approach is based on six qualities: distinctive, welcoming, adaptable, resource efficient, safe and pleasant, and easy to move around and beyond. I look forward to the forthcoming policy on architecture and place, which will also show how we can encourage good design and create the kind of places that we would all like to visit and to live and work in.

As a member for Central Scotland, I echo Margaret Mitchell's comments about what the policy will mean for Central Scotland as a region. I welcome the Grangemouth and Peterhead carbon capture and storage schemes, the central Scotland green network, and the national cycling and walking network, which will cover all three local authorities in Central Scotland.

I hope that members will not mind if, as someone who was born and brought up in Motherwell, I also focus on something that has already been mentioned quite a bit this afternoon—the Ravenscraig site. It is not the white canvas that Robert Owen had in New Lanark, but it is perhaps the nearest thing that we have to that in Scotland. It is the biggest brownfield site in Europe, and the development of Ravenscraig will give us a great opportunity to get the balance right in our community—a balance that will meet the needs of the existing towns of Motherwell and Wishaw, and provide economic opportunities.

It is 30 years since Ravenscraig closed, and the initial plans for the site included a new town centre, major leisure facilities, housing, business, industry, hotels and a railway station, as John Pentland mentioned—the whole package of new town community facilities and road improvements. It is a hugely ambitious project, but something that is desperately needed in Lanarkshire. When we consider what businesses and industries might come back to Lanarkshire, I hope that we will be able to build on the history of technology and engineering in the area, perhaps looking to opportunities in the oil and gas sector and in new technologies.

The site is not empty at the moment. Motherwell College has developed its residential unit as a

circle, alluding to the Ravenscraig towers. The regional sports centre has already been used for the international children's games, and is a possible training centre for the 2014 Commonwealth games. It is interesting that the shape of the steel coming out of the manufacturing process has been captured in the design of those buildings at Ravenscraig.

Sarah Boyack mentioned innovation. The most exciting thing at Ravenscraig at the moment is the Building Research Establishment innovation park, where six sustainable and carbon-efficient houses are going to be built. BRE is working closely with the college to ensure that the skills to build sustainable housing developments will be acquired by people in the area.

I welcome the policy as a great opportunity. If we get the balance right, it will be wonderful for Scotland. I finish with a note of optimism from Robert Owen. In 1816, he said that

"no obstacle whatsoever intervenes at this moment except ignorance to prevent such a state of society from becoming universal".

I believe that that is the case, and that we can achieve it.

16:20

**Nigel Don (Angus North and Mearns) (SNP):**

Given that I am speaking 15th this afternoon, I have to register that there may not be much new to say. However, I shall try to find something and I shall succeed, I assure members. That is not to gainsay all the things that have been said before. I am entirely supportive of the documents and congratulate the Government and the minister on what they have achieved. Nevertheless, I will bring up perhaps half a dozen issues to which we should give some thought.

I echo Sarah Boyack's comments about combined heat and power, which I do not think that anybody else has picked up on. In Aberdeen, what is essentially an aircraft engine is attached to an alternator and the heat that is generated through that process warms the adjacent tower blocks. That is a standard bit of technology that has been around for my entire professional lifetime, but it is the kind of thing that we should be trying to put in areas of high-density housing. We know where they are, and I suggest to the minister that we must find ways of progressing that. I know that it is burning gas, but we will be burning quite a lot of gas for quite some time and it is an extraordinarily efficient way of generating electricity and using what would otherwise be waste heat to deliver low-grade heat into buildings. It is entirely the right way forward thermodynamically and I commend it to the Government.

Rather nearer my constituency is the Aberdeen western peripheral route. I do not think that it has yet been pointed out in this debate that it has seemed to take for ever for that project to begin. I wonder whether the Government has given any thought to the timetabling of the work. I understand that it is going through the courts, but it is not entirely outwith the Parliament's remit to consider how the courts deal with such things and whether, in the future, something like that should be allowed to take so long. I think that we need to address that, please.

Becoming distinctly more parochial, I now focus on Montrose harbour, which appears in the documents. I ask members to register the thought that the throughput through Montrose harbour is less than 1 million tonnes a year. That appears to be a cut-off point for the map, but there is also a relevant cut-off point for the funding that the trans-European transport network generates. I have here a document from John Paterson of Montrose Port Authority, who explains that a threshold of 1.5 million tonnes of cargo applies to European funding. That appears to be a completely arbitrary level, but it means that a relatively small but quite substantial port such as Montrose does not have access to European funding, which is really quite important in the context of its development. I wonder whether the Government might give that some thought as well, please.

I reflect on my days as a councillor in Dundee and on Mike MacKenzie's comments on planning resource. I do not wish to criticise Dundee City Council—we tried quite hard—but I am conscious that, because of a lack of resources, we sometimes struggled to do things at speed that our constituents wanted us to do. The minister said that more money has gone into this, but I think that we should be setting some serious targets and ensuring that they are met so that planning matters are progressed on time. Given the minister's local government experience I am sure that he has that in mind, but I would like some reassurance that that will happen. The planning process should not hold anybody up unnecessarily.

I would also like confirmation of something that I thought that I heard the minister say about sustainable economic development, which has been the subject of much discussion. It is fundamental that economic development is to be taken as a material consideration. However, I return to something that Stuart McMillan and others have pointed out: there needs to be community involvement in any planning application, because there are many communities around the country that feel that they have been told about economic development that will result in X hundred jobs, but by the time the process has finished, X hundred jobs have disappeared

because some small part of the application has been forgotten about and the slightly more efficient bit has been left behind. We need to ensure that we play fair with communities in that process.

A map of long-distance cycling and walking routes is in NPF3—it is map 11. In my constituency, much of the route is on main roads. We should be moving to a position in which it is possible to go for a cycling holiday around Scotland without having to go anywhere near a main road, although I recognise that some bits of the route will have to use minor roads, which, in some respects, can be just as dangerous to cyclists as main roads, because drivers do not expect to find them there. We need to have such a vision. I would like it to be possible to get off the train at Montrose—as I will do later tonight—get on the bike and cycle to Brechin, which is where I would like to stop, and then up Glen Esk into the Cairngorm national park. That ought to be perfectly possible. It would not cost a fortune to make that feasible. I commend that thought to the minister and the chamber.

My final reflection is on town centres, of which there are five in my constituency. I think that I am not the only one who is noticing that shops are closing in towns—even ones that are not large—some of which will never reopen. That is simply because we now shop online and use supermarkets, which will deliver. I know that a fund is being worked on to ensure that such premises can be brought back into residential use. I am sure that that is a good thing, but we need to work on it fairly quickly, because there are vacant premises that will not reopen as shops.

I am sorry to end by making a few asks of the minister.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer (John Scott):** We move to closing speeches.

16:26

**Patrick Harvie:** I apologise to the Presiding Officer if some of the language that I used earlier might have been unparliamentary. I must admit that I thought that we had to go rather further than I did to cross the line, but any offence that was caused was entirely unintentional.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** I am grateful for your apology nonetheless; thank you.

**Patrick Harvie:** I think that I said in my opening speech that planning was sometimes not thought of as a particularly sexy subject, but I admit that the planning nerd in me has got a bit of a kick out of the debate—I have enjoyed it very much.

It is natural that there are things in the documents that we are discussing that all members have been able to welcome, and I hope



that my amendment reflects the fact that there are things to welcome from my perspective. The central Scotland green network has been mentioned, as have sustainable and active travel, renewables and the electricity grid. Although many of us will always come to the chamber and say that we want more or that we want a strong focus on such things, I put it on record that there are aspects of the documents that I welcome and which I hope will be strengthened rather than downgraded in the final draft.

However, as I have mentioned, there are aspects of the documents that need to be questioned. For example, I question whether the Captain project—the coal gasification plant—will be fully CCS compliant from day 1 of its operation and whether it will be prevented from continuing to operate if the CCS technology does not achieve what it sets out to achieve. I also question the role that the Scottish Government sees unconventional gas extraction having. It will add ever more to our stocks of fossil fuels. That is a threat, not an opportunity.

In transport, the emphasis continues to be on aviation expansion. In addition, some detail is missing. I mentioned the issue of individual turbines, which I look forward to pursuing with the minister. I had hoped to hear something about the Government's target for community-owned land and community-owned energy. A clearer emphasis in the planning system on achieving those things might have been helpful.

I want to reflect on Sarah Boyack's speech. I very much welcomed the thrust of it and the critique that she offered of sustainable economic growth. I welcome her to that argument, which I have been making since the Government introduced the term to its programme back in 2007, and I would be happy to share some of my best lines with her, if she is interested. I particularly enjoy describing sustainable economic growth as the Government's central contradiction, because as well as being inherently unsustainable, the relentless pursuit of GDP growth fails to achieve economic justice, equality or human wellbeing when it takes place in already wealthy societies.

I also welcome Sarah Boyack's comments on housing and energy, including heat, and hope that the minister will reflect on that argument before producing the final proposals for both documents.

However, from a Green perspective, it is understandable that many of the arguments in which I have involved myself in this debate have been about the issue of growth. It is clear that from now on economic growth considerations will trump—I use that word quite consciously—environmental considerations. After all, as happened in the Menie estate scandal, when big

money talks, the Scottish planning system seems to roll over.

My former colleagues from the Economy, Energy and Tourism Committee, Mike MacKenzie and Chic Brodie, took issue with the Green analysis of growth. After calling for the Government to use clearer language, Mr Brodie attempted to define the term “sustainable economic growth”—and after listening to his effort, I can only advise the minister to look elsewhere for a plain English consultant. Mr Brodie also suggested that before we can achieve social and environmental objectives we need economic activity to generate wealth. My response to that is no—before we can sustain any kind of economy, we must come to live within the ecological limits that the planet itself has laid down. Before we can have a good society, we must challenge the selfish values of the current economic model.

Kenny Gibson offered a definition of sustainable economic growth from, I think, the OECD. I will read the *Official Report* to see his precise form of words, but I am pretty sure that the Government does not report its own economic progress in line with that definition. However, the OECD offers a rather shorter definition of the term as

“that which sustains human and environmental as well as economic capital.”

Although that is interesting, I think that there is very little difference between that and sustainable development. If so, I have to question why sustainable development has been replaced by growth as the central objective in the planning system.

That said, I want to twist this argument into something more positive. The Government's other NPF—the national performance framework—has positive scope to move us beyond GDP in the same way that the Government's adviser Joseph Stiglitz has argued that the world itself should move beyond GDP. That is why it is so troubling to see growth enshrined not only in policy but in law, as the Government is doing in the Regulatory Reform (Scotland) Bill, before that debate on alternatives to GDP progresses.

Frankly, if the Green Party, of all people, did not challenge that notion, I would wonder what it was for. Mine might be the only amendment tonight that is not supported by the chamber and it might well be that the Greens will be the only people voting against the Government motion, but as a wise philosopher once said:

“It's not that easy bein' green”.

I think, especially at the end of a debate such as this, that it is the only colour I want to be.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** Thank you very much—and thank you for your contribution to the OED.

16:33

**Alex Johnstone (North East Scotland) (Con):** First of all, I welcome not only the publication of the two documents before us but much of their content. Although I disagree with certain points, the broad thrust of what they contain appeals to the Conservative side of the chamber.

That said, I must take issue with one or two speakers. Mike MacKenzie's comments about the use of plain English stood in stark contrast to the way in which the minister opened the debate, which gave me the clear impression that this morning his office had been playing buzzword bingo. The jargon, the planning-speak, the clichés, the alliteration and even onomatopoeia were to the fore in great scale but through the mist I could detect a number of issues with which I could agree.

I and many other people in the debate have talked about the commitment to town centres. Our town centres form a vital part of our country; in fact, Scotland can be defined by its smaller and medium-sized market towns and, if they are allowed to die, the very heart of Scotland will disappear. The most heartfelt plea for Scotland's town centres came from Anne McTaggart, during whose speech I got the clear indication that some shop to live while others live to shop.

An interesting discussion took place when the minister himself suggested that some people took the view that the NPF document was all about wind farms. We all know that, in fact, it is just mostly about wind farms. The issue that was raised—significantly by Patrick Harvie—was about where we choose to put wind farms and some of the minister's language on that is the kind of language that we have been asking for from successive planning ministers for years. However, I am not entirely convinced that this process will deliver strategic guidance on the timescale that many of us would like, even now.

On the subject of whether a single wind turbine constitutes a wind farm, I am no expert in that area. However, I can look back at this Parliament's history and point out that, during the passage of the hunting bill, we received advice that one dog could in fact constitute a pack. I do not know whether that point can be carried over.

On the issue of grid enhancement for the distribution of electricity, it is essential that we all back the principle of grid enhancement as a key element of what we try to do in the long term. We know that it is not easy; the experience of the Beaulieu to Denny line and the planning process

that that had to go through will make it extremely difficult for us to progress grid enhancement as quickly as we would all like. Although there are those of us who are concerned about the massive spread of wind farms, it is of course the case that if we are to develop environmentally based electricity sources in the long term, Scotland's grid must be enhanced. For that reason, we look forward to rising to that challenge as well.

An interesting point in the debate was when Sarah Boyack seemed to suggest that we are still in a recession. I do not believe that Scotland is in a recession; I believe that we are doing extremely well. In fact, the employment figures that were announced earlier today indicate that Scotland is even doing rather better from the far-sighted and ambitious policies of George Osborne than the rest of the United Kingdom is. That advantage might have been accrued from the fact that we here in Scotland were freed from the dead hand of Labour control a full three years before the UK was and, consequently, we had a head start.

I move on to an area that is perhaps critical of the Government. Margaret Mitchell spoke at some length about the enforcement issues that surround planning and it would be remiss of me if I did not raise the issue that I have raised before in relation to this subject—that of timescales. The efficiency of the planning system in Scotland is vital to our economic wellbeing. We all know that planning applications can be contentious and even divisive in communities, but the situation that we find ourselves in is that planning applications—major planning applications in particular—are taking longer and longer.

Anything that was deemed to be a major development in the third quarter of 2012-13, which are the most recent figures that I have, was taking 36 weeks. Individual times ranged from eight weeks right through to an astonishing 84 weeks. That is 84 weeks of frustration and delay, bringing with it the continuing risk that another local economy might miss out on investment. Processing times, including legal agreements, make further grim reading, with an average of 103 weeks. That is almost two years to process an application, which is not fair on investors or on the communities that may be opposing those developments.

As I bring my remarks to a conclusion, I wish to say more about unconventional gas. I believe that the documents describe it as an opportunity. I believe that it is an opportunity that we must explore in order to create the jobs and wealth that gas production can bring, as well as providing the opportunity to cut energy costs. With that said, I will bring my remarks to a conclusion—

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** I would be grateful if you would.

**Alex Johnstone:** At five o'clock tonight, the minister will have the support of the Conservatives, whether he likes it or not.

16:39

**Sarah Boyack:** I am delighted to follow that.

My point, which was a serious one, related to housing—even though new jobs are being created as we speak, the housing market has not turned round. I was told at a recent council briefing that the social housing investment process is broken. A key problem is that, although there is aspiration across the country and land that has been cleared and has planning permission, the developers cannot afford to put houses on to the plots. That is a huge issue in Edinburgh.

The minister will be aware that having a five-year land supply that is viable, capable of being developed and marketable is a difficult issue. On paper, that may look totally sensible but, in Edinburgh, for example, where the local plan is about to be delivered, the council had thought that it was about to get thousands of new houses from the waterfront development as Malcolm Chisholm mentioned, but there is now a massive shortfall from that site. That will not be made up easily anywhere else in the city—certainly not instantly.

I understand that the local authority will be asked to increase dramatically the amount of available land. The developers say that they can build just more than 5,000 houses in the next five years. However, there is land for 42,000 houses. There is a gap between land that is identified for development and land that has planning clearance but where there simply is not the money to develop it. In Edinburgh, we could end up with a free-for-all. However brownfield sites are described—they are also described as formerly developed or gap sites—they will not be as attractive as green-belt land.

The minister needs to take a sharp look at that issue. We must ensure that there is not a free-for-all. We must get away from the position in which land is available and identified for development but the developers cannot make it work. That goes to the heart of issues to do with public and private sector investment.

What has happened with the Scottish Government's investment in housing is not helping. I hope that the minister will agree to meet me. The issue was raised by the City of Edinburgh Council in its quarterly planning briefing. It also came up in a discussion that we had with a number of local authorities around Edinburgh, because other authorities do not want to take up Edinburgh's housing slack. It has become a regional issue but, at the end of the day, no one will win because the land will not become available

for development and we will not get the industry development or the houses that we need.

Planning is seen as the problem rather than the solution. Planning cannot be the obstruction to development; it must be about how we get the right development and a positive process for shaping our communities for future development. That is about all our aspirations for development.

There is a particular requirement on members to ensure that our communities understand that there is a national planning framework and that, once the Government has agreed the priorities and the matter has been through the parliamentary process, the projects in it will in effect be approved. Therefore, the framework is a major issue for our constituents. Although there has been innovative work, I am not sure whether all our constituents who live in affected areas will be aware of the framework, so there is a challenge in that regard.

An issue that I will focus on is what the tools are for the job and who is carrying out the planning. A number of members have talked about the need to have faster planning and decision making. There is a tension here, to which Malcolm Chisholm referred. It is correct to have a much more up-front investment in planning consultation, but applications still need to meet the demands of communities, the planning system and the development industry. Reconciling those demands when they are different is the job of planning.

We must highlight that, although the minister is asking planning authorities to move faster, they have to do so with fewer planners. There are also fewer people in other council departments to support them. A Unison survey on planning staff came out today, which talks about the reduction in the number of planners in our local authorities: 60 per cent of planners who were interviewed described the level of cuts as "major" or "severe"; 53 per cent believe that there are further major or severe cuts to come, and 87 per cent believe that the overall service that is provided to the public is being "adversely affected". Therefore, there are major challenges in delivering the kind of planning system that we want.

We need a planning system that is responsive and swift yet deals with ever more complexity. However, there are major challenges in delivering on all the objectives in the draft Scottish planning policy document. To provide the right kind of infrastructure for development, for energy, for digital communications, for transport or for reduced CO<sub>2</sub> emissions requires a process whereby applications are tested against all those objectives. That will not always be achieved through a tick-box exercise but will often require a proper evaluation and judgment. The bit at the end that Malcolm Chisholm talked about—the

occasions when the Scottish Government needs to look at decisions that have been rubber-stamped at local level—also needs to be right.

All of that comes back to what the purpose of planning is. As I said in my opening remarks, sustainable development should be our starting point and economic growth must be part of that process. Whether we are in a recession or just in difficult economic times, I do not really care, but the point is that thousands upon thousands of young people are not getting jobs. Young people with five standard grades, who historically would never have got those standard grades, are entering a labour market where there are no jobs. We need to take economic issues into account but, as I said in my opening remarks, economic issues cannot trump everything else.

**Patrick Harvie** *rose—*

**Sarah Boyack:** The draft SPP document starts off with “Sustainable Economic Growth” and then goes on to “Sustainable Development”, whereas those should be the other way round. Climate change also needs to be factored in as part of that process.

I will take a brief intervention from Patrick Harvie. Presiding Officer, do I have eight minutes?

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** Yes, but you are in your last minute.

**Patrick Harvie:** Short-term considerations may be different, but we are passing policy that will last for the long term, even after the recession ends. Is there not a danger that growth will then become the priority when it need not be?

**Sarah Boyack:** My point is that, regardless of whether we are in good times or tough times, the decisions need to be right because they will be with us for the long term. We need to create jobs and to support industry, but we need to do that on the basis of thinking through the impacts. That is why the policy should not start off with sustainable economic growth, which cannot be defined properly. Sustainable development, which is included in legislation at international, European, UK and Scottish levels, should be our starting point. This is not about being against development but about being in favour of the right development and ensuring that we get that right for future generations. The planning system must be about the long term as well as the short term.

When planning gets it right, it delivers exciting things, such as national parks, the west Highland way and the cleaning up of the legacy of industrial sites in Falkirk and Stirling. Given the right resource, planning can deliver a huge amount, but it needs the right objectives—

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** You should be drawing to a close, please.

**Sarah Boyack:** The draft Scottish planning policy document is the place to get that framework right.

16:48

**Derek Mackay:** We have had a very good debate on national planning framework 3 and the Scottish planning policy.

Let me begin by following on from what Sarah Boyack said. I agree with her that planning decisions are for the short, medium and long term. We should not make decisions that affect only the short term without considering the long term. That is why the aspirations that are set out in NPF3—a transition to a low-carbon economy, becoming an area in which people want to invest, providing connectivity and having quality places—are important. I believe that there is a strong sense of sustainability and sustainable development within that.

On the economic cycle, clearly it would be beyond frustration to have a planning system that did not enable sustainable economic growth at this time to ensure that we build those quality places. All the speeches this afternoon, including the Greens’ comments, which were fully expected, help within that debate.

Let me be clear that the importance of sustainable development has not changed in the new policy documents. The shift is towards a greater understanding of economic impact in the planning process and in the weightings that are used. Frankly, I find it bizarre that, in some determinations on applications, the economic impact has not featured. Imagine hearing the great news today that there is more money for wage support schemes and youth employment to get young folk back into work, only to be told that it will take two years to process the planning application to realise that economic impact on the ground. The planning system should enable the right development in the right places.

**Patrick Harvie** *rose—*

**Derek Mackay:** I think that I took three interventions earlier but, to come on to one of Patrick Harvie’s points, the reason why I use the word “balance” is that I believe that there is a balance between the economic impact and environmental issues. I have said clearly that development is not necessarily at the expense of the environment. In fact, the investment and planning proposals will help us to realise our aspirations on the low-carbon economy through, for example, the proposals on housing, transport and particularly the decarbonisation of energy. I welcome the support for that in the renewables policy, which has various new proposed categories to give the clarity that Jim Hume is

looking for and to provide planning support for local authorities while still empowering them to find the right and most appropriate sites within the national parameters.

A couple of technical questions were raised. Margaret Mitchell asked about the town centre external advisory group report. The group will report imminently. We are waiting for it to conclude its report before the Government responds. My understanding is that we are a few weeks away from that, or perhaps even less. Therein lies an opportunity to extend the sequential approach in planning. I apologise to Mr Johnstone for having to turn to such language, but we have to expand the sequential approach to ensure that town centres give protection to more than just retail. Town centres will change from their traditional patterns and will have new functions. There will have to be some diversification and repopulation and so on. Therefore, the planning guidance on town centres will, I think, be strengthened.

There has been far more engagement on NPF3 than there was on earlier iterations—NPF2 and the original planning framework—which is to be welcomed. For example, this debate will inform the policies. I have been out personally to meet the public to discuss some of the priorities. There is an expectation that local planning priorities and designations will be consulted on, which includes through the community council liaison officers.

On further opportunities, we are considering other sources of energy, but environmental concerns and assessments must be taken into account. Those sources are not seen as an opportunity in isolation, as we must consider the environmental issues. Heat maps provide an opportunity to more adequately connect heat source with provision and demand in a way that has not been done before. There are opportunities for transport connections and for various networks to connect Scotland and enhance the opportunities for offshore renewables.

On renewables, some have said that the greater protection for the environment that will be afforded by the new policies will mean an overconcentration in areas that do not have that greater protection. However, that proliferation will not necessarily occur because, with repowering as well as the offshore opportunities and the changes in technology, one does not necessarily lead to the other. We can meet the renewables targets without some of the scare stories and fears about proliferation coming to pass. We are also consulting on cumulative impact and on extending the separation distances from communities.

There are further technology opportunities, such as permitted development in relation to digital technology. I recently spoke about that at the

Local Government and Regeneration Committee, which has considered some of the issues in detail.

On green infrastructure, there are fantastic opportunities to connect urban and rural communities and to connect ecosystems with economics. That is why the central Scotland green network is such a welcome and on-going project in the proposed developments.

I suppose that it is coincidence that we had 14 priorities in NPF2 and we have 14 in NPF3. Some of the previous ones have not continued, because they have been completed, have reached their consenting regime or are no longer appropriate, as Kenny Gibson explained in relation to Hunterston. Another example is the Commonwealth games projects, which will be concluded by the time we get to the implementation of NPF3 in June 2014.

The proposed national developments have been welcomed in this debate. I did not hear much dissent in relation to those that are proposed, including Ravenscraig. Some members have recognised that that represents an opportunity for the surrounding communities, not a threat to them, although I understand Mr Wilson's concerns. We have an opportunity to regenerate a part of Scotland that desperately needs it, bringing in not only housing, but education, a town centre and associated innovation.

The grid infrastructure enhancements to enable us to achieve our renewables and energy capacity targets are a wonderful opportunity.

**Sarah Boyack:** Could the minister update us on progress on building that grid infrastructure? I understand that there are currently some significant delays in the system.

**Derek Mackay:** Clearly, I cannot prejudice individual planning decisions. The framework creates the planning hierarchy that gives certainty for investors and planners about the infrastructure that we need in order to meet our ambitions as a nation. That, in essence, is what these documents are about.

Other new features include Dundee waterfront, with a connection between it and the city; the regeneration of Ravenscraig, which we have touched on; Aberdeen harbour, which has reached capacity and has room for expansion to enhance the economic vibrancy of the area; the Grangemouth investment zone; the high-speed rail connections; and the strategic airport enhancements, which are vital to allowing us to use airports as dynamic places in which we can do business, connect to the world and realise our local economic growth plans.

Performance is clearly an issue in the planning system. That is why we have focused on the four pillars of planning reform, with a focus on the plan

and on simplification and streamlining to take out of the system that which adds no value. On improved performance, to turn to Nigel Don's point about resources, an increase in planning fees should encourage better investment in the planning system, which I believe will make a difference in delivery on the ground and will improve the timescales.

There is no dilution of the policy with regard to brownfield sites and regeneration—indeed, we have strengthened it. We have not used the term “brownfield sites”; we have used the term “previously developed land”. However, as with many issues in this consultation, if people feel that there are gaps or that amendments are required, we will consider that language, as we want to ensure that there is not even the perception of a shift in the policy.

We are focused on the climate change agenda and on using the planning system to achieve our climate change targets, which are the most ambitious in the world. We want to focus on architecture, place making, quality and the environment and we want to realise the aspirations of our country in a way that engages with the public.

On enforcement, the system is only as good as the enforcement powers that we are willing to use, although that is more of a matter for local government. However, by accepting the amendment, I hope that we show that we will take it seriously.

There is a question of balance. We argue over definitions. Chic Brodie made a comment about language and planning, but I think that these documents are clear, concise, positive and dynamic. They set the vision for Scotland and will provide a platform from which we can inject energy into other Government strategies to ensure that we can continue on the road to recovery in Scotland, increasing employment, developing sustainable economic growth, protecting the environment, achieving our targets, including our renewables targets, and creating the kind of country in which we all want to live, work and invest. As the minister with responsibility for planning, I will do my part to ensure that the system contributes to that in a positive way.

## Business Motion

16:59

**The Deputy Presiding Officer (John Scott):**

The next item of business is consideration of business motion S4M-06943, in the name of Joe FitzPatrick, on behalf of the Parliamentary Bureau, setting out a business programme.

*Motion moved,*

That the Parliament agrees the following programme of business—

Tuesday 18 June 2013

2.00 pm	Time for Reflection
<i>followed by</i>	Parliamentary Bureau Motions
<i>followed by</i>	Topical Questions (if selected)
<i>followed by</i>	Scottish Government Debate: Hydropower in Scotland
<i>followed by</i>	Business Motions
<i>followed by</i>	Parliamentary Bureau Motions
5.00 pm	Decision Time
<i>followed by</i>	Members' Business

Wednesday 19 June 2013

2.00 pm	Parliamentary Bureau Motions
2.00 pm	Portfolio Questions Infrastructure, Investment and Cities; Culture and External Affairs
<i>followed by</i>	Ministerial Statement: 2012-2013 Provisional Outturn
<i>followed by</i>	Stage 1 Debate: Victims and Witnesses (Scotland) Bill
<i>followed by</i>	Standards, Procedures and Public Appointments Committee Debate: 5th Report 2013, Minor Standing Order Rule Changes
<i>followed by</i>	Business Motions
<i>followed by</i>	Parliamentary Bureau Motions
5.30 pm	Decision Time
<i>followed by</i>	Members' Business

Thursday 20 June 2013

11.40 am	Parliamentary Bureau Motions
11.40 am	General Questions
12.00 pm	First Minister's Questions
12.30 pm	Members' Business

Tuesday 25 June 2013

2.00 pm	Time for Reflection
<i>followed by</i>	Parliamentary Bureau Motions
<i>followed by</i>	Topical Questions (if selected)
<i>followed by</i>	Stage 3 Proceedings: Crofting (Amendment) (Scotland) Bill

*followed by* Stage 3 Proceedings: Land and Buildings Transaction Tax (Scotland) Bill

*followed by* Business Motions

*followed by* Parliamentary Bureau Motions

6.00 pm Decision Time

*followed by* Members' Business

Wednesday 26 June 2013

2.00 pm Parliamentary Bureau Motions

2.00 pm Portfolio Questions  
Education and Lifelong Learning

*followed by* Stage 3 Proceedings: Post-16 Education (Scotland) Bill

*followed by* Business Motions

*followed by* Parliamentary Bureau Motions

6.00 pm Decision Time

*followed by* Members' Business

Thursday 27 June 2013

11.40 am Parliamentary Bureau Motions

11.40 am General Questions

12.00 pm First Minister's Questions

12.30 pm Members' Business

2.15 pm Parliamentary Bureau Motions

2.15 pm Ministerial Statement: Second Climate Change Report on Proposals and Policies (RPP2) and the Scottish Greenhouse Gas Emissions Annual Target 2011 Report

*followed by* Stage 3 Proceedings: Scottish Independence Referendum (Franchise) Bill

*followed by* Business Motions

*followed by* Parliamentary Bureau Motions

5.00 pm Decision Time—[*Joe FitzPatrick.*]

*Motion agreed to.*

## Parliamentary Bureau Motions

### The Deputy Presiding Officer (John Scott):

The next item of business is consideration of eight Parliamentary Bureau motions. I ask Joe FitzPatrick to move motions S4M-06945 to S4M-06951, on approval of Scottish statutory instruments, en bloc.

#### *Motions moved,*

That the Parliament agrees that the Children's Hearings (Scotland) Act 2011 (Modification of Primary Legislation) Order 2013 [draft] be approved.

That the Parliament agrees that the Children's Hearings (Scotland) Act 2011 (Movement Restriction Conditions) Regulations 2013 [draft] be approved.

That the Parliament agrees that the Children's Hearings (Scotland) Act 2011 (Implementation of Secure Accommodation Authorisation) (Scotland) Regulations 2013 [draft] be approved.

That the Parliament agrees that the Children's Legal Assistance (Scotland) Regulations 2013 [draft] be approved.

That the Parliament agrees that the Protection of Vulnerable Groups (Scotland) Act 2007 (Modification of Regulated Work with Children) (Children's Hearings) Order 2013 [draft] be approved.

That the Parliament agrees that the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974 (Exclusions and Exceptions) (Scotland) Amendment Order 2013 [draft] be approved.

That the Parliament agrees that the Secure Accommodation (Scotland) Regulations 2013 [draft] be approved.—[*Joe FitzPatrick.*]

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** I also ask Joe FitzPatrick to move motion S4M-06944, on the establishment of a committee.

#### *Motion moved,*

That the Parliament shall establish a committee of the Parliament as follows:

Name of Committee: Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee.

Remit: To consider matters relating to the Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill.

Duration: Until the Bill is passed, falls or is withdrawn.

Number of members: 4.

Convenership: The Convener will be a member of the Scottish National Party and the Deputy Convener will be a member of the Scottish Conservative and Unionist Party.

Membership: Jackson Carlaw, Mark Griffin, Joan McAlpine, Gordon MacDonald.—[*Joe FitzPatrick.*]

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** The questions on the motions will be put at decision time.

## Decision Time

### The Deputy Presiding Officer (John Scott):

There are six questions to be put as a result of today's business. The first question is, that amendment S4M-06933.3, in the name of Sarah Boyack, which seeks to amend motion S4M-06933, in the name of Derek Mackay, on progress towards national planning framework 3 and the Scottish planning policy, be agreed to.

*Amendment agreed to.*

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** The next question is, that amendment S4M-06933.1, in the name of Margaret Mitchell, which seeks to amend motion S4M-06933, in the name of Derek Mackay, on progress towards national planning framework 3 and the Scottish planning policy, as amended, be agreed to.

*Amendment agreed to.*

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** The next question is, that amendment S4M-06933.2, in the name of Patrick Harvie, which seeks to amend motion S4M-06933, in the name of Derek Mackay, on progress towards national planning framework 3 and the Scottish planning policy, as amended, be agreed to. Are we agreed?

**Members:** No.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** There will be a division.

### For

Dugdale, Kezia (Lothian) (Lab)  
 Finnie, John (Highlands and Islands) (Ind)  
 Harvie, Patrick (Glasgow) (Green)  
 Johnstone, Alison (Lothian) (Green)  
 Urquhart, Jean (Highlands and Islands) (Ind)

### Against

Adamson, Clare (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 Allan, Dr Alasdair (Na h-Eileanan an Iar) (SNP)  
 Baillie, Jackie (Dumbarton) (Lab)  
 Baxter, Jayne (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)  
 Beamish, Claudia (South Scotland) (Lab)  
 Beattie, Colin (Midlothian North and Musselburgh) (SNP)  
 Biagi, Marco (Edinburgh Central) (SNP)  
 Boyack, Sarah (Lothian) (Lab)  
 Brodie, Chic (South Scotland) (SNP)  
 Brown, Gavin (Lothian) (Con)  
 Brown, Keith (Clackmannanshire and Dunblane) (SNP)  
 Burgess, Margaret (Cunninghame South) (SNP)  
 Campbell, Aileen (Clydesdale) (SNP)  
 Campbell, Roderick (North East Fife) (SNP)  
 Carlaw, Jackson (West Scotland) (Con)  
 Chisholm, Malcolm (Edinburgh Northern and Leith) (Lab)  
 Coffey, Willie (Kilmarnock and Irvine Valley) (SNP)  
 Crawford, Bruce (Stirling) (SNP)  
 Cunningham, Roseanna (Perthshire South and Kinross-shire) (SNP)  
 Davidson, Ruth (Glasgow) (Con)  
 Dey, Graeme (Angus South) (SNP)  
 Don, Nigel (Angus North and Mearns) (SNP)  
 Doris, Bob (Glasgow) (SNP)  
 Eadie, Helen (Cowdenbeath) (Lab)

Ewing, Annabelle (Mid Scotland and Fife) (SNP)  
 Fabiani, Linda (East Kilbride) (SNP)  
 Fee, Mary (West Scotland) (Lab)  
 Ferguson, Patricia (Glasgow Maryhill and Springburn) (Lab)  
 Fergusson, Alex (Galloway and West Dumfries) (Con)  
 Findlay, Neil (Lothian) (Lab)  
 FitzPatrick, Joe (Dundee City West) (SNP)  
 Fraser, Murdo (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)  
 Gibson, Kenneth (Cunninghame North) (SNP)  
 Gibson, Rob (Caithness, Sutherland and Ross) (SNP)  
 Goldie, Annabel (West Scotland) (Con)  
 Grahame, Christine (Midlothian South, Tweeddale and Lauderdale) (SNP)  
 Grant, Rhoda (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)  
 Gray, Iain (East Lothian) (Lab)  
 Griffin, Mark (Central Scotland) (Lab)  
 Hepburn, Jamie (Cumbernauld and Kilsyth) (SNP)  
 Hume, Jim (South Scotland) (LD)  
 Hyslop, Fiona (Linlithgow) (SNP)  
 Johnstone, Alex (North East Scotland) (Con)  
 Keir, Colin (Edinburgh Western) (SNP)  
 Kelly, James (Rutherglen) (Lab)  
 Lamont, Johann (Glasgow Pollok) (Lab)  
 Lamont, John (Ettrick, Roxburgh and Berwickshire) (Con)  
 Lochhead, Richard (Moray) (SNP)  
 MacAskill, Kenny (Edinburgh Eastern) (SNP)  
 MacDonald, Angus (Falkirk East) (SNP)  
 Mackay, Derek (Renfrewshire North and West) (SNP)  
 MacKenzie, Mike (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)  
 Malik, Hanzala (Glasgow) (Lab)  
 Marra, Jenny (North East Scotland) (Lab)  
 Martin, Paul (Glasgow Provan) (Lab)  
 Matheson, Michael (Falkirk West) (SNP)  
 Maxwell, Stewart (West Scotland) (SNP)  
 McCulloch, Margaret (Central Scotland) (Lab)  
 McDougall, Margaret (West Scotland) (Lab)  
 McInnes, Alison (North East Scotland) (LD)  
 McKelvie, Christina (Hamilton, Larkhall and Stonehouse) (SNP)  
 McLeod, Aileen (South Scotland) (SNP)  
 McMahon, Michael (Uddingston and Bellshill) (Lab)  
 McMahon, Siobhan (Central Scotland) (Lab)  
 McMillan, Stuart (West Scotland) (SNP)  
 McTaggart, Anne (Glasgow) (Lab)  
 Milne, Nanette (North East Scotland) (Con)  
 Mitchell, Margaret (Central Scotland) (Con)  
 Neil, Alex (Airdrie and Shotts) (SNP)  
 Paterson, Gil (Clydebank and Milngavie) (SNP)  
 Pearson, Graeme (South Scotland) (Lab)  
 Pentland, John (Motherwell and Wishaw) (Lab)  
 Rennie, Willie (Mid Scotland and Fife) (LD)  
 Robertson, Dennis (Aberdeenshire West) (SNP)  
 Robison, Shona (Dundee City East) (SNP)  
 Russell, Michael (Argyll and Bute) (SNP)  
 Scanlon, Mary (Highlands and Islands) (Con)  
 Scott, Tavish (Shetland Islands) (LD)  
 Smith, Drew (Glasgow) (Lab)  
 Smith, Elaine (Coatbridge and Chryston) (Lab)  
 Smith, Liz (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)  
 Stewart, David (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)  
 Sturgeon, Nicola (Glasgow Southside) (SNP)  
 Swinney, John (Perthshire North) (SNP)  
 Thompson, Dave (Skye, Lochaber and Badenoch) (SNP)  
 Torrance, David (Kirkcaldy) (SNP)  
 Walker, Bill (Dunfermline) (Ind)  
 Watt, Maureen (Aberdeen South and North Kincardine) (SNP)  
 Wheelhouse, Paul (South Scotland) (SNP)  
 Wilson, John (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 Yousaf, Humza (Glasgow) (SNP)



**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** The result of the division is: For 5, Against 91, Abstentions 0.

*Amendment disagreed to.*

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** The next question is, that motion S4M-06933, in the name of Derek Mackay, on progress towards national planning framework 3 and the Scottish planning policy, as amended, be agreed to. Are we agreed?

**Members:** No.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** There will be a division.

#### For

Adamson, Clare (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 Allan, Dr Alasdair (Na h-Eileanan an Iar) (SNP)  
 Baillie, Jackie (Dumbarton) (Lab)  
 Baxter, Jayne (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)  
 Beamish, Claudia (South Scotland) (Lab)  
 Beattie, Colin (Midlothian North and Musselburgh) (SNP)  
 Biagi, Marco (Edinburgh Central) (SNP)  
 Boyack, Sarah (Lothian) (Lab)  
 Brodie, Chic (South Scotland) (SNP)  
 Brown, Gavin (Lothian) (Con)  
 Brown, Keith (Clackmannanshire and Dunblane) (SNP)  
 Burgess, Margaret (Cunninghame South) (SNP)  
 Campbell, Aileen (Clydesdale) (SNP)  
 Campbell, Roderick (North East Fife) (SNP)  
 Carlaw, Jackson (West Scotland) (Con)  
 Chisholm, Malcolm (Edinburgh Northern and Leith) (Lab)  
 Coffey, Willie (Kilmarnock and Irvine Valley) (SNP)  
 Crawford, Bruce (Stirling) (SNP)  
 Cunningham, Roseanna (Perthshire South and Kinross-shire) (SNP)  
 Davidson, Ruth (Glasgow) (Con)  
 Dey, Graeme (Angus South) (SNP)  
 Don, Nigel (Angus North and Mearns) (SNP)  
 Doris, Bob (Glasgow) (SNP)  
 Dugdale, Kezia (Lothian) (Lab)  
 Eadie, Helen (Cowdenbeath) (Lab)  
 Ewing, Annabelle (Mid Scotland and Fife) (SNP)  
 Fabiani, Linda (East Kilbride) (SNP)  
 Fee, Mary (West Scotland) (Lab)  
 Ferguson, Patricia (Glasgow Maryhill and Springburn) (Lab)  
 Fergusson, Alex (Galloway and West Dumfries) (Con)  
 Findlay, Neil (Lothian) (Lab)  
 Finnie, John (Highlands and Islands) (Ind)  
 FitzPatrick, Joe (Dundee City West) (SNP)  
 Fraser, Murdo (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)  
 Gibson, Kenneth (Cunninghame North) (SNP)  
 Gibson, Rob (Caithness, Sutherland and Ross) (SNP)  
 Goldie, Annabel (West Scotland) (Con)  
 Grahame, Christine (Midlothian South, Tweeddale and Lauderdale) (SNP)  
 Grant, Rhoda (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)  
 Gray, Iain (East Lothian) (Lab)  
 Griffin, Mark (Central Scotland) (Lab)  
 Hepburn, Jamie (Cumbernauld and Kilsyth) (SNP)  
 Hume, Jim (South Scotland) (LD)  
 Hyslop, Fiona (Linlithgow) (SNP)  
 Johnstone, Alex (North East Scotland) (Con)  
 Keir, Colin (Edinburgh Western) (SNP)  
 Kelly, James (Rutherglen) (Lab)  
 Lamont, Johann (Glasgow Pollok) (Lab)  
 Lamont, John (Ettrick, Roxburgh and Berwickshire) (Con)  
 Lochhead, Richard (Moray) (SNP)  
 MacAskill, Kenny (Edinburgh Eastern) (SNP)  
 MacDonald, Angus (Falkirk East) (SNP)  
 Mackay, Derek (Renfrewshire North and West) (SNP)

MacKenzie, Mike (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)  
 Malik, Hanzala (Glasgow) (Lab)  
 Marra, Jenny (North East Scotland) (Lab)  
 Martin, Paul (Glasgow Provan) (Lab)  
 Matheson, Michael (Falkirk West) (SNP)  
 Maxwell, Stewart (West Scotland) (SNP)  
 McCulloch, Margaret (Central Scotland) (Lab)  
 McDougall, Margaret (West Scotland) (Lab)  
 McInnes, Alison (North East Scotland) (LD)  
 McKelvie, Christina (Hamilton, Larkhall and Stonehouse) (SNP)  
 McLeod, Aileen (South Scotland) (SNP)  
 McMahon, Michael (Uddingston and Bellshill) (Lab)  
 McMahon, Siobhan (Central Scotland) (Lab)  
 McMillan, Stuart (West Scotland) (SNP)  
 McTaggart, Anne (Glasgow) (Lab)  
 Milne, Nanette (North East Scotland) (Con)  
 Mitchell, Margaret (Central Scotland) (Con)  
 Neil, Alex (Airdrie and Shotts) (SNP)  
 Paterson, Gil (Clydebank and Milngavie) (SNP)  
 Pearson, Graeme (South Scotland) (Lab)  
 Pentland, John (Motherwell and Wishaw) (Lab)  
 Rennie, Willie (Mid Scotland and Fife) (LD)  
 Robertson, Dennis (Aberdeenshire West) (SNP)  
 Robison, Shona (Dundee City East) (SNP)  
 Russell, Michael (Argyll and Bute) (SNP)  
 Scanlon, Mary (Highlands and Islands) (Con)  
 Scott, Tavish (Shetland Islands) (LD)  
 Smith, Drew (Glasgow) (Lab)  
 Smith, Elaine (Coatbridge and Chryston) (Lab)  
 Smith, Liz (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)  
 Stewart, David (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)  
 Sturgeon, Nicola (Glasgow Southside) (SNP)  
 Swinney, John (Perthshire North) (SNP)  
 Thompson, Dave (Skye, Lochaber and Badenoch) (SNP)  
 Torrance, David (Kirkcaldy) (SNP)  
 Urquhart, Jean (Highlands and Islands) (Ind)  
 Walker, Bill (Dunfermline) (Ind)  
 Watt, Maureen (Aberdeen South and North Kincardine) (SNP)  
 Wheelhouse, Paul (South Scotland) (SNP)  
 Wilson, John (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 Yousaf, Humza (Glasgow) (SNP)

#### Against

Harvie, Patrick (Glasgow) (Green)  
 Johnstone, Alison (Lothian) (Green)

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** The result of the division is: For 94, Against 2, Abstentions 0.

*Motion, as amended, agreed to,*

That the Parliament welcomes the publication of *Scotland's Third National Planning Framework: Main Issues Report and Draft Framework* and the *Draft Scottish Planning Policy*; recognises the ongoing innovative work to engage the public in the development of the proposals; supports their focus on economic recovery, balanced growth and creating a low-carbon place; further supports the aspiration to ensure that Scotland is a natural place to invest in, by making best use of natural resources and protecting national assets; recognises the importance of placemaking and the opportunities to ensure that Scotland is a successful, sustainable place by supporting economic and regeneration priorities; believes that planning can play an important role in facilitating a planned approach to transport and digital infrastructure to make Scotland a connected place; notes the crucial role that effective enforcement structures and mechanisms play in the planning system and believes that this should be stressed in the final Scottish Planning Policy, and endorses the positive steps being taken to ensure that national planning

policy plays a proactive role in supporting economic recovery, however notes that the Scottish Government has failed to meet its second climate change target; understands that the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 sets a clear need for policies and investment; further understands that the planning system plays a key role in helping to ensure that Scotland achieves sustainable development and that sustainable communities are essential to deliver on the targets adopted by the Scottish Government.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** I propose to put a single question on motions S4M-06945 to S4M-06951, on approval of Scottish statutory instruments, unless any member objects.

The question is that, motions S4M-06945 to S4M-06951, on approval of SSIs, be agreed to.

*Motions agreed to,*

That the Parliament agrees that the Children's Hearings (Scotland) Act 2011 (Modification of Primary Legislation) Order 2013 [draft] be approved.

That the Parliament agrees that the Children's Hearings (Scotland) Act 2011 (Movement Restriction Conditions) Regulations 2013 [draft] be approved.

That the Parliament agrees that the Children's Hearings (Scotland) Act 2011 (Implementation of Secure Accommodation Authorisation) (Scotland) Regulations 2013 [draft] be approved.

That the Parliament agrees that the Children's Legal Assistance (Scotland) Regulations 2013 [draft] be approved.

That the Parliament agrees that the Protection of Vulnerable Groups (Scotland) Act 2007 (Modification of Regulated Work with Children) (Children's Hearings) Order 2013 [draft] be approved.

That the Parliament agrees that the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974 (Exclusions and Exceptions) (Scotland) Amendment Order 2013 [draft] be approved.

That the Parliament agrees that the Secure Accommodation (Scotland) Regulations 2013 [draft] be approved.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** The final question is, that motion S4M-06944, in the name of Joe FitzPatrick, on the establishment of a committee, be agreed to.

*Motion agreed to,*

That the Parliament shall establish a committee of the Parliament as follows:

Name of Committee: Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill Committee.

Remit: To consider matters relating to the Burrell Collection (Lending and Borrowing) (Scotland) Bill.

Duration: Until the Bill is passed, falls or is withdrawn.

Number of members: 4.

Convenership: The Convener will be a member of the Scottish National Party and the Deputy Convener will be a member of the Scottish Conservative and Unionist Party.

Membership: Jackson Carlaw, Mark Griffin, Joan McAlpine, Gordon MacDonald.

## Challenging Stereotypes

**The Deputy Presiding Officer (Elaine Smith):**

The final item of business today is a members' business debate on motion S4M-05944, in the name of Hanzala Malik, on challenging negative racial and religious stereotypes. The debate will be concluded without any question being put.

*Motion debated,*

That the Parliament welcomes the campaign, I Speak For Myself, which has been launched by Amina Muslim Women's Resource Centre in Glasgow; understands that the campaign aims to empower Muslim women to encourage them to share their personal messages with fellow Scots in order to challenge any negative stereotypes associated with them and the Islamic faith; notes that the campaign suggests that, although Scotland is a welcoming and inclusive nation with a vibrant multicultural society, global events have caused a rise in misconceptions about and discrimination toward Muslim women and the Islamic faith and an increase in the number of citizens with negative attitudes; commends the campaign's aims to educate, dispel myths and promote awareness about the inequalities and discrimination facing the Muslim community and its work in tackling racial and religious prejudice, and notes suggestions that, in order to create a fairer Scotland, this and other campaigns, such as Show Racism the Red Card Scotland and Nil by Mouth, would benefit from an integrated and systematic approach to tackling problems of negative stereotypes and discrimination.

17:05

**Hanzala Malik (Glasgow) (Lab):** I was very happy when my motion was selected for today's debate as I had wanted an opportunity to discuss how we in Scotland can challenge negative racial and religious stereotypes.

I congratulate Amina—the Muslim Women's Resource Centre on its I speak for myself campaign. The campaign was created to encourage Muslim women to share with fellow Scots messages about anything that they feel is important. More than 400 Scottish Muslim women have participated and shared messages as part of the campaign, which came out of the work that Amina did in 2011 when it visited some 25 secondary schools in Scotland and was shocked to find that 70 per cent of young people associated words such as "terrorist", "uneducated", "foreign" and "oppressed" with Muslim women.

The travelling exhibition encouraged dialogue and promoted understanding of a misunderstood community and faith. I am pleased to say that 55 members of the Scottish Parliament and three ministers have pledged their support to standing up against intolerance and prejudice, by speaking out against discrimination and contributing to making a fairer Scotland.

The work in schools is funded only in Glasgow and Dundee and it is not really possible to

accommodate requests to engage that Amina receives from schools outwith those areas. I suggest that if other councils want to take part, they should contact Amina to try to resolve that issue.

Since the campaign began, there has been a shift in communities. With the murder of Lee Rigby in Woolwich, there is a greater need than ever to promote understanding between communities. In my opinion, the best way to do that is to speak to people from different communities and to let them speak for themselves, as the campaign has tried to do.

In the discussions in schools as part of Amina's research on efforts to combat negative stereotypes, I was surprised to learn that little was brought up by students in their normal classes. However, when it came to religious education classes, students were more open about their views and were willing to share those views with the rest of the class. That suggests that there is still a lot of work to be done, even with our young people.

Why, however, are we dealing with stereotyping of Muslim women separately from other forms of discrimination? I would like to see the work that Amina is doing in a framework in which all such organisations work together. On paper, those organisations are meant to work across equalities strands, but for some reason we are not doing that. We tend to deal with bigotry separately, but I do not understand why. In addition to that, bigotry in football is treated as a special case. Again, I ask why equalities organisations do not work together, because it is important to appreciate that all forms of discrimination are equally unwelcome.

I believe that work on challenging stereotypes with regard to racism, sectarianism or even to redheads—whatever kind of prejudice—should have benchmarking to help progress the work so that there is a clear vision for its direction and we can see whether we are, in fact, improving our lot, if one can use that phrase.

We need to start with the foundation that we are all human beings and that we are all different in many ways. I read somewhere the statement that

“you are unique, just like everyone else.”

That is what our young people need to understand first, then individual organisations can bring their separate skills together to assist one another. The issue now is that there are many organisations that have people with marvellous skills, but unfortunately because they work in isolation those skills are not transferable to other organisations and, as a result, we do not benefit from them.

I congratulate Amina on doing such a marvellous job in working among minority

communities, but especially with our women, who have real issues in bringing up young families and facing up to the most difficult challenges, not only in the home but in the workplace. We must congratulate Amina on bringing to our attention the difficulties that our young people face. I make a plea that we, as the Scottish Parliament, take all possible measures to assist our vulnerable communities in working together to become a fairer and clearer nation, so that we all benefit equally.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** We turn to open debate, with speeches of four minutes, please. I am going to call Malcolm Chisholm first because he has, as a courtesy to members, indicated that he has to leave early for other parliamentary business.

17:12

**Malcolm Chisholm (Edinburgh Northern and Leith) (Lab):** I have apologised to the minister, but I apologise to you, Presiding Officer, and to Hanzala Malik, because I have to leave to chair the parliamentary cross-party group on cancer, which starts soon.

I congratulate Hanzala Malik on lodging an important motion, and I congratulate Amina—the Muslim Women's Resource Centre on all the great work that it has done over several years. However, in the context of this debate, I congratulate it particularly on its I speak for myself campaign. I have no doubt that other members have looked into that and have seen the film that is available online. I certainly hope that as many people as possible will watch that film and promote it so that other people become aware of it.

Amina's campaign has always been important for the reasons that Hanzala Malik gave, but I think that we would agree that it is especially timely, given the appalling crime in Woolwich. As we all know, people of all religions and none commit crimes, but a particular crime can never be an excuse for turning on an innocent community that happens to share the criminal's religion. Unfortunately, that is what has happened over the past few weeks.

I was at a community workshop in my constituency two weeks ago. It is a great group, which is working to promote race equality and integration in north Edinburgh, but it was very sad to hear one of the Muslim women at that recent meeting say that she had lived in her community in north Edinburgh for six years and had never, until the week before, been harassed. She described a terrifying incident that happened to her when she was on her bicycle.

We have to face facts: there has been a recent rise in racism and Islamophobia, and the prejudice

and stereotyping that we know exist have been exacerbated. We have to address that problem, and Amina's great campaign can help us to do that. We need to listen to individual Muslim women and men, and we need to relate to them as much as possible. That is what the message of integration is about, so that we can live together in harmony and break down the barriers, prejudices and stereotypes that get in the way of our living in harmony.

In a way, I have been reminded of what happened in 2005 in the wake of the London bombings, when there was the same kind of increase in racism and Islamophobia. In the wake of that, a group in my constituency, the Pakeeza women's group—I hope that Hanzala Malik will not mind my mentioning this—produced a booklet, "Pride and Prejudice: Beyond the Veil". I was reminded of that because the women in Pakeeza were trying to do the kind of thing that the women at Amina are trying to do. They were trying to say, "This is the kind of person I am. See beyond the fact that I might or might not wear a veil. See beyond the stereotyping and the prejudices that are so common in society and in the media. I am a human being. I have interests and am just like you in many ways." They were also saying in the booklet, just as the Amina campaign is saying, "I do have a particular religion and I want you to know about it", because, of course, a lot of the prejudice and stereotyping is to do with the Islamic faith. The faith is misrepresented and is associated with violence and so on, which is totally inappropriate.

Let us listen to those women. I hope that the media will also listen, because much responsibility rests with the media for reporting in unhelpful, prejudiced and derogatory ways. We should all work together to challenge myths and stereotypes and to bring about a society in which we can live in harmony. I hope that we can do that more and more at community level, as I am pleased to say is happening in my constituency.

17:16

**Dennis Robertson (Aberdeenshire West) (SNP):** I congratulate Hanzala Malik on bringing the debate to the Parliament.

I have always found it difficult to understand the concept of prejudice. I am blessed, in that I have had Nigerian cousins since I was about six—more than 50 years ago. I also have Mauritian cousins.

When Hanzala Malik was speaking, I had a flashback to when I was at school in Edinburgh. I will share the memory with members. I remember a young lad who was 13 or 14—he was ages with me. He had been born without eyes and was

totally blind. He therefore had no concept of colour, but he had a prejudice about black people.

I could not understand that and I engaged with him. He said, "Oh, no, I just don't like black people." I said, "You do not know what black is. You have no idea. You have no concept of colour, or night and day, or light and dark." However, he was convinced of his nigh-on hatred of black and ethnic minority people—at the time, we probably did not use the phrase "ethnic minority".

He was prejudiced because his parents were prejudiced. That is how he had learned to be prejudiced against people whom he had never met and of whose colour or ethnicity he would have had no idea if he passed them in the street.

I find it hard to understand why so much prejudice remains. When we pass people in the street, we have no idea what their faith is—I certainly do not. I have no idea whether a person was born in this country.

It is disturbing that, in a survey, 28 per cent of the population said that prejudice is right. Some 28 per cent of people still think that it is right to be prejudiced against certain people in our communities and some 31 per cent think that people from ethnic minority backgrounds are taking our jobs. I do not understand that, either. Our jobs? Whose jobs?

As I said to start with, I find prejudice difficult to understand. I am a former member of the Equal Opportunities Committee, which deals a lot with the Scottish Human Rights Commission. When we did a report on the Gypsy Travelling community, the commission said that the last bastion of self-respecting prejudice and racism is against the Gypsy Travelling community. A percentage of people from other ethnic minority groups are prejudiced against the Gypsy Travelling community. People have prejudices against things because they do not understand them. Hanzala Malik and others are absolutely right: that is about education and awareness.

Malcolm Chisholm said that the media have a responsibility, which they certainly do. Sometimes, the way in which the media portray racism and prejudice incites more racism and prejudice. The media should have a responsibility to raise awareness rather than to incite.

17:21

**Anne McTaggart (Glasgow) (Lab):** I am delighted to contribute to this important debate on challenging negative racial and religious stereotypes and to add my congratulations to Amina—the Muslim Women's Resource Centre. I welcome people from it to the chamber, including Faten Hameed, who is one of its directors.

We are here to talk about the launch and success of the I speak for myself campaign. I thank my colleague Hanzala Malik for securing time in the chamber to talk about the important issues that have arisen from that campaign and to highlight the excellent work that is being carried out in the Glasgow region.

Amina's I speak for myself campaign is just one of many examples of what is great about the third sector in Scotland. Amina visited Scottish secondary schools to discuss Islam with pupils and recognised a problem. A staggering 70 per cent of the pupils to whom it spoke associated incredibly false and negative ideas with Muslim women. Amina identified that problem and immediately went about fixing it. We can all be proud of its campaign to challenge misconceptions about Muslim women by actively getting out and speaking to Muslim women about their experiences, identity and personal beliefs.

Nil by Mouth is another excellent example of a charity that works hard to challenge negative religious stereotypes. On a budget of only £60,000, it delivered workshops to more than 5,000 people last year in my region of Glasgow. It has over the past few years worked with Garscadden primary school, which is one of my local schools, and with St Brendan's primary school, and its projects have allowed pupils to learn more about not only other faiths and cultures but their own. The vast majority of pupils enter into such projects with great interest and enthusiasm. This could be the generation that beats bigotry once and for all.

The work that organisations such as Nil by Mouth, Amina and many others do is incredibly important and must be adequately funded, but it works only when it is matched with an education policy and far-reaching initiatives that get to the heart of the problem of intolerance. Integrated approaches are essential to engender change in our communities. I trust that the Scottish Government agrees with me and that it will use the cross-party support for such campaigns as a springboard to an overview of the incredible work that the charitable sector is doing.

17:24

**Annabel Goldie (West Scotland) (Con):** I, too, thank Hanzala Malik and congratulate him on bringing the motion before the Parliament for debate. I know that before he came to the Parliament, he played an important role as an advocate for the Muslim community as a Glasgow City Council councillor for 17 years. Indeed, it was my pleasure to encounter him in that capacity many years ago when we were members of the court of the University of Strathclyde, to which he made a distinguished contribution. We brought our

different backgrounds and experiences to that forum.

In bringing this debate to the Parliament, Hanzala Malik has achieved two important things. First, and quite rightly, he has highlighted the imagination and innovation of Amina—the Muslim Women's Resource Centre in Glasgow in devising and launching the I speak for myself campaign, which deserves praise in its own right. Secondly, the carefully drafted script of his motion lifts the veil on the vulnerability, apprehension and isolation that are felt by many in the Muslim community, all of which can be intensified by external events.

As a Parliament, we should be very concerned if that community suffers from misconceptions about and endures discrimination towards Muslim women and the Islamic faith. That is utterly unacceptable and it is important that this Parliament—as an institution and through its proceedings and debates—condemns such activity and plays its part in educating, dispelling the myths and promoting awareness of such issues in order to eliminate those negative attitudes.

Show Racism the Red Card Scotland and Nil by Mouth have been very effective vehicles in their own way in maintaining awareness, keeping the issues to the forefront of discussion and guarding against the enemy of complacency. I note with interest the suggestion in the motion of a more

“integrated and systematic approach to tackling problems of negative stereotypes and discrimination.”

There may indeed be scope for that, but there is also strength in numbers and I would not like to see the identities of those two campaigns and the new one—I speak for myself—blurred. All three have something very important to say.

Broadening out the debate to consider what positive options are available to help in the work of those campaigns, I can think of no better model than the annual Pakistan Welfare Trust dinner. Like others in the chamber, I have had the pleasure of attending that dinner over many years. It is a highlight in the Muslim community's calendar and it has developed a very positive reputation, with many guests from politics and civic Scotland. It has played an important role in broadening awareness and understanding, and in nurturing solid and positive relationships. It is also an immensely enjoyable social occasion.

This year the dinner was outstanding. It took place against the backdrop of the appalling murder of Lee Rigby in Woolwich, to which Malcolm Chisholm referred, but that tragedy served to demonstrate how, from our different backgrounds and cultures, we stand united in condemning what is wrong and bad and supporting what is good and

right. That unity of purpose was explicit in the apposite reading from the Qur'an that evening and the many speeches that were made at the dinner.

There was a power for good that evening, which was tangible to all who were present. It was born out of mutual respect and—quite simply—born, over the years, out of getting to know one another. I hope that those strengths will imbue and encourage both the existing campaigns and the new I speak for myself campaign. I wish it every success.

17:28

**Mary Fee (West Scotland) (Lab):** I congratulate my friend and colleague Hanzala Malik on securing this members' business debate on an issue that affects many individuals in black and ethnic minority communities, not only here in Scotland but across the globe.

It would be naive of any member to suggest that Scotland is a haven for racial equality and that the campaigns implemented by the current Administration and previous Administrations have tackled stereotypes and negative attitudes towards race and religion. As we all know, there is still a long way to go.

The motion makes specific reference to the I speak for myself campaign: a very emotive campaign put forward to the public in a very simple way. The campaign uses real people and real-life examples to help show that Muslim women are just like any other members of society, in that they drink Irn Bru and are interested in their local football clubs. Such campaigns help to bring about community cohesion and continue to show that Scotland is a welcoming and inclusive nation for anyone who wishes to come here.

Every member in this chamber, as well as individuals across the UK and around the world, is aware of the death of Drummer Lee Rigby. That has led to the increased presence of far-right groups that seek to paint a single religion as the perpetrator of that atrocity. Those groups have used a single event caused by two individuals who just happened to be from a certain religion to fuel tensions and reinforce negative attitudes and stereotypes. Leaders of various faith groups have rightly stood side by side to declare that that was an attack by two people, not an attack by a religion. That solidarity of support is a beacon of hope and unity, which was recognised by the majority of the population across the United Kingdom. Having said that, there has unfortunately been an increase in the number of Islamophobic incidents. Attacks and crimes of any kind are terrible, but those that are motivated by malice or ill will towards a specific group in society due to

people's religion and beliefs are downright despicable.

I commend the work undertaken by various groups, such as Amina—the Muslim Women's Resource Centre. The group's campaign, I speak for myself, has enabled it to help raise awareness of discrimination and issues that the Muslim community faces, and I whole-heartedly support the idea of an integrated and systematic approach to tackling negative stereotypes and discrimination. With more organisations collaborating together, they will be able to reach various societal groups and bring their message to various parts of the country, and in doing that they will pave the way for a more equal, respectful and tolerant Scotland.

As Dennis Robertson mentioned, the Equal Opportunities Committee has completed two inquiries into Gypsy Travellers in the past year and a half. One of the key messages in both reports is that Gypsy Travellers, as an ethnic group, are frequently stereotyped and discriminated against, often as a result of media coverage. We found evidence of newspapers encouraging the nimby attitude to Gypsy Travellers, and television programmes portraying them in a bad light and promoting stereotypes.

I sum up my feelings on the motion and debate by quoting the former United Nations secretary general, Kofi Annan, who said:

"Ignorance and prejudice are the handmaidens of propaganda. Our mission, therefore, is to confront ignorance with knowledge, bigotry with tolerance, and isolation with the outstretched hand of generosity. Racism can, will, and must be defeated."

With that, I gladly lend my support to the motion.

17:32

**The Minister for Community Safety and Legal Affairs (Roseanna Cunningham):** I congratulate Hanzala Malik on securing today's members' business debate, and I thank the members who have participated in discussing this important matter. It is important because there should be no place in Scotland for any form of racial or religious intolerance and discrimination, at any time, at any place or in any community. As a Government, we deplore any attempt to exploit Drummer Rigby's death, and we reaffirm the message that Scotland is a country where people of all faiths and none are welcome and can live in peace.

Police Scotland reports that recent events have led to a slight increase in hate crime reporting in Scotland. Part of that is due to the excellent relationship between Police Scotland and local communities. Because we are having this debate against the wider background of the brutal killing

of Drummer Rigby, it is right that people flag up and recognise the attempts by a small minority of people to exploit his death for their own divisive purposes. However, the increase in the reporting of hate crimes has resulted in robust enforcement action being taken in each case, and it is an important point of confidence for communities suffering any form of harassment or discrimination to know that their complaints will be taken seriously and acted on.

As Police Scotland will always respond promptly to such reports, I encourage members of the public to report every instance of hate crime to the police as soon as possible. I hope that members who, like Malcolm Chisholm, Mary Fee and Anne McTaggart, have become aware of incidents of harassment or other attacks in their communities will encourage individuals to report those incidents to the police. It means, regrettably, that our hate crime statistics may look as if they are going up, but often it is not the number of incidents that is increasing but the confidence in reporting them, and that is important. People need to feel that they can report such incidents and be listened to, so I encourage people to report those incidents to the police.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** Minister, I am sorry to interrupt, but could you please check your microphone?

**Roseanna Cunningham:** I am sorry—can people not hear me? People do not often say that they cannot hear me.

I, too, congratulate Amina—the Muslim Women's Resource Centre on its I speak for myself campaign. That national campaign aims to encourage and inspire Muslim women by spreading knowledge of women's rights and promoting positive images of Muslim women. As has been stated by many members, the campaign seeks to empower Muslim women to share their personal messages with their fellow Scots so that damaging stereotypes can be challenged. We have two male Muslim MSPs, and I personally look forward to our first Muslim woman MSP—perhaps she is sitting in the public gallery this evening. I am sure that Annabel Goldie, Mary Fee and Anne McTaggart would all join me in expressing that wish. To echo the campaign pledge, we want Scotland to be a place where all people can flourish and be themselves, free from being judged and labelled because of their race, faith or personal background.

As a Government, we value Scotland's ethnic minority communities for the contribution that they make and the important role that they play in making Scotland the diverse and vibrant country that we are today. Since 2012, we have committed nearly £6 million to supporting specific projects and initiatives to combat racist and religious

bigotry and hatred. That includes work with Gypsies/Travellers, the Roma community, asylum seekers, refugees and the other groups that one might expect to see on that list. We have also developed our one Scotland campaign through a variety of media and we are now disseminating a one Scotland toolkit to enable local areas to develop their own anti-racism campaigns. That may go some way towards the skill sharing that Hanzala Malik wants to see. Officials are also updating the race equality statement, which is expected to be published later this year. The statement will underpin the themes of prevention and early intervention and will consider issues such as race equality and employment, poverty and hate crime.

I turn to faith equality. We often see a combining of the two issues of faith and race. This is not the first time that that has happened in Scotland. The issues of faith and race or faith and ethnic minority have been combined before historically, which has often led to a disfiguring in some of our communities. We want to prevent that from happening to another community in the future. It is important that we continue to restate that the diverse faith and belief communities are valued in and for themselves and to emphasise the important role that they play in enriching our country. There is no place in Scotland for any form of religious hatred or intolerance any more than there is for hatred based on race. We will not tolerate any form of religious prejudice. A total of £768,000 has been allocated to faith projects specifically to tackle racism and religious intolerance for the current three-year spending review period. In addition, £360,000 has been allocated to Interfaith Scotland, in Glasgow, which I visited this morning. Interfaith Scotland is a place where all faith communities can come together to discuss and share issues and concerns.

I was interested in Anne McTaggart's comments on the work that is being done in her area. I have visited the schools that she talked about and I agree with her about the inspiring nature of the work that is being done by young people there. I am trying to remember the name of the play that the little kids do, which is based on "The Rainbow Fish". It is well worth seeing not just how much they enjoy that but how much they learn from it.

Announcements have been made about funding, and there will be more. As a Government, we have very good relations with Scotland's faith communities, including the Muslim community. Ministers and officials meet faith leaders and faith groups regularly. In recent weeks—for good reasons in the post-Woolwich scenario—both the First Minister and the Cabinet Secretary for Justice have visited mosques and have offered support and reassurance in the aftermath of that terrible event. In addition, I believe that, this morning,

while I was in Glasgow meeting Interfaith Scotland, the cabinet secretary was in Dundee meeting people from the Dundee International Women's Centre.

*Meeting closed at 17:40.*

I thank all the members who have participated in the debate, including Dennis Robertson, who brings his own unique perspective to such debates, in that he is physically unable to see what all these differences are supposed to be about. That is always a very good reminder for us. I join everyone in congratulating Amina—the Muslim Women's Resource Centre on the I speak for myself campaign.



Members who would like a printed copy of the *Official Report* to be forwarded to them should give notice to SPICe.

---

Available in e-format only. Printed Scottish Parliament documentation is published in Edinburgh by APS Group Scotland.

All documents are available on  
the Scottish Parliament website at:

[www.scottish.parliament.uk](http://www.scottish.parliament.uk)

For details of documents available to  
order in hard copy format, please contact:  
APS Scottish Parliament Publications on 0131 629 9941.

For information on the Scottish Parliament contact  
Public Information on:

Telephone: 0131 348 5000  
Textphone: 0800 092 7100  
Email: [sp.info@scottish.parliament.uk](mailto:sp.info@scottish.parliament.uk)

e-format first available  
ISBN 978-1-78351-307-9

Revised e-format available  
ISBN 978-1-78351-326-0

---

Printed in Scotland by APS Group Scotland

---