Lochgelly Supplementary Planning and Transport Guidance

Report by: Keith Winter Head of Enterprise and Protective Services

Wards Affected: Ward no 9

Purpose

This report provides a summary of responses to the recent consultation exercise on the draft Lochgelly Supplementary Planning and Transport Guidance and recommends adoption of the proposed Fife Council policy. An assessment of the findings and analysis of the responses is set out in Appendix A.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Lochgelly Supplementary Planning and Transport Guidance (SPTG) (Appendix C) is adopted as Fife Council planning policy with modifications as set out in Appendix B.

Resource Implications

There were no significant financial resource implications in preparing the Lochgelly SPTG but significant time was allocated by development planning staff in preparing the draft Lochgelly SPTG and assessing the consultation responses.

Legal & Risk Implications

The Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended by the Planning etc. (Scotland) Act 2006) allows a planning authority to adopt and issue guidance in connection with a local development plan. Although a new style local development plan for Fife has not yet been prepared, the Council has complied with the publicity and consultation requirements imposed by Section 22(3) in the preparation of the draft SPTG.

The Fife Development Plan provides the statutory policy framework for land use planning in Fife. On 29th June 2010 Planning Committee agreed that if the outcomes from the Lochgelly Charrette are considered to include improved planning solutions for Lochgelly, Fife Council would look to progress these solutions through Supplementary Planning Guidance with appropriate consultation prior to adoption of the Mid Fife Local Plan.
Impact Assessment

The Mid Fife Local Plan has been subject to an environmental assessment process. The draft Lochgelly SPTG was subject to a formal screening under the terms of the Environmental Assessment (Scotland) Act 2005. The Scottish Government in their formal response advise that the consultation authorities (SEPA, SNH and Historic Scotland) agree that there were likely to be no significant environmental effects arising from the draft Lochgelly SPTG. A separate Integrated Impact Assessment has also been carried out on the draft Lochgelly SPTG.

Consultation

The Executive Directors, Performance and Organisational Support, Housing and Communities, and Finance and Resources have been consulted and are in agreement with the content of this report.

Ward 9 Members and the Cowdenbeath Committee chair were sent copies of the draft Lochgelly SPTG and offered the opportunity of a briefing session prior to the document being published for the public consultation.

Consultation on the draft supplementary planning guidance was undertaken between 15th June and 20th July 2011 through Fife Council’s online consultation portal. In addition local groups were given the opportunity to submit additional comments up to 14th September 2011 as the consultation was partially during the summer holidays. All the representations have now been summarised and are included in Appendix A of this report along with responses to the comments made.

1.0 Background

1.1 The Lochgelly charrette was held on 8-13th March 2010 as part of the Scottish Government's Scottish Sustainable Communities Initiative (SSCI) Charrette Series. The outcomes from the charrette were the subject of a workshop for the Cowdenbeath Area Committee and Council Services on 18th May 2010.

1.2 Given the amount work undertaken through the Charrette process and the commitment shown by the local community to participate in the Charrette consultation, it was considered important to design a method by which the outcome from the Charrette can be included within the Development Plan process. In view of the statutory restrictions that prevented the Charrette report from being considered fully at the Local Plan examination, the 18th May workshop concluded that the preparation of Supplementary Planning Guidance would be an alternative route to give status to the Charrette findings in the Development Plan. This approach was agreed by Planning Committee on 29th June 2010.
2.0 Issues and Options

2.1 Development of the Lochgelly Supplementary Planning and Transport Guidance

2.1.1 The Lochgelly Supplementary Planning and Transport Guidance (SPTG) is a new type of guidance for Fife Council, it provides detailed and specific guidance on urban design and sustainable development for the whole of Lochgelly including the land identified to meet the Lochgelly Strategic Land Allocation requirement set by the Fife Structure Plan.

2.1.2 A scoping paper which set out the proposed contents of the guidance was prepared in July 2010 and circulated to key stakeholders including the ward 9 members, key council services, and members of the Fife Design Review Panel for comments.

2.1.3 The Lochgelly SPTG has been developed in collaboration with a number of Fife Council services most notably Transportation Service and Leisure and Cultural Service to ensure that the Lochgelly SPTG does not conflict with other Fife Council strategies. The Lochgelly SPTG also complies with national design policies Designing Places and Designing Streets.

2.1.4 In January 2011 a Fife Design Review was held to consider an early draft of the guidance. The feedback from the review was then used to refine and improve the document.

2.1.5 In April and May 2011 a series of workshops were held to develop and agree design principles for the Strategic Land Allocation Areas. This discussion built on work started during the Lochgelly Charrette. Key Fife Council services, landowners and developers were invited to participate in the workshops. Some funding was secured from the SSCI so that an independent facilitator could be brought in to oversee some of these workshops. The agreed development principles were then included in the draft Lochgelly SPTG.

2.1.6 The draft Lochgelly SPTG was published for public consultation on 15th June 2011.

2.2 Consultation Responses

2.2.1 The consultation on the draft supplementary planning guidance ran for 5 weeks and attracted 15 representations from various individuals, local groups, landowner and developers, and business interests. A summary of the main findings of the issues raised through the consultation is set out below. A fuller assessment of the representations and Fife Council responses is provided in Appendix A.
2.2.2 Many of the representations received included comments on the level of housing that was being proposed around Lochgelly or objections to the sites identified to meet the Strategic Land Allocation. These elements are set by the Mid Fife Local Plan and the objections revisit issues that have been raised through the Local Plan process and which have been considered through the examination into the Local Plan. The Lochgelly SPTG did not revisit these allocations but provided more detailed design guidance as to how these areas should be developed to ensure that they become attractive and well integrated parts of Lochgelly.

2.3 Support

2.3.1 There was support for much of the Lochgelly SPTG in particular for the aims and objectives that were described in the guidance, the town centre development areas, the protection of built heritage and the design principles for the Strategic Land Allocation areas.

2.4 Design Principles

2.4.1 There were comments from developers and landowners agents that some of the more detailed guidance in the development principles (street width, block layout and active frontages) is too prescriptive and does not provide enough flexibility for alternative design solutions to emerge.

2.4.2 The design principles in the guidance reflect best urban design practice. It is considered that these principles do not promote a single design solution to fit all situations but allow for a range of different solutions; so that designers can tailor their design to suit a particular situation. The design principles have been included to ensure that all new development in Lochgelly meets a standard of design that is acceptable to Fife Council and contributes positively to public spaces. This means that new development should help to shape the public realm (by providing definition and enclosure to the space), help to make the public realm more attractive and safe by providing active frontages (which will provide interest and passive surveillance) and by including measures to reduce traffic speeds.

2.4.3 In addition, the guidance on street design was considered to be too complex by some representations. The design principles and street guidance have been reworked to simplify them and to remove some of the more generic design guidance which is provided by other policies and guidance.
2.5 Benchmarking

2.5.1 There were a couple of comments that suggested a cautious approach should be taken towards the vision statement that new development in Lochgelly would provide a benchmark for design quality and sustainability. In response to this the vision has been reworded to remove the term "benchmark" and replace it with "exemplar" as this better reflects the vision for Lochgelly. They were also concerned that the Fife Sustainability Checklist targets for environmental sustainability described in the guidance might be set beyond Scottish Building Regulations levels. While the creation of sustainable development is one of the key aims of the Lochgelly SPTG it is not the intention of the guidance to put a burden on development that would make it unviable. The guidance has been revised to reflect this.

2.6 Rail Station relocation

2.6.1 The proposal to safeguard land at Launcherhead Park for a potential relocation of the rail station was the subject of a number of representations. Many of these suggested that alternative land to the east of the existing station or north of the railway line could be used for improvements to the existing provision.

2.6.2 The proposal to relocate and enhance the rail station at Launcherhead Park and connect this to an extended Station Road was identified through the Lochgelly Charrette. The proposal was discussed at the May 2010 workshop on the charrette outcomes. At that workshop it was agreed that the land to accommodate this proposal should be safeguarded to ensure that this opportunity was not lost through injudicious development before further assessment of the rail station proposal could take place. Options for the future of the rail station in Lochgelly will be considered through future assessment. The Lochgelly SPTG just safeguards the site.

2.7 Pipeline consultation zone guidance

2.7.1 There were a couple of representations that objected to the guidance for the pipeline consultation zone. These were from landowners or developers with land within the middle pipeline consultation zone covered by the guidance. Other representations supported restricting the level of development near the pipelines.

2.7.2 As a response to the concerns raised through the consultation there have been further discussions with all key stakeholders (the Health and Safety executive, representatives of Shell and landowner/developer agents, Fife Council officers). As a result of these discussions an alternative approach to this issue is being considered and has been set out in the amended guidance.
2.8 Long and complex document

2.8.1 There were a few comments that the Lochgelly SPTG is a long and complex document. It is agreed that the document is too long, this is partially because it includes look up lists of guidance for specific areas in the appendices and includes some explanations of how and why certain parts of the guidance have been included. The format of the document has been substantially revised make it easier to use. The guidance is now a concise document containing key design considerations with an associated compendium of more detailed and technical guidance.

2.9 Consultation period

2.9.1 Several representations received asked if the consultation period could be extended and highlighted that the Service Centre is only open for two days a week and that not everyone has internet access.

2.9.2 A hard copy of the guidance was available to view at Lochgelly Library which is open six days a week as well as in the Local Office. It was not considered possible to extend the consultation period given committee timescales and Local Plan work programming. However, groups who raised this as an issue were given the opportunity to submit additional comments up to 14th September so that committee can consider them.

2.9.3 There were also a number of representations who highlighted that some of the area covered by the Lochgelly SPTG is covered by Lumphinnans Community Council and requesting that they be consulted on the document. This was an oversight on our part and as a result Lumphinnans Community Council were sent a hard copy of the guidance and several copies on CD on 22nd July. They were also given the 14th September deadline to respond with any comments they may have. No further representations have been received.

3.0 Conclusions

3.1 The public consultation exercise on the draft Lochgelly Supplementary Planning and Transport guidance generated a number of responses. The comments highlighted the length and complexity of the document and as a result the guidance has been substantially reworked restructured and more generic elements of the guidance have been removed. There have also been a number of modifications made to the content of the guidance in response to comments. These are listed in Appendix B. If adopted the Lochgelly SPTG will be a material consideration in determining planning applications.
List of Appendices

1. Appendix A: Assessment of Consultation Responses
2. Appendix B: Modifications made to the draft Lochgelly Supplementary Planning and Transport Guidance.
3. Appendix C: Lochgelly Supplementary Planning and Transport Guidance (a CD with this document has been sent to members and it is available to view on FISH and Fife Direct).

Background Papers
The following papers were relied on in the preparation of this report in terms of the Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1973:

- Draft Lochgelly Supplementary Planning and Transport Guidance, June 2011
- Minute of Planning Committee 29th June 2010
- Planning Committee 29th June 2010 item 07 - Mid Fife Local Plan - Pre Examination Modifications: Consultation outcome - Appendix F
- Representations to the draft Lochgelly Supplementary Planning and Transport Guidance, June 2011

Report Contact

Author Name Alison Wood
Author’s Job Title Planner
Workplace Town House, 2 Wemyssfield, Kirkcaldy
Telephone: 08451 55 55 55 442268
Email - alison.wood@fife.gov.uk
1.1 Background

1.1.1 Fifteen representations were received as part of the consultation on the Lochgelly Supplementary Planning and Transport Guidance (SPTG).

List of Represenetees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep no</th>
<th>Representee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LSPTG1</td>
<td>Richard Innes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSPTG2</td>
<td>Margaret McBride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSPTG3</td>
<td>James Glen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSPTG4</td>
<td>Lochgelly Community Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSPTG5</td>
<td>Christine McGrath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSPTG6</td>
<td>T Glen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSPTG7</td>
<td>No representation made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSPTG8</td>
<td>DPP (for Shell UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSPTG9</td>
<td>Loch of Shining Waters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSPTG10</td>
<td>David Hempseed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSPTG11</td>
<td>Ernest McPherson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSPTG12</td>
<td>Alexander Sharp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSPTG13</td>
<td>Robert Millar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSPTG14</td>
<td>JS Builders and MacTaggart Mickel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSPTG15</td>
<td>Lynch Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSPTG16</td>
<td>Strawsons/Omnivale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Profile of representees

1.1.2 The two main issues arising from the consultation were the size and complexity of the document and the pipeline consultation zone guidance.
List of Issues:

- Level of housing development around Lochgelly, sites identified for housing development and need for associated infrastructure to be provided;
- Need for caution when promoting Lochgelly as a benchmark for design and sustainability;
- Some of the design principles were considered to be too prescriptive;
- The street guidance was considered to be too complex;
- Relationship of the guidance to the Fife Sustainability Checklist;
- Improvements at Lochgelly rail station;
- Objection to further investment at Miners Square;
- Town House development area should reflect the extant planning consent for the Fabtec site;
- The Berry Street guidance was considered to be vague;
- Specific queries relating to the SLA development principles including queries on the provision of play equipment and comments that the plans were confusing;
- Objections to the perceived ‘token’ nature of greenspace to be provided by new development and concern over the future maintenance of greenspace;
- Request that ruins to the south of Lochgelly are included in the list of valuable Built Heritage;
- Objections to the pipeline consultation zone guidance;
- Length of the consultation and need to consult Lumphinnans Community Council;
- Length and complexity of the document and clarity over when updates would be required.

1.1.3 This appendix provides a detailed and full assessment of the findings and analysis of the representations and responses to them.

2.2 Level and location of new development

2.2.1 There were four representations that objected to the level of housing development proposed around Lochgelly mainly due to perceived loss of greenspace around Lochgelly (as new development is mainly proposed on greenfield sites). The need to provide infrastructure (education, health) for this increased population was also raised. In addition there were objections and support for particular strategic land allocation sites.

2.2.2 The level and type of development around Lochgelly and the particular sites identified to accommodate the development have been set by the Fife Development Plan and is beyond the remit of the Lochgelly SPTG. Infrastructure improvements required to serve an increased population are also addressed in the Development Plan. These issues have been previously raised through consultation on the Mid Fife Local Plan and have been considered through the examination into that plan. The Examination report concluded that the sites identified to accommodate the Lochgelly Strategic Land Allocation (SLA), the uses identified for those sites and the capacity of
the SLA should go forward as proposed in the Mid Fife Local Plan Pre-
Examination Modifications - modification 147.

2.2.3 To reinforce the principle of walkable neighbourhoods the SLA
development principles plans will include indicative areas where adaptable
buildings should be located; these are buildings which could accommodate
alternative uses which provide neighbourhood facilities as required.

2.3 Vision + Aims and Objectives

2.3.1 Ten of the representations supported the vision and the aims and
objectives for Lochgelly that were described in the guidance. Particular
support was given to the promotion of the town centre and the town centre
redevelopment proposals; the over arching design principles for Lochgelly; the
creation of attractive public spaces with clear functions; improving
connections through Lochgelly; shop front improvements; street tree planting;
and the sympathetic development and protection of the existing built heritage.

2.3.2 There was some concern that the vision did not benefit local people
enough, or was encouraging development on greenfield land but these
appear to be a response to the level of development that is proposed around
Lochgelly through the Fife Development Plan which is discussed in section
2.2.

2.3.3 A couple of representations felt that a cautious approach should be
taken towards the vision statement that new development in Lochgelly would
provide a benchmark for design quality and sustainability. In response to this
the vision has been reworded to remove the term benchmark and replace it
with exemplar as this better reflects the vision for Lochgelly.

2.4 Design Principles

2.4.1 There was support for the overarching design principles although one
representation expressed doubt that all new development could be designed
to be of high quality and incorporate energy efficient design. However, it is
Scottish Government policy that new development will be of good design to
help to create successful, sustainable places. This is reflected in Mid Fife
Local Plan Policy E4: Development Quality – Design, particularly in the
requirement for new development to demonstrate well thought out design, and
high standards of architecture in terms of form, scale, layout, detailing and
choice of materials. The Lochgelly SPTG provides an additional level of detail
to describe what is meant by these terms and explain how this can be
achieved in the particular context of Lochgelly.

2.4.2 The energy efficient design principles that are outlined in the guidance
are all passive measures that relate to how a building and its surroundings
can be designed to reduce energy consumption, rather than promoting the
use of mechanical measures such as solar panels. Over the next few years
Building Standards requirements for reduction in carbon emissions will
become much more onerous and all buildings will be required to demonstrate
energy efficient design. In future revisions of the Lochgelly SPTG this section
could be removed form the guidance. At present however it is considered
useful to promote passive measures for energy efficient design that should influence the masterplanning process. In addition text will be added to the SLA section of the guidance to highlight the need for long term developments to consider any land use requirements that may be needed to meet building standard requirements in the future.

2.4.3 Two representations were concerned that the more detailed guidance on street width, block layout and active frontages is too prescriptive and that the guidance on street design is too complex.

2.4.4 The design principles in the guidance reflect best urban design practice. It is considered that these principles do not promote a single design solution to fit all situations but allow for a range of different solutions; so that designers can tailor their design to suit a particular situation. The design principles have been included to ensure that all new development in Lochgelly meets a certain standard of design and contributes positively to the public realm of Lochgelly. This means that new development should help to shape the public realm (by providing definition and enclosure to the space) and help to make the public realm more attractive and safe by providing active frontages (which will provide interest and passive surveillance) and including measures to reduce traffic speeds.

2.4.5 It is considered that there is value in categorising different streets according to their movement vs place function and providing urban design guidance for these different categories of streets. However, it is agreed that it would be beneficial to make this guidance clearer. To that end the more generic design guidance has been removed leaving the guidance for different categories of street.

2.4.6 Specific questions were asked in relation to parking ratios and parking courtyards. Fife Council provides guidance on parking ratios in the Fife Council Transportation Guidelines. Specific detail would be discussed as part of planning application discussions. As the section on parking in the guidance is generic and covered by other Fife Council guidelines and Designing Streets; this section of the guidance will be removed.

2.4.7 The requirement in the Lochgelly SPTG to meet various Sustainability Checklist standards was considered to be particularly onerous and to have substantial cost implications and clarification was requested on the relationship between the Fife Sustainability Checklist and other Fife Council policies and which should take precedence if they conflict.

2.4.8 The Lochgelly SPTG is intended to promote sustainable development but not to introduce targets that make development unviable. The references to the Fife Sustainability Checklist targets will be removed from the guidance as development proposals will be considered against the checklist through the planning application process.

2.4.9 There was support for improvements to be made to the rail station particularly in relation to providing disabled access to the north. However, six representations objected to the loss of Launcherhead Park to accommodate the rail station proposals and many of these suggested that land further east of the current station or to the north of the railway could be used to accommodate the improvements.
2.4.10 The opportunity to relocate and improve the rail station to the Launcherhead Park area was identified through the Lochgelly Charrette. The proposal in the Lochgelly SPTG is to safeguard the land at Launcherhead Park for rail station improvements to ensure that the opportunity to relocate the rail station to this location is not lost through injudicious development.

2.4.11 The proposal to safeguard land at Launcherhead Park was supported at the Cowdenbeath Area Committee workshop on 18th May 2010 and on 29th June 2010 Planning Committee agreed to commend the person carrying out the examination into the Mid Fife Local Plan to include the proposal in the Lochgelly settlement plan in the Local Plan. Unfortunately due to the timing of the charrette (as it came after the draft Local Plan was published), the examination reporters were unable to include outcomes from the charrette in their recommendations for changes to the Local Plan. They did however highlight the importance of the charrette process and that the findings from the charrette should inform the development of future masterplans. The viability of the rail station proposal and alternative options to improve the facility will be explored in more detail in the future. There will be opportunities in the future for the public to comment on any options which are being considered through the Local Development Plan process.

2.5 Town Centre Guidance

2.5.1 Six representations supported the town centre development area proposals although there was some concern around the cost of buying and demolishing properties to deliver the strategies. One representation objected to more money being spent on the Miners Square area suggesting that future investment would best be directed elsewhere in Lochgelly (in particular to various flats) spreading investment more equally through Lochgelly.

2.5.2 Funding has already been secured to start the demolition of buildings around the Town House area and these are due to be completed by spring 2012. Further improvements to the Miners Square were proposed through the Lochgelly Charrette to help to enclose the square shutting out unsightly views and to provide active frontages to the space with the aim of increasing the usage of the space. The Miners Square is the most prominent civic space in Lochgelly so further investment in it will benefit all the residents of Lochgelly.

2.5.3 One representation was concerned that while there is a definite strategy established for the Berry Street area the proposals for the area seemed a bit vague.

2.5.4 The Berry St is a cleared site and doesn’t have the constraints associated with the other town centre sites such as historic buildings, a mix of landowners, and potential for building removal. As a result, the other sites require stronger and more detailed design advice to help facilitate re-development. On the Berry Street site the strategic design principles will help to secure a high quality development but they incorporate an element of flexibility to encourage potential developers to come up with appropriate detailed design proposals.
2.5.5 One representation argued that the extant planning consent for a retail development on the Fabtec site (in the Town House area), should be referred to in the guidance and reflected in the strategy. In particular they asked that the residential units shown facing the park be deleted and the building at the corner of Hall St and High St be removed from the larger building footprint as these are not part of the current consent.

2.5.6 The urban design strategy for the town house area is aspirational and indicative and therefore should not be linked to specific planning consents. In terms of seeking the most appropriate development opportunities, and highest quality streetscape to meet wider urban design objectives, it is considered that the small single storey unit adjacent to the Fabtec site would ideally form part of a larger development scheme. With an enlarged development site, scope exists for providing a positive frontage development on to the Park.

2.5.7 The representation also argued that all the new development footprints should be clearly labelled as indicative. Fife Council agrees that this should be clarified and proposes to add a statement to the Lochgelly SPTG highlighting that the illustrations are indicative unless they form part of a currently approved scheme.

2.6 Strategic Land Allocation guidance

2.6.1 As discussed in paragraph 2.2.2 the majority of the comments regarding the Strategic Land Allocation guidance (ten) were objecting to or supporting particular sites rather than relating to the design guidance for the different areas. The representations that did comment on the design guidance supported many of the design principles set for the SLA sites although a number of points were raised and the keys and plans were thought to be confusing. In response to this last comment Fife Council intends to present the plans and principles for the SLA areas in an alternative way.

2.6.2 There were a couple of comments relating to the principle that ‘development should sit back to back with the existing built edge’. These argued that there may be areas where an alternative approach should be taken for instance allowing gables to face onto the backs of existing buildings. Fife Council believes that the principle of ensuring that the backs of existing buildings are not left exposed by new development is sound. If deviation from this principle can be justified in a particular circumstance it can be considered as part of a detailed planning application.

2.6.3 In the development principles for South Lochgelly representations asked for more clarity over the delivery of environmental improvements by Albert Park and anticipated development within the hatched areas referred to above. There was a request that the land to the east of The Mains should be included as having potential for future growth and that the reference to the pipeline consultation zone should be the same as in the principles for Lochgelly East.

2.6.4 The route that passes beside the Albert Park will form one of the main pedestrian routes between the development to the south of Lochgelly and the town centre and it is important that this route is made more attractive to encourage usage. The land is owned by Fife Council and it is anticipated that
this will be a Fife Council led environmental improvement project with some financial contribution from the developers of Lochgelly South.

2.6.5 The land to the east of The Mains is not shown as having the potential for future development for a couple of reasons, firstly it was not shown as developed in the long term masterplan that was produced through the Lochgelly Charrette. In addition, much of this land falls within the inner pipeline consultation zone which is not considered suitable for any residential development in the Health and Safety Executives Land Use Planning Methodology (PADHI+).

2.6.6 With regard to the reference to the pipeline consultation zone in Lochgelly South the Lochgelly SPTG guidance for the Pipeline Consultation Zone has changed (see paragraph 2.9.3) this text will be deleted from all the Lochgelly South and Lochgelly North East development principles.

2.6.7 One representation would like the development principles for Lochgelly West to clarify the reference to an access to future development along the western boundary and the relationship of new development to the existing cottages within the site. It is agreed that the backs of the existing cottages in Lochgelly West should be highlighted on the development principles plan in the same way that the backs of other existing properties are highlighted. The arrow indicating access to future development on the western boundary will be removed for consistency as this does not reflect an area highlighted for potential future development in the Lochgelly Charrette.

2.6.8 There is a representation that is concerned about access shown to Lochgelly North from Launcherhead Road creating congestion and the future of the core path through Lochgelly North. All the sites which have core paths through or adjacent to them include text stating that any core paths must be retained although their routes can be altered slightly. With regard to the access to Lochgelly North taken from Launcherhead Road, three potential routes are shown into the area of which two must be provided, this has been agreed with Transportation Service and will be discussed in more detail when specific proposals are put forward in a planning application. However, given the constraint of the railway bridge the access from Launcherhead Road will always be a fairly narrow secondary access into Lochgelly North and it not considered likely that congestion will be a problem.

2.6.9 There were a couple of representations on the design principles for Lochgelly East. It was argued that the preparation of a brief for this area pre-empted the reporter’s findings from the examination into the Mid Fife Local Plan. Fife Council does not agree that this guidance pre-empted the reporter’s findings as the design principles for Lochgelly East set guidance for the design of a development rather than specifying particular land uses. Given the presence of two pipelines cutting across the site any alternative uses will be fairly restricted and could be accommodated within the framework as shown. The report on the examination into the Mid Fife Local Plan has now been published and the land uses for Lochgelly East proposed by Fife Council have been supported by the examination reporter.

2.6.10 The principles of using the wayleaves to frame views into the site, protecting existing wall and tree belts and creating linkages to from and
through the site were all supported. However, it is suggested that access
could be taken from the existing roundabout on the B9149 rather than solely
from the south of the site. It is assumed that this representation refers to the 3
arm roundabout at the junction with Muir Road. Transportation Services have
confirmed that they have no objection to the provision of a 4th arm from this
roundabout. It is anticipated that this would be a more expensive option than
upgrading the Avenue to provide access, particularly as the Avenue would
need to be upgraded in either scenario as at least one access would be taken
from it. However, the design principles for Lochgelly East will be amended to
include the option to provide a 4th arm off the Muir Road roundabout.

2.6.11 One representation made on behalf of Shell, suggested that the NGL
pipeline is not shown in the correct location. This representation also states
that building frontages in close proximity to the pipeline are not appropriate
and should be reconsidered. Following further discussions with the
representee they agree that the position of the NGL pipeline is not shown in
the wrong location on the plan. However, it is agreed that built frontages
should not be shown so close to the line of the pipeline on the plan, these will
be moved back.

2.6.12 A couple of representations promoted the development of a
supermarket and petrol station on Lochgelly North East. Appropriate land
uses within the Strategic Land Allocation areas are identified in the Local Plan
which also includes policies on the location of new retail development. It is not
the role of the Lochgelly SPTG to review these land uses.

2.6.13 Representations also raised concerns about the sewerage capacity of
Lochgelly West and Lochgelly North. Scottish Water have been consulted
regarding the Strategic land Allocations around Lochgelly and have advised
that should there be insufficient capacity for development at water or
wastewater treatment works (Part 4 Assets), Scottish Water will provide
additional capacity if the developer can meet set criteria.

2.6.14 Two representations questioned Fife Council’s decision not to require
additional equipped play areas in Lochgelly West and Lochgelly South but to
require a financial contribution to upgrade existing play facilities at Brucefield
Park, Violet Park, Town Park and West End Park. They argue that this
conflicts with other Fife Council guidance and PAN65 and suggest that the
requirement for play equipment is better discussed at the planning application
stage than set out as a requirement in the SPTG.

2.6.15 National policies and guidance SPP/PAN65/ Fields In Trust all state
that locally based standards on play areas should be developed. This is what
Fife Council have done through the Greenspace Audit, Greenspace Strategy
and proposed Open Space Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG). The
emerging draft Open Space SPG will state that not all new developments will
require a new play area. Fife Council is looking at providing a play hierarchy
so that there is an equitable distance to public play areas and three levels of
type of play area. Publicly usable residential greenspace is proposed as
neighbourhood play space, and is not necessarily equipped.

2.7 Greenspace guidance
2.7.1 There was support for the greenspace guidance. However, there were a number of representations that objected to any loss of greenspace in Lochgelly. These appear mainly to refer to the Strategic Land Allocations being on greenfield sites and the safeguarding of Launcherhead Park for rail station improvements, both of which have already been discussed (in section 2.2 and paragraphs 2.4.5 and 2.4.6). There were also several representations that asked that public parks, football parks, allotments and the golf course are given protection. This issue has been raised previously through the Local Plan process and was addressed through the Mid Fife Local Plan Pre Examination modifications Oct 2009. It was also considered through the examination into the Mid Fife Local Plan which concluded that the identification of key areas of open space proposed through modification 147 would address the concerns raised. The examination report also agreed with Fife Council’s position that the golf course should not be designated as open space as it is outwith Lochgelly settlement envelope and so is protected by countryside policies.

2.7.2 Some representations questioned the ‘token’ nature of the greenspace that will be provided within the Strategic Land Allocation areas and one which queried why the accessibility threshold used is 250m rather than the 400m that is recommended at national planning advice level as an easy walking distance.

2.7.3 The development principles for the Strategic Land Allocation sites include areas of indicative greenspace that must be a minimum of 0.5 hectares in size (although of course these spaces could be larger). The total amount of greenspace that will be required for each development site will depend on the number of houses that are to be built on it; the development principles just indicate how key areas of that greenspace should be provided in terms of location and minimum size to ensure that the greenspace is well distributed and usable for different activities. Fife Council research has shown that greenspace of 0.5 hectares and above can incorporate a range of facilities and features and promotes physical activity whereas greenspace which is smaller than 0.5 hectares can accommodate much fewer activities.

2.7.4 Regarding accessibility thresholds, the draft open space SPG will propose that publicly usable greenspace is no more than 250m away from dwelling plot front entrances and that equipped play areas are less than 500m away. The 250m distance is based on research on children’s roaming ranges that is being used in the development of the Open Space Supplementary Planning Guidance.

2.7.5 One representation highlighted that Brucefield Park should be shown on the hierarchy of open space diagram and argued that it should be considered of local not neighbourhood importance. It is agreed that Brucefield Park should be categorised as of local and not neighbourhood importance. The open space information has been presented in a different way in the revised guidance. Brucefield Park is included on this new diagram.

2.7.6 The future maintenance of greenspace was raised as a concern and clarity was sought on whether street trees on adopted roads would be adopted by Fife Council.
2.7.7 Fife Council does not maintain all the public land in Fife. There are various organisations that own and maintain public land. The land that Fife Council does maintain has to meet certain standards which are monitored. The maintenance of public space in new development is the responsibility of the developer and is not monitored publicly. The adoption of street trees would be discussed as part of detailed planning application discussions.

2.8 Built Heritage
2.8.1 There was support from three representations for the protection of the existing built heritage of Lochgelly and the quality of some recent development in Lochgelly was raised as an issue, in particular the relationship of new development to older building in the town. Concern over the gradual erosion of the quality of the built environment in Lochgelly is one of the key reasons why the Lochgelly SPTG has been produced. It is hoped that this guidance will lead to the expectation and delivery of higher quality in all new development in the town.

2.8.2 There was a request that the ruins in Lochgelly South should be included within the built heritage section and given protection from development. Fife Council agrees to include these ruins within the built heritage section of the guidance.

2.9 Pipeline Consultation Zone guidance
2.9.1 There were a number of consultations that raised concerns about development near the pipelines and there was support for protection of the pipeline zones. There were three representations that commented directly on the pipeline consultation guidance in the Lochgelly SPTG.

2.9.2 A couple of representations from developer/landowner agents did not support the guidance for the pipeline consultation zone, they considered that the guidance was too prescriptive and fundamentally flawed.

2.9.3 As a response to the concerns raised through the consultation a meeting has been held with all key stakeholders (the Health and Safety Executive, representatives of Shell and landowner/developer agents, Fife Council officers). As a result of this meeting alternative approaches to this issue are being considered and will be reflected in the amended guidance.

2.10 Other general comments
2.10.1 The representations also included a number of general comments on a range of issues.

Consultation period
2.10.2 Six representations asked for the consultation period to be extended, they highlighted that the Service Centre is only open for two days a week and that not everyone has internet access. In addition to the Service Centre a hard copy of the document was available to view at Lochgelly Library, which is
open six days a week. With regards to an extension of the consultation period this was not considered possible because of committee timescales and competing Local Plan work pressures. Groups who raised this as an issue were given the opportunity to submit additional comments up to 14th September. No additional representations have been received.

**Lumphinnans Community Council**

2.10.3 There were also four representations who highlighted that some of the area covered by the Lochgelly SPTG is covered by Lumphinnans Community Council and requesting that they be consulted on the document. This was an oversight on our part and as a result Lumphinnans Community Council were sent a hard copy of the guidance and several copies on CD on 22nd July. They were also given the 14th September deadline to respond with any comments they may have. No comments have been received from Lumphinnans Community Council.

**Regeneration benefits**

2.10.4 There was a comment that questioned whether development on greenfield land would have the effect of regenerating Lochgelly. Others supported the regeneration of Lochgelly although one was concerned that the viability of the town centre may be compromised because of the lack of a supermarket in the town and some concerns were raised over how recent retail applications had been handled in the Lochgelly and Cowdenbeath area. There were also a couple of representations that promoted projects to develop better links to and usage of Loch Gelly although these acknowledged that this was beyond the remit of the Lochgelly SPTG. The draft Fife Core Path Plan proposes improved links between Lochgelly and Loch Gelly; the Lochgelly SPTG does not prejudice the development of these pathways and includes text that core paths must be retained.

**Charrette**

2.10.5 There were two comments that referenced the outcomes from the charrette. One felt that decisions had already been made prior to the charrette and that comments made during the charrette regarding the Lochgelly Centre and South Street housing have not been taken into account since. A couple of representations were concerned that Lochgelly golf course is shown as developed in later stages of the charrette masterplan.

2.10.6 The comments that were made during the charrette regarding the Lochgelly Centre and housing at South Street were discussed immediately after the charrette with the design teams for these projects. Unfortunately both projects were at stages where further delays would have led to funding and contractual problems so neither project could accommodate major redesigns. However, landscaping and the roundabout to the front of the Lochgelly Centre are currently being looked at with a view to upgrading this area as proposed during the charrette. The proposal to develop on the golf course in the future will be assessed through future Local Development Plans.

2.10.7 The charrette masterplan does not have any status in planning terms. The timing of the charrette was beyond Fife Council’s control and it came after the publication of the draft Kirkcaldy and Mid Fife Local Plan which had already identified sites to accommodate the Lochgelly SLA. The charrette
team were given the remit to test these allocations and propose any changes to the boundaries that they felt were justified. However, no significant alterations were made by the charrette masterplan.

The document format

2.10.8 There were a number of comments that related directly to the document itself. Several representations commented that the document was large and complicated. This will be addressed by the creation of a short summary document that presents the key design considerations for Lochgelly with the more detailed and specific guidance in an associated compendium. The presentation of the information will also be simplified to make it more accessible and easier to read. There were a couple of labelling errors for some images which will be rectified. And the public will be added as a key audience for the guidance as requested.

Concept plan

2.10.9 The status of the Lochgelly development framework concept plan in the Mid Fife Local Plan was raised asking if this will be superseded by the Lochgelly SPTG. There are a few differences between what is presented in the concept plan and what is shown in the more detailed plans for the SLA areas in the Lochgelly SPTG mainly relating to access and routes. The Lochgelly SPTG plans were developed through further discussion with key stakeholders and present the more up to date position regarding the design principles that should guide the development of the site; these would supersede the concept diagram. If adopted the Lochgelly SPTG will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

Updates

2.10.10 One comment asks for the guidance to provide clarity on when updates will be required and a commitment to consult on the Action Plan when it is produced. The guidance will be reviewed on a regular basis to ensure that it reflects the local development plan and national and local policies. The Action Plan (the programme of medium to long term projects in Lochgelly) will be the subject of consultation when it is developed.
## Appendix B

**Modifications made to the Draft Lochgelly Supplementary Planning and Transport Guidance.**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The structure of the document has been significantly changed and is now a concise document of key design considerations for Lochgelly with a more detailed and technical associated compendium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The more generic design guidance has been deleted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Strategic Land Allocation development principles drawings have been presented in a clearer format. The East Lochgelly drawing has been altered to move back the building frontages form the pipeline corridor. The West Lochgelly drawing has been altered to remove the arrow indicating a route through to potential development on the western boundary, and to indicate the backs of the existing cottages to the north of the site. Locations for adaptable buildings have been added to the SLA development principles plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The Town Centre guidance has been revised and represented to make it easier to read.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>It is considered that the building lines along the key streets are well defined and do not need to be replicated in the guidance. The information in Appendix B has been deleted and text referring to the principal frontage of all future development being located along the street's building line inserted instead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The key linkages have been renumbered and the link between Bank Street, Hall Street and High Street has been deleted as this is covered by the town centre guidance. An additional key linkage has been added between West End Park and Lumphinnans Road (Link 13) – this was previously referred to in the greenspace guidance section in the draft guidance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>References to the Fife Sustainability Checklist have been removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Text has been added to the SLA section to highlight that long term developments need to consider any land use requirements of building standards requirements in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The vision has been reworded to delete ‘benchmark’ and replace it with ‘exemplar’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10| The text relating to the pipeline consultation zone is to be deleted and replaced with the following:  

*Development levels to the east of Lochgelly and the constraint posed by the NGL pipeline need to be considered collectively. Further advice will be sought from the HSE which will inform the development of the SLA masterplans and inform future planning decisions. This advice will be reflected in updates of this guidance when it is available.* |
| 11| Guidance on the following is available elsewhere locally or nationally so these sections will be deleted from the guidance:  

- Waste collection;  
- SUDS  
- Parking  
- Appendix I: Guidance on low carbon development – technologies and methodologies |
| 12| The ruins to the south of Lochgelly (The Mains) have been added to the Built Heritage list. |
| 13| The public have been added as a key audience of the guidance in the introduction.            |
| 14| The open space diagram has been revised and the existing open space is shown in a different way with spaces that relate to the growth area highlighted. |
| 15| A diagram illustrating how the design process and planning process should work together has been included in the compendium. |
| 16| The guidance for specific streets has been reviewed and these have been renumbered.          |
Introduction
This document provides design guidance for all new development* in Lochgelly and a defined area around the town. The key audience for the guidance are developers, designers, planning officers, those making decisions on planning applications and the public. This document is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications within the area it covers. The guidance will be updated on a regular basis as required.

* For the purposes of this document development is defined as all domestic and non domestic development that is not considered as general permitted development

The growth and regeneration of Lochgelly has been selected as an exemplar project by the Scottish Sustainable Communities Initiative. The Lochgelly Charrette held in 2010 established principles for the future development of Lochgelly to ensure that it develops as a sustainable community. Most notably the principles of walkable neighbourhoods, connectivity and the support and regeneration of Lochgelly town centre define the content of this document.

How does this guidance relate to other planning policy?
The Lochgelly SPTG supplements the Mid Fife Local Plan as this diagram illustrates. Outcomes from the Lochgelly Charrette have been developed in collaboration with developers, landowners, other stakeholders and through public consultation and are reflected in this guidance.

More guidance on how the design process and the planning process should work together is in the compendium.
What does this document cover?
This document contains design guidance for:
1. Specific growth areas (Lochgelly Strategic Land Allocation);
2. Lochgelly Town Centre; and
3. Key streets, buildings and open spaces in Lochgelly.

Associated with this document is a compendium which contains some generic background information and some very specific data that will be relevant for particular planning applications. The compendium includes guidance on the following:

Introduction. Relationship of the design process to the planning process
A. Street Guidance
B. Greenspace Guidance
C. Built Heritage Guidance
# Aims and Objectives

## Aims and Place Objectives for Lochgelly

### Design Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aims and Place Objectives for Lochgelly</th>
<th>Design Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aim: Improved existing public realm and create high quality new public realm throughout Lochgelly which local residents feel is theirs to enjoy and look after.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Key Streets</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Urban Design Guidance:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o All new development must have a positive impact on the existing public realm of Lochgelly.</td>
<td>• Active frontages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All new public realm created by development must be of high design quality.</td>
<td>• Reduction in visual clutter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Private/public space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aim: Lochgelly residents choose to visit Lochgelly town centre for their everyday needs.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Town centre guidance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Town centre development area guidance:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Enhance the town centre and support the range of facilities needed to sustain the commercial centre of Lochgelly.</td>
<td>• Miners Square area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Protect and enhance the historic environment in Lochgelly.</td>
<td>• Town House area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Berry Street area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Built heritage</strong></td>
<td><strong>Key Streets:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Building lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Streets:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Urban Design Guidance:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Block Layout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open space</strong></td>
<td><strong>Key Linkages</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aim: Encourage the residents of Lochgelly to have healthier and more active lifestyles</strong></td>
<td><strong>SLA Development briefs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives:</strong></td>
<td>• Lochgelly South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Create high quality, accessible and attractive public spaces</td>
<td>• Lochgelly West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Create a network of safe, attractive, well connected streets and paths throughout Lochgelly and ensure that new facilities are within easy walking/cycling distance of all residents.</td>
<td>• Lochgelly North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lochgelly North East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lochgelly East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Design Guidance:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rail Station safeguarding</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Energy efficient design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pipeline consultation zone</strong></td>
<td><strong>Red design considerations apply to all new development within the red line</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Green design considerations apply to specific areas such as:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Development including or beside open space, built heritage, rail station proposal and within the pipeline consultation zone.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Blue design considerations apply to development in the town centre</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Orange design considerations apply to the Strategic Land Allocation</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**How to use this document**

Establish which design considerations will apply to your development.
The Vision for Lochgelly

- Lochgelly will be a place where people chose to live, work and invest.
- New development will be well-connected to existing neighbourhoods and the town centre.
- The town centre will be supported to become the vibrant heart of a strong and confident community.
- New neighbourhoods will be designed to enhance local identity and to become an exemplar in local design quality and sustainability.

Walkable neighbourhoods
The plan shows areas within a 5 minute (400m) walk from existing convenience shops (blue crosses and circles), the area within a 10 minute walk of Lochgelly Town Centre (pink circle) and some key locations where new neighbourhood facilities should be located to serve areas of growth (green crosses and circles).
1. Growth areas - Lochgelly Strategic Land Allocation

A number of discrete sites have been identified in the Mid Fife Local Plan to meet the Lochgelly Strategic Land Allocation. Given the separate nature of these sites it is not considered necessary for all the sites to be masterplanned together. However, individual masterplans must be developed for the five growth areas highlighted on the vision diagram regardless of land ownership. There must also be a co-ordinated approach taken to the design of the junction along Lumphinnans Road where Lochgelly South and Lochgelly West meet as highlighted on this plan.

Developing sites within a Strategic Land Allocation area

- Develop a masterplan for the SLA area the site is within, working with Fife Council and other landowners/developers with land in the same SLA area. The masterplan must take into account the development brief for the area in this document and the Lochgelly development framework in the Mid Fife Local Plan.
- The masterplan must not prejudice the long term potential for future development around Lochgelly as indicated in the Lochgelly Illustrative Plan -Charrette Series Report (2010).
- Existing mature trees, hedgerows and semi natural grassland should be retained in new development where possible.
- New greenspaces and water management systems should be designed to enhance the natural infrastructure, creating an integrated network of habitats, providing wildlife corridors and enhancing biodiversity.
- Produce an energy masterplan for all developments that will be built out over a long time. This is to ensure that the development will be able to meet future building standard requirements on carbon emissions and to identify any associated land requirements and implications for the layout of future development phases.

How does this document relate to the design process?

In the compendium there is a diagram which sets out the different stages of the design process and how these should relate to the planning process.
Lochgelly South development principles

Several areas of strategic greenspace have been identified across the site, the plan gives an indication of their location but the exact configuration of the space is flexible. Brucefield Park can be moved slightly so it is overlooked by houses and to create a more attractive entrance from Viewfield Terrace. No additional equipped play areas are required on site but a financial contribution must be made to upgrade play equipment in the Brucefield Park, West End Park and Public Park equivalent to two new local play areas.

The pedestrian route past Albert Park is an important link through to Lochgelly town centre. The area highlighted with a green hatch should be the subject of environmental improvements to make this an attractive route for pedestrians.

The routes through the sites should be designed so that they are broken up into short lengths with distinctive spaces created along their route, this will help to reduce traffic speeds and enhance legibility.

New development must not prejudice potential future development within these areas.

The southern edge of the site should be designed so to accommodate potential future growth to the south.

The core paths which run through the site must be retained although their routes can be altered slightly.

The pedestrian route past Albert Park is an important link through to Lochgelly town centre. The area highlighted with a green hatch should be the subject of environmental improvements to make this an attractive route for pedestrians.

Development frontages along the south western and south eastern perimeters of the site should face outwards towards the countryside and the Dora Golf course, these edges should not have a continuous built frontage but should allow pockets of greenspace to soften the impact of development facing the countryside.

Some well-connected locations within the development site have the potential to accommodate functions such as live work units or small scale retail/business uses. The masterplan should identify the locations for community hubs where adaptable buildings will be incorporated that could accommodate alternative uses in the future.

Development should sit back to back with the existing built edge.

Brucefield Park can be moved slightly so that it is overlooked by houses and to create a more attractive entrance from Viewfield Terrace.

No additional equipped play areas are required on site but a financial contribution must be made to upgrade play equipment in the Brucefield Park, West End Park and Public Park equivalent to two new local play areas.

The routes through the sites should be designed so that they are broken up into short lengths with distinctive spaces created along their route, this will help to reduce traffic speeds and enhance legibility.

At the east end of the site development must face onto The Avenue.

The southern edge of the site should be designed so to accommodate potential future growth to the south.

The core paths which run through the site must be retained although their routes can be altered slightly.

The pedestrian route past Albert Park is an important link through to Lochgelly town centre. The area highlighted with a green hatch should be the subject of environmental improvements to make this an attractive route for pedestrians.

Development frontages along the south western and south eastern perimeters of the site should face outwards towards the countryside and the Dora Golf course, these edges should not have a continuous built frontage but should allow pockets of greenspace to soften the impact of development facing the countryside.

Several areas of strategic greenspace have been identified across the site, the plan gives an indication of their location but the exact configuration of the space is flexible. Brucefield Park can be moved slightly so that it is overlooked by houses and to create a more attractive entrance from Viewfield Terrace. No additional equipped play areas are required on site but a financial contribution must be made to upgrade play equipment in the Brucefield Park, West End Park and Public Park equivalent to two new local play areas.

The pedestrian route past Albert Park is an important link through to Lochgelly town centre. The area highlighted with a green hatch should be the subject of environmental improvements to make this an attractive route for pedestrians.

The routes through the sites should be designed so that they are broken up into short lengths with distinctive spaces created along their route, this will help to reduce traffic speeds and enhance legibility.

At the east end of the site development must face onto The Avenue.

The southern edge of the site should be designed so to accommodate potential future growth to the south.

The core paths which run through the site must be retained although their routes can be altered slightly.

The pedestrian route past Albert Park is an important link through to Lochgelly town centre. The area highlighted with a green hatch should be the subject of environmental improvements to make this an attractive route for pedestrians.

Development frontages along the south western and south eastern perimeters of the site should face outwards towards the countryside and the Dora Golf course, these edges should not have a continuous built frontage but should allow pockets of greenspace to soften the impact of development facing the countryside.
Lochgelly West development principles

Two main vehicular accesses into the site are identified along with a key pedestrian route towards the town centre.

The layout should include a principal street through the site which links the two vehicular accesses into the site and extends to the north and east so that these routes could be extended in the future if the adjacent land becomes available for development.

The existing route and core paths which run through the site must be retained although their routes can be altered slightly.

SUDS are best located to the north west of the site and should ideally be designed to form accessible greenspace as part of the landscaped edge on the western boundary.

The existing treebelt on the western boundary should be enhanced to provide other greenspace and development must face onto this area.

Development frontages along the perimeter of the site should face outwards towards the Golf course, this edge should not have a continuous built frontage but should allow pockets of greenspace to soften the impact of the development facing the golf course.

Two accesses that would allow routes through to potential future development to the north and east have been identified (a minimum of two must be provided); the exact position of these access points is flexible but they should continue existing routes through the site.

Development frontages along the perimeter of the site should face outwards towards the Golf course, this edge should not have a continuous built frontage but should allow pockets of greenspace to soften the impact of the development facing the golf course.

The existing route and core paths which run through the site must be retained although their routes can be altered slightly.

A well-connected location within the development site has the potential to accommodate functions such as live work units or small scale retail / business uses. The masterplan should identify the location of a community hub where adaptable buildings will be incorporated that could accommodate alternative uses in the future.

One area of strategic greenspace has been identified towards the centre of the site, the plan gives an indication of its location but the exact configuration of the space is flexible. No additional equipped play areas are required on site but a financial contribution must be made to upgrade play equipment in the Violet Park equivalent to one new local play area.

New development must either face the front of the cottages to the north of the site or be sideways to them. The rear of the cottages should sit back to back with new development.

Development should sit back to back with the existing built edge.

New development must either face the front of the cottages to the north of the site or be sideways to them. The rear of the cottages should sit back to back with new development.

The existing route and core paths which run through the site must be retained although their routes can be altered slightly.

SUDS are best located to the north west of the site and should ideally be designed to form accessible greenspace as part of the landscaped edge on the western boundary.

The existing treebelt on the western boundary should be enhanced to provide other greenspace and development must face onto this area.

Development frontages along the perimeter of the site should face outwards towards the Golf course, this edge should not have a continuous built frontage but should allow pockets of greenspace to soften the impact of the development facing the golf course.

Two accesses that would allow routes through to potential future development to the north and east have been identified (a minimum of two must be provided); the exact position of these access points is flexible but they should continue existing routes through the site.

Access to be left through to potential future development

Built frontage

Rear gardens

Adaptable buildings

Existing greenspace

Existing built environment

SLA boundary
Lochgelly North development principles

It is assumed that no residential development will be built under the line of the overhead cables and for 30m either side of this line. If Lochgelly expands further to the north or west of the Local Plan allocation the overhead cables should be moved as part of the development proposals which would allow for this land to be built out. The design of the development in the short term must consider how the land under the overhead cables will integrate into the layout in the future.

Development frontages should face outwards towards the countryside with streets aligned north - south. There is justification for an alteration to the boundary to create an attractive entrance to Lochgelly and a better design solution for the development. The perimeter should not have a continuous built frontage but should allow pockets of greenspace to soften the visual impact of the development from the north.

The routes through the sites should be designed so that they are broken up into short lengths with distinctive spaces created along their route, this will help to reduce traffic speeds and enhance legibility. The core paths which run through the site must be retained although their routes can be altered slightly.

Three potential main vehicular accesses into the site are identified - a minimum of two must be provided.

Areas of strategic greenspace are indicated on the plan, however the exact configuration of the greenspace on the site is flexible. One equipped local play area must be provided on site.

The western edge must be designed to accommodate future vehicular/pedestrian connections. The exact position of these connections is flexible but they should continue existing routes through the site.

Development should sit back to back with the school and, in the future with the existing built edge, and the railway.

A route through to the area identified for the relocation of the rail station must be safeguarded.
The core paths which run through the site must be retained although their routes can be altered slightly.

Development frontages along the perimeter of the site should face outwards towards the countryside. The eastern perimeter should not have a continuous built frontage but should allow pockets of greenspace to soften the visual impact of the development from the east.

The pedestrian routes to the convenience shop on Cooper Ha’ Avenue should be enhanced.

Areas of strategic greenspace must be provided; indicative locations are shown on the diagram; however the exact location of the greenspace is not fixed. One equipped local play area must be provided on site.

Development should sit back to back with the existing built edge and the railway.

The backs and fronts of the existing houses at Sharp Grove, and Morris Avenue are currently arranged in a confusing layout with frontage facing away from the streets and backs and fronts facing each other in some places. The new development should seek to integrate the existing development to help resolve some of the existing conflicts between fronts and backs of houses.

Several vehicular and pedestrian accesses are shown on the diagram; one access must be taken from Stationhead Road and one should form a fourth arm from the junction at Auchterderran Road. The other access points are not fixed although a new vehicular access should be provided through to Morris Avenue to increase the permeability of this part of Lochgelly.

A signalised or priority junction at Auchterderran Road should be investigated to improve the junction for pedestrians.
Lochgelly East development principles

Two pipelines cross this site, wayleaves over both pipelines must be left free of development to allow for access - 7m wide along the NGL pipeline corridor and 10ft wide along the Natural Gas SGN pipeline corridor. Development within the pipeline consultation zone must comply with the Health and Safety Executive’s PADHI guidelines.

The main accesses into the site are taken from The Avenue. The first principal access into site should be positioned so that development can occur between B9149 and the NGL wayleave and a frontage can be formed at the prominent south western corner of the site. The location of further accesses will be determined through detailed layouts.

Access can be taken into the site via a fourth arm from the roundabout on the B9149.

The building that faces the roundabout at the south western corner of the site must be designed to reflect its prominent location. Development at this corner of the site must not prejudice a potential reconfiguration of the roundabout in the future.

The main accesses into the site are very important for the site, two pedestrian routes are identified to the west of the site, and the more northerly route is the more important of these two as it will provide a direct link to the town centre. This route should be provided as a minimum.

There is the potential to establish visible secondary frontages within the site by utilising the wayleaves as vistas.

Both tree belts that traverse the site and the pocket of trees in the far south west corner of the site should be retained. The rubble wall that forms the eastern boundary of the site should be retained and repaired (although access points can be taken into the site along this boundary).

Linkages to the rest of Lochgelly are very important for the site, two pedestrian routes are identified to the west of the site, and the more northerly route is the more important of these two as it will provide a direct link to the town centre. This route should be provided as a minimum.
2. Lochgelly Town Centre

Overview

Lochgelly Town Centre – Key Features

Problems

1. Absence of a ‘heart’ or focus to Lochgelly’s town centre – currently spread out over a large area.

2. Large areas of land which are vacant, underused, contain empty buildings, and do not look good.

3. Pedestrian connections between important town centre sites are not clear.

Opportunities

1. Create a new ‘heart’ to the town centre, based upon St. Andrews Church and its surroundings as a focal point.

2. Mixed use development to bring more activity into the town centre, regenerating the three identified town centre sites.

3. Development should be used to ‘activate’ underused sites by virtue of their location and orientation to streets and civic spaces.

4. Make it easier for people to move between the town centre sites, activities and facilities.
## Design Principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Principles</th>
<th>Supporting details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Building front facing the square</td>
<td>a. A café would enhance town centre activity at this important location. A building front facing the Square would add life and activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Integrate the Square – remove visual and movement barriers</td>
<td>b. Remove pedestrian barrier at the road junction. Amend boundary treatment to the car park and use appropriate palette of materials to integrate this area (including the gable elevation of the Miner’s Institute) into the Square environment. Consider reduction in shrubs and possible relocation of sculpture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Make pedestrian movement easier from Bank St./Main St.</td>
<td>c. Slow traffic down. Create a mixed priority area. Use an appropriate palette of materials to clearly mark entrance/exit to this area. Lower kerb to reinforce concept of shared priority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Seal poor quality edge to the Square.</td>
<td>d. Screen wall/feature used to draw the eye away from unsympathetic building behind, to the Square and its environment. The wall would also enclose the space and prevent it ‘leaking’ into substandard areas nearby.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Gable treatment – improve appearance and function of inactive/blank gable.</td>
<td>e. Opportunity to improve the visual quality of the very prominent building gable – through rendering/painting and/or installation of window openings to provide activity and overlooking to this blank gable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Existing pedestrian routes to Bank St are limited (as shown in red routes)

• St Andrews Church and Town House (shown in blue) ‘hemmed in’ by surrounding unsympathetic buildings.

• The solid red line indicates a current poor quality pedestrian link that should be improved as part of any development proposal.

• Removal of selected buildings (grey) would enable development to be achieved that meets the urban design strategy within this document.

• New buildings shown in red.

• Layout creates much greater pedestrian permeability to Bank St, with a network of overlooked streets and spaces.

• St Andrews Church and the Town House are released from the existing confinement, giving them more prominence within the town centre as befits their previous civic role.

• The solid red line indicates the potential long term opportunity to create a continuous new building frontage to Bank St, enhancing the activity onto the new pedestrian routes and avoiding service areas being presented onto these public spaces.

Note: All footprints of new buildings shown above are indicative.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Principles</th>
<th>Supporting details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Improve pedestrian links between the town centre and Town House area.</td>
<td>a. Removal of some buildings allows routes to be created to provide choice of movement and better integration between new retail opportunity (at Hall St/High St.) and other town centre locations/uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Enhance the setting of prominent historic buildings within the streetscape.</td>
<td>b. A new retail building facing onto the High St – alongside development of houses/offices on the west side of High St will help frame views to the Town House from the south and help use this important building as a local landmark.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. St Andrews Church will be freed from its claustrophobic relationship to adjacent buildings and perform an important civic role as the 'heart' of a rejuvenated town centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. The retention of the Art Deco frontage facing Bank St is encouraged. This is a landmark feature within streetscape of the town centre which provides character and definition to Bank St. Proposals should address the parking/service areas and building treatment to the rear, ensuring this area and the adjacent pedestrian route is attractive and safe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Create new civic space to:</td>
<td>e. New civic space around St Andrews Church could accommodate a range of uses (meeting place, music venue, market location, café), set within a mixed priority area to accommodate vehicular access movements without compromising pedestrian accessibility or comfort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provide a visual link between Bank St and Hall St, and a ‘natural’ movement route;</td>
<td>f. There is an opportunity for a new building adjacent to the rear of St Andrews Church. This could help activate the civic space by providing an active building front onto the space and provide a link with any new activity within the main body of the Church. To maintain the original buildings’ importance and setting, any new building: Must be subservient to the main church in size and architectural detailing. Be of simple design and proportions, with flexibility embedded in the design to allow for it to be used either as a stand alone unit or as an extension of uses associated with the Church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provide space for outdoor activity and increase the liveliness of the town centre.</td>
<td>g. New development will be expected to hide lower quality and private areas such as back gardens, service yards etc. from public view through the appropriate location of buildings. Within the illustrative concepts offered in this section, the principal streets and spaces all have building fronts facing them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. New development should:</td>
<td>h. There is a potential opportunity to extend the building line to enclose the rear of the Art Deco building on Bank St. (red dashed line). This would provide building fronts and activity facing the adjacent pedestrian route to the civic square and beyond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Enclose and overlook new streets and spaces with building fronts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Design Principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Principles</th>
<th>Supporting details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Seal prominent back gardens and rear elevations facing Berry St.</td>
<td>a. Berry Street realignment and infill development – allow building fronts to face the street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Create a focal point which captures key views into and through the site</td>
<td>b. Development of a flagship community facility (health centre). Principal frontage to Francis St with open space setting. Minimum 3 storeys from existing ground level to Francis St elevation – massing and building importance to be greater than adjacent care home building to reinforce flagship concept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Enhance the potential for pedestrian links to the town centre – supporting the integration of uses on this site with other town centre activities</td>
<td>c. Streetscape enhancements along Berry St/Bolan Sq, Francis St/Bank St and Francis St/Main St to make routes safe, attractive and easy to find. To include – hard/soft landscaping and a public art strategy to define each route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Development to provide building fronts facing adjacent streets and spaces</td>
<td>d. New development should present active building fronts to all streets and public spaces. Principal fronts should be located at junctions across the site and where buildings would terminate important views.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Key streets, buildings and open spaces

**Key Streets**

Understanding the significance of the place and movement functions of key streets in Lochgelly allows design objectives to be set that can best enhance their role within the public realm of Lochgelly. This context will also allow new streets within Lochgelly’s growth areas to be designed to reflect their role within the place / movement model.

The place / movement matrix below can be used to help classify different routes and parts of routes in Lochgelly based on their characteristics. The compendium contains guidance for each street classification and there is specific urban design guidance in the compendium for the streets that are highlighted on the plan below. These streets have a quality to their built environment which needs to be protected and enhanced.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District (A)</th>
<th>Neighbourhood (B)</th>
<th>Local (C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Street</td>
<td>Main Street (west of Bank Street)</td>
<td>Streets with negligible through vehicular traffic with a key civic role in Lochgelly. There are no streets in Lochgelly that can be categorised as C1 streets. However, the development area around the Town House will create C1 streets around St Andrews Church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Road</td>
<td>Lumphinnans Road</td>
<td>Streets with negligible through vehicular traffic adjacent to public space of street/quarter or town wide importance e.g. Hall Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auchterderran Road</td>
<td>McGregor Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets with a fairly constant flow of vehicular traffic adjacent to public space of street/quarter or town wide importance e.g. Cartmore Road</td>
<td>Other streets with negligible through vehicular traffic e.g. Gardiner Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grainger Street (north of Union Street)</td>
<td>Watters Crescent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Main Street (for east)</td>
<td>Stewart Crescent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Westwater Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Building Lines**

In much of the historic core of Lochgelly the buildings are located at a consistent distance from the street creating a well-defined character. However, in many places this consistency has been ignored by later development, resulting in a reduction of the overall quality of the street. To ensure that consistent building lines in the centre of Lochgelly along key streets are not eroded by further inappropriate development, the principle frontage of all future development must be located along the street’s building line.

Historic areas of Lochgelly have a clear pattern of development when two streets meet. At this point the buildings face the more prominent of the two streets whilst the gables of these buildings are generally hard or close to the secondary street. Therefore if development proposals front onto more than one street, the building line must reflect the established building lines for both streets, with the main frontage and principal entrance to the building being taken from the more important street in terms of place/movement function: alternatively the entrance could be placed at the corner.
To ensure Lochgelly’s future development supports the principles of walkable neighbourhoods a number of key movement connections have been identified. These fall into two categories: - connections to growth areas around the town (this page); and - connections within the town’s urban area (overleaf).

**Link 01**
Lane west of Launcherhead Park
This link should be enhanced, it will provide a key vehicular and pedestrian route to new development to the north of Lochgelly. See Lochgelly North Development Principles.

**Link 02**
Lomond Crescent
This will form the main access route through to new development at the north east of Lochgelly. See Lochgelly North East Development Principles.

**Link 03**
Links to Sharp Grove and Morris Avenue
New development to the east of this area has the potential to improve the permeability of this part of Lochgelly. Two links should be provided through to the new development from Sharp Grove and Morris Avenue (see Lochgelly North East Development Principles). The link from Morris Avenue should be a vehicular link.

**Link 04**
Eastern link road and pedestrian links to Geatons Road and the B9149.
A vehicular link should be provided between the Avenue and Union Street to improve access from the east of Lochgelly to the town centre. Pedestrian links through to Geatons Road and the B9149 should also be provided (see section 3.1.3) to improve permeability and provide good pedestrian routes to the new employment area to the east of Lochgelly.

**Link 05**
Link between South Street and land to the south.
This link will become an important pedestrian route from new development to the south of Lochgelly towards the town centre and local schools. This route should be enhanced by environmental improvements to encourage usage see Lochgelly South Development Principles.

**Link 06**
Lanes at Erskine Street and Watters Crescent
These links will become key vehicular and pedestrian links into new development to the south of Lochgelly (see Lochgelly South Development Principles). They must be designed to help integrate the new development with the existing housing.

**Link 07**
Link west of Moffat Crescent
This is an important pedestrian link that must be provided from new development to the south of Lochgelly (see Lochgelly South Development Principles). It must be designed to encourage usage see Lochgelly South Development Principles.
If your development site includes an area which has been identified as having the potential to provide a key linkage your development should provide this connection as a priority.

**Link 08**
Path connecting Cartmore Road, Paxton Crescent and James Black Gait.
This is an important pedestrian route between two parts of Lochgelly that are not otherwise linked. It provides a shorter route to the High School and the rail station from the west of Lochgelly. The route should be enhanced to encourage usage.

**Link 09**
Path connecting Hill Street and Station Road
This is an important pedestrian link for housing along Hill Street to Station Road, the High School and the rail station. It should be enhanced to encourage usage.

**Link 10**
Link between Station Road and McGregor Avenue.
Any opportunities to provide a pedestrian route between Station Road and McGregor Avenue should be exploited as this would improve the permeability of this part of Lochgelly.

**Link 11**
Link between Auchterderran Road and Westwater Street.
There are very few vehicular linkages between Auchterderran Road and the housing to the north of it. If the opportunity arises through redevelopment in the area highlighted a new vehicular link should be provided to enhance the permeability of this part of Lochgelly.

**Link 12**
Link between Geatons Road and Grace Street.
This pedestrian link should be enhanced to encourage usage.

**Link 13**
Link between Lumphinnans Road and West End Park.
This is an important pedestrian link between the park and Lumphinnans Road. It is currently domestic in scale and does not create a good visual link to the park. The path and entrance should be redesigned to exploit the link and create an attractive route through to Lumphinnans Road.
Urban Design Guidance

Active frontages
All buildings must present active frontages to streets and public spaces.
- The main entrance to a building should face onto the street.
- All public spaces (including streets) should be faced by building entrances and windows;

Active frontages in Lochgelly are expected to have:
- Very few blind or passive facades;
- Frequent doors and windows;
- Depth and modelling to the building surface;
- Good quality materials and refined detailing.

Reduction in visual clutter
All new development and redevelopment proposals should seek to reduce the need for street markings and signage, street lights should be discreet and street furniture should be selected and placed with care.
- Any proposed redevelopment of existing public realm in Lochgelly should begin by assuming that all street elements are removed. Only those street elements that are considered absolutely necessary should be retained in the final design.

Materials
- Materials should be durable and environmentally sustainable;
- Materials must be detailed appropriately to avoid future maintenance and staining problems;
- Roofs should be dark;
- Light grey, silver and beige materials should be used sparingly, and should not be used for whole elevations or roofs;
- Dry dash should not be used;
- The creative use of colour is encouraged as part of the design of new buildings and public space.

Private/public space
There must be a clear distinction between public and private spaces
- The transition between private and public areas should be carefully considered in the design of new development.
Front Walls
Front boundary walls are a key feature of the built environment in Lochgelly. These are generally low stone or brick walls which may be associated with a higher hedge and help to give definition to many streets in the town. They also serve as an important transition between the public space of the street and the private space of the house and rear gardens.
- New development within Lochgelly should incorporate a low front wall where this is a feature of its location. These walls should reflect the height of the existing walls along the street. Where the heights of walls along the street vary the wall should match adjacent walls or if there are no adjacent walls match the most consistent wall height found in the street.
- The inclusion of low front walls is also encouraged in the areas of urban expansion around Lochgelly.

Block Sizes
In Lochgelly block sizes are generally much bigger than those which have been found to create the best network to serve both vehicular and pedestrian needs. These large block sizes effectively reduce the permeability of many parts of Lochgelly giving pedestrians less choice of route and encouraging higher traffic speeds.
- New development should ideally be designed with block widths of no greater than 100m (although lengths of up to a maximum of 110m could be allowed along one side of a block.
- In areas where more pedestrian activity is being promoted the spacing between junctions should be reduced to 70m.

Energy Efficient Design
New development in Lochgelly will need to demonstrate that energy efficiency is a key consideration in the design of the proposal as required by Mid Fife Local Plan policy E3.

All new development should incorporate passive design measures to maximise the energy efficiency of new development, these include measures such as:
- Walkable neighbourhoods
- Responding to microclimate, topography and landscape
- Building orientation
- Internal room layout
- Materials specification
- Thermal mass in walls and floor
- Landscaping
Built Heritage Guidance

There are many existing buildings in Lochgelly which form an important part of the town’s inherited urban fabric. These buildings may be considered of little merit individually (and hence they are not listed) but collectively they reflect the history of the town, help give it a distinctive character and form an important backdrop to Lochgelly’s public spaces.

This plan identifies the buildings and built structures that are considered to be of value to Lochgelly, these have been assessed against three main values, Architectural Value, Heritage Value and Streetscape Value. This assessment has identified a number of distinctive characteristics that define Lochgelly’s built form and which have informed the urban form guidance in this document. Specific guidance has been produced for these in the compendium.

If your development site includes buildings and built structures that have been identified as of importance to the built heritage of Lochgelly; then you will be expected to preserve and enhance the character of the building and the surrounding area in line with the specific guidance provided in the compendium.

Lochgelly Built Heritage Policy

Development affecting any of the buildings highlighted as of value to the townscape and character of Lochgelly must preserve and enhance the character of the building and the surrounding area in line with the guidance provided.

Proposals for the total or substantial demolition of a building which has been identified as of value to Lochgelly will only be supported where it is demonstrated beyond reasonable doubt that every effort has been exerted by all concerned to find practical ways of keeping it.

This will be demonstrated by inclusion of evidence to the planning authority that the building:

- has been actively marketed at a reasonable price and for a period reflecting its location, condition and possible viable issues without finding a purchaser; and
- is incapable of physical repair and re-use through the submission and verification of a thorough structural report.
Connecting to existing open space
The plan below identifies the key areas of public space in Lochgelly (excluding streets). The compendium includes specific guidance for each of these public spaces relating to their role within the urban environment and how the spaces could be redesigned to be more attractive and feel safer with the aim of encouraging better usage.

Creating new open spaces

- The Lochgelly Greenspace Policy in the compendium establishes the minimum amount of greenspace that new development is required to provide.
- Ensure that the size, location and design of new open spaces meet the principles for open space described in the Supplementary Planning Guidance - Developments and Open Space when published. Prior to that new open spaces should be overlooked by active frontages, designed to be attractive and appealing, able to support a range of different functions including biodiversity and well managed.
- Aim to include streets trees in public spaces and encourage tree planting in gardens. The planting of native trees is encouraged as much as possible but the choice of tree must be suitable for its location in terms of scale and growing habits. Existing mature trees must be preserved where possible with the benefit of providing an instant maturity to these areas. Guidance on locating and selecting street trees and detailed planting guidance is available in Trees for Cities document *Best Practice Guidelines* and Communities and Local Government document *Tree Roots in the Built Environment*.
- New play spaces will be expected to contain play facilities for different age ranges and should incorporate seating areas. Existing features such as slopes, trees, rocks etc. must be integrated into the design of play spaces making them specific to their location and providing interest.

Pipeline consultation zone guidance

Development levels to the east of Lochgelly and the constraint posed by the NGL pipeline need to be considered collectively. Further advice will be sought from the HSE which will inform the development of the SLA masterplans and future planning decisions. This advice will be reflected in updates of this guidance when it is available.
Rail Station Safeguarding at Launcherhead Park

The existing rail station has minimal facilities and does not have disabled access to the northern platform. The Lochgelly Charrette identified the opportunity to enhance the rail station facilities to more fully exploit this important asset for Lochgelly through relocating the station slightly to the west. This could provide full disabled access, additional parking and become the commercial centre of new neighbourhoods to the north of Lochgelly. The relocation and improvement of the rail station is a future aspiration but land at Launcherhead Road must be safeguarded so that this important opportunity is not lost to Lochgelly.

Lochgelly Charrette proposals for Lochgelly rail station

Lochgelly Rail Station proposal

The land highlighted blue on the plan below is designated as Other Transportation Proposal, to be safeguarded for the potential relocation of the rail station as identified in the Charrette Series Report (2010).
Lochgelly Supplementary Planning and Transport Guidance - Compendium

Introduction. Relationship of the design process to the planning process

A. Street Guidance

B. Greenspace Guidance

C. Built Heritage Guidance
Aim: To meet the 6 qualities of successful places and planning policy

Development Management Engagement

Meeting 1: Set Brief
- National
- Development Plan
- Regional Transport Strategy
- Lochgelly SPTG
- Other material considerations

Meeting 2: Agree Principles
- PAN68 Checklist
- Table 4.1 Fife Masterplans Handbook
- Summarise other relevant information:
  - Flood risk
  - Transport Assessment
  - Ecological etc.

Meeting(s) 3: Discuss outline proposals

Pre-Application

Site and area appraisal

Constraints and Opportunities

Site specific design principles

Concept Development

Submit Application

Planning Policy

Ensure the planning appraisal stage contains the proper assessments to respond to all policy requirements

Planning Permission in Principle:
For each SLA area need a plan defining:
- Urban Structure;
- Character and density (see Density Study on next page);
- Movement Network;
- Greenspace Network;
- Physical constraints (to accompany PPP or in advance of planning applications)

Detailed Planning Permission:
Appraise against:
- 6 qualities of successful places
- questions contained in the Design and Access SPG (when published) – based on PAN83
- Growth area plan

Application Appraisal

Review information in the Lochgelly SPTG:
- Built Heritage Guidance
- Open Space Guidance
- Street Guidance etc.

Review information in the Lochgelly SPTG:
- SLA: Based on coding
- Town centre development areas
- Town wide guidance

1. Relationship of the design process to the planning process
Density Study:
This density study was produced as part of the Charrette Series Report 2010, it illustrates how different character and density can be accommodated within the same block structure.

Appendix II: Density Study

The architectural work for Grandhome included this study, in which the design team analysed various densities and how they could be achieved on a one-hectare block. Through this research, the team developed several sample block proposals including a variety of unit types. Such an approach fosters the development of diverse neighbourhoods, as opposed to the monocultures of single unit types and densities often seen in new housing estates.

This research suggested that a block with the following units might best cater to a community of a diverse demographic:

- 2 buildings of six flats each,
- 9 terraced houses,
- 4 semi-detached houses
- 5 detached houses
A. Street Guidance

Background:
All roads and streets have a place function and a movement function. The Scottish Government’s Designing Streets policy highlights the need to achieve the right balance between the place function and movement function of different routes whilst achieving the six qualities of successful places as set out in Designing Places.

Lochgelly place/movement matrix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement function</th>
<th>Place function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District (A)</td>
<td>Neighbourhood (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A1</strong> Streets with a constant flow of vehicular traffic which have a key civic role.</td>
<td><strong>A2</strong> Streets with a constant flow of vehicular traffic adjacent to public space of neighbourhood or town wide importance + bus routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B1</strong> Streets with a fairly constant flow of vehicular traffic which have a key civic role.</td>
<td><strong>B2</strong> Streets with a fairly constant flow of vehicular traffic adjacent to public space of neighbourhood or town wide importance + bus routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C1</strong> Streets with negligible through vehicular traffic which have a key civic role.</td>
<td><strong>C2</strong> Streets with negligible through vehicular traffic adjacent to public space of neighbourhood or town wide importance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Movement Function - characteristics**
(A) **District** – vehicular traffic routes which form important links from Lochgelly to surrounding areas.
(B) **Neighbourhood** – streets between district routes and local routes which have a fairly constant flow of vehicular traffic along them.
(C) **Local** - streets which are mainly for access, they have negligible through vehicular traffic other than to adjoining streets.

**Place Function – characteristics**
(1) **District** – Streets that have a key role (for instance the primary commercial and shopping area) within Lochgelly.
(2) Neighbourhood – Local streets and places which act as destinations for local users e.g. walking, cycling & bus routes, or adjacent to public spaces of neighbourhood and town wide importance or key community facilities.

(3) Local – Streets which are used for place activities only by immediately adjoining frontages.

The place/movement characteristics of routes will often vary along their length as this analysis of Lumphinnans Road/ Main Street demonstrates:

Designing for different street characteristics:

A1 streets - Main Street (west of Bank Street) and Bank Street:
These streets are in the very centre of Lochgelly. They have a high place function as they are where the main commercial activity of the town occurs and where people are most likely to meet others and interact. However, they also have a high movement function as they form part of the main thoroughfare through Lochgelly.
The challenge is to make Main Street and Bank Street civic places for the residents of Lochgelly whilst allowing access for through traffic. To achieve this careful detailing of the streetscape will be required allied to high quality and durable materials. Street clutter and unneeded pedestrian barriers should be removed to facilitate accessibility and place (see the Town Centre Guidance). A speed limit of 20mph could be put in place along the A1 streets, with the street layout being redesigned to make this self enforcing by utilising widened footways, level crossing points, reduced forward visibility and changes in horizontal alignment. Designing streets provides guidance on using design to influence driver behaviour.

A1 streets must be faced by active frontages that provide a lot of visual interest - there should be no blank or passive facades. Guidance on the design of shop frontages is provided in the Fife Council guidance on shop front design. The buildings along A1 streets should be 2 - 3 storeys in height and form a tight built edge along the street following the traditional pattern of development in this area. The buildings must incorporate a mix of uses to ensure activity occurs at different times of the day.

Analysis of pedestrian frontage experience in Lochgelly town centre carried out during the Lochgelly Charrette.

Cycle parking should be provided at locations along the A1 streets in areas which are well lit and overlooked by shops. The cycle parking should be designed to complement the streetscape without cluttering up the street.
A2 streets - Lumphinnans Road, Station Road and Auchterderran Road:
A2 streets have relatively equal place to movement functions and must work well for both uses. In Lochgelly the A2 streets are mainly faced by residential uses but they also have considerable amounts of traffic passing through them as they form the main thoroughfares through the town. The speed limit along these routes will remain at 30mph although traffic calming measures which also benefit cyclists and pedestrian movements should be considered.

Key crossing points along these busy streets should be identified to maximise pedestrian movement through the town. Controlled or advisory crossings will be provided depending on the level of use and importance. To encourage cycling along A2 streets segregated cycle facilities should be provided. These could be on road mandatory lanes or traffic free routes created by widening footways. Cycling by Design 2010 provides the latest guidance on cycling facilities.

To enhance the place function of A2 streets making them interesting and safe they should have wide pavements (greater than 2m wide). Street trees could be planted along these streets to give the impression of a barrier between the traffic and the pedestrian, and make the streets more attractive. On-street parking can also be used to help separate the pedestrian and vehicular traffic but it should be broken up into short bays defined by hard and soft landscaping which will reduce the dominance of cars parked on the street.

New development along A2 routes must face onto the street and should be at least 2 storeys high to provide enclosure to the space.
C1 streets:

C1 streets are streets which have a civic function in place terms, acting as an area for people to meet and as a location for town events similar to a civic square however they will have some limited traffic that will pass along them. C1 streets will be expected to demonstrate the highest design quality as befits their importance within the town.

C2 and C3 streets:

C2 and C3 streets have very little through traffic passing along them and should function first and fore mostly as places for the people who live on them. They should be treated as social spaces with the passage of vehicular traffic along them having a very low priority. The junctions into quiet residential streets should be designed to discourage vehicles using these streets as through routes. This could be achieved through narrowing the entrance to the street through the placement of buildings, boundary walls and street trees or by changing the surface of the street to indicate it is a different type of route.

New C2 and C3 streets should be designed so that the width between the buildings is generally less than on A and B streets. The distance between junctions, corners or other changes in alignment should be designed to discourage vehicle speeds.

Shared and level surfaces will be appropriate for some but not all C2 and C3 streets. Designing Streets includes guidance on the use of level surfaces and ensuring that these are designed to be inclusive.
Courtyards:
C3 streets include courtyards. Courtyards allow for more informal groupings of houses but the courtyard must form a well defined and positive public space that the buildings face onto. This is particularly important where the courtyard is enclosed by the backs of surrounding buildings, these must be screened in a positive and attractive way, providing enclosure and definition to the courtyard space. High fences are not considered a positive or attractive screening method.

In Lochgelly many of the existing courtyards have been created in the centre of larger perimeter blocks or other spaces which are behind the main building line along the streets. These types of spaces can be developed out as long as they do not have a negative impact on the adjacent streetscape.

Other Routes:
Walking/Cycling Routes:
Fife Council aim to have all of Lochgelly including the areas of new development linked to the town centre with high quality cycle routes. In residential areas with 20mph speed limits these will be on-street routes, but crossing points over busy roads and traffic free routes should be provided where required.

As well as routes on street for cyclists and pedestrians, a good network of walking and cycling routes should be provided throughout the town. These should utilise existing public spaces and will help to connect the town to the surrounding countryside and the Core Path Network. These routes may be used as commuter routes or safer routes to school, so they should be designed to be durable and usable all year round. It is essential that these routes are well designed and overlooked by buildings wherever possible to avoid people being put off using them in winter or evenings. Planting and vegetation should be controlled so that paths are open to the sky and pass through wide landscape corridors with no overhanging trees or shrubs. Lighting may also be required for key routes. Paths should not be located to the rear of buildings as these often attract antisocial behaviour which can lead to routes being closed.

Core Paths:
Core paths which cross the development areas must be protected and the quality of these routes improved. These routes are important elements of the wider network of routes through and around Lochgelly and they play an important role in encouraging healthier lifestyles. New connections to identified core paths are an important consideration in the design of new development.

Core paths should be designed to be multi use, to accommodate walkers, cyclists, disabled users and horse riders. They should be 2.5 – 3m wide and designed to be visible, safe and pleasant; they should not be bound by fences of over 1.2m high. The opportunity to use core paths to create green corridors should be considered while ensuring that vegetation is not so dense as to discourage public use of the paths.
Specific urban design guidance is provided for the streets highlighted on this plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG01</td>
<td>Auchterderran Road</td>
<td>New development must conform with the existing building line of the south side of the street and with the guidance for A2 streets. The streets north of Auchterderran Road have very poor links to the road, a new vehicular link must be provided between Westwater Street and Auchterderran Road if the opportunity arises through redevelopment. In addition, the existing pedestrian links should be upgraded and made more attractive for users. Along the south side of Auchterderran Road new development should include a low front wall consistent with the rest of the street, or be built hard to the street. To the north side of Auchterderran Road new development should be built within 2.7 of the edge of the street and include a low wall along the boundary. Auchterderran Road is up to 35m wide in some areas and the buildings are too low and the built edge too disjointed to provide effective enclosure for the space. Given the dimensions and nature of Auchterderran Road it should be treated as a boulevard and designed to incorporate trees and parking to help define the street and create an attractive entrance into Lochgelly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG02</td>
<td>Bank Street</td>
<td>New development must conform with the existing building lines of both sides of the street and with the guidance for A1 streets. See Town Centre Guidance for the Miners Square and Town House areas. In addition, a section of Bank Street with wide pavements could be exploited to enhance the public realm of the town centre (see greenspace guidance LOCH27).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG03</td>
<td>Buller Street</td>
<td>New development must conform with the existing building lines of both sides of the street and with the guidance for C3 streets. The line of the low walls should be maintained and continued. To the north of Buller Street at the junction with Main Street any new development must face onto Main Street and comply with the guidance for that street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG04</td>
<td>Cartmore Road (southern end)</td>
<td>New development must conform with the existing building line of both sides of the street and with the guidance for B2 streets. The line of the low walls should be maintained and continued by new development. New development at the junction with Main Street should face onto Main Street and comply with the guidance for that street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG05</td>
<td>Chapel Street</td>
<td>New development must conform with the existing building line of the west end of the street and with the guidance for C2 streets. This is a traditional narrow street and it is appropriate that any new development west of Hall Lane should be built hard to the street. East of Hall Lane Chapel Street changes from tight urban grain to a more sub-urban feel. East of Hall Lane new development should be set back no more than 9m from the centre of the carriageway and should have low walls along the front boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG06</td>
<td>Church Street (north)</td>
<td>New development must conform with the existing building lines of both sides of Church Street north of Park Street and with the guidance for B2 streets. New buildings at the corners with Main Street will be encouraged to turn the corner and provide active frontages to both Main Street and Church Street as these are prominent corners on the principal route through Lochgelly. The pavement could be widened at this junction to enhance the pedestrian experience and help reduce traffic speeds. The junction between Church Street and the west of Park Street should be redesigned using a smaller radius to help reduce traffic speeds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG07</td>
<td>David Street</td>
<td>New development must conform with the existing building line of the west side of the street and with the guidance for B2 streets (north of Landale Street) and the guidance for C3 streets (south of Landale Street). New development should continue the line of the low walls that line the street. To the east of David Street development should not be set back further than 9m from the centre of the carriageway, and should have a low boundary wall to the street. Street trees should be planted along the boundary of the car park to enclose the space and create greater definition to David Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG08</td>
<td>Dundas Street</td>
<td>New development must conform with the existing building lines of both sides of the street and with the guidance for C3 streets. To the west of the street development should be built hard to the street and follow the lines and scale of the terraced housing. Any development at the junction with Paul Street should face onto Dundas Street following the pattern set on Buller Street and Zetland Street. To the east of the street development should have a low wall along the front boundary following the line of the existing wall. At the northern end of Dundas Street (at the junction with Main Street) any new development must face onto Main Street and comply with the guidance for that street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG09</td>
<td>Garry Street</td>
<td>New development must conform with the existing building line of the south side of the street (east end) and with the guidance for B3 streets. The line of the low walls should be maintained and continued. To the south of Garry Street new development should not be set back more than 9m from the centre of the carriageway. Any new development at either end of Garry Street should face onto the adjacent streets (David Street and Henderson Street/Boyd Place) to reflect the traditional pattern of streets in Lochgelly. Any development at the corner with Henderson Street/Boyd Place should reduce the width of the entry into Garry Street as a way of influencing driver behaviour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG10</td>
<td>Grace Street</td>
<td>New development must conform with the existing building line of the western side of the street and with the guidance for C3 streets. To the east development should be set back no further than 2.5m from the edge of the street with low front walls enclosing small front gardens. The link to Geatons Road should be enhanced. At the junction with Auchterderran Road new development on the corner should face onto Auchterderran Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG11</td>
<td>High Street</td>
<td>New development must conform with the guidance for B2 streets. The northern end of the street will be covered by town centre guidance for the Town House area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG12</td>
<td>Hugh Place (west of Reid Street)</td>
<td>New development must conform with the existing building line of the southern side of the street and with the guidance for B3 streets. Addition of formal parking bays and street trees along the southern edge of the street would help to make the street more attractive, mitigate the lack of active frontage and provide traffic calming measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG13</td>
<td>Landale Street</td>
<td>New development must conform with the existing building line of the south side of the street and with the guidance for B2 streets. The line of the low front walls should be maintained and continued on the south side of Landale Street. To the north of Landale Street new development should not be set back more than 9m from the centre of the carriageway. If new residential development is built on the north side this should have a low wall detail to the front boundary. If the land on the north side remains as a car park the line of trees should be continued to enclose the space all along the street - groundcover planting under the trees is not encouraged as this creates a barrier for pedestrians and car passengers with litter. The entrance into the site should be designed to blend into the street and be in keeping with the existing street planting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG14</td>
<td>Launcherhead Road</td>
<td>New development must conform with the existing building line of the north side of the street and should be no further back than 9m from the centre of the carriageway on the south side. New development should continue the line of the low walls and conform with the guidance for B3 streets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG15</td>
<td>Lumphinnans Road (east of Motion Street)</td>
<td>New development must conform with the existing building lines of both sides of the street east of Motion Street and with the guidance for A2 streets. The line of the low walls should be continued on both sides of the street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG16</td>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>New development must conform with the existing building lines of both sides of the street and with the guidance for A1 streets. See the town centre guidance for the Miners Square area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG17</td>
<td>Main Street (east of Bank Street)</td>
<td>New development must conform with the existing building lines of both sides of the street and with the guidance for B1 streets. Development on both sides of the street should be built hard to the street. The mature street trees provide a welcome relief to the tight built form along this part of main street and preserving them should be a priority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG18</td>
<td>Melgund Place (east end)</td>
<td>New development must conform with the guidance for B2 streets. Buildings should be built not more than 5m back from the street edge (as defined by the line of the walls) on the north side of the street and should be no further back than 9m from the centre of the carriageway on the south side. The line of the low walls should be maintained and continued as a solid wall (except in front of the open space where a low metal fence could be used if enclosure was required). Any new development at the junction with Station Road must face onto Station Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG19</td>
<td>Park Street</td>
<td>Park Street is one of the earliest and narrowest streets in Lochgelly. The existing qualities of the street should be enhanced by any new development. To that end new development must conform with the existing building line of the northern side of the street and with the guidance for C3 streets. On the north side of Park Street new development should be built hard to the street. On the south of Park Street development should not be more than 5m from the edge of the street and should have a low wall built along the front boundary. The junction between the western section of Park Street and Church Street would benefit from being redesigned with tighter radii to encourage slower traffic speeds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG20</td>
<td>Station Road</td>
<td>New development must conform with the existing building lines of both sides of the street and with the guidance for A2 streets. New development should continue the line of the low walls along the street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG21</td>
<td>Whyte Street</td>
<td>New development must conform with the existing building lines of both sides of the street and with the guidance for C3 streets. Development at the ends of Whyte Street should face the adjacent streets (Chapel Street or Auchterderran Road) following the traditional pattern of development in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG22</td>
<td>Zetland Street</td>
<td>New development must conform with the existing building lines of both sides of the street and with the guidance for B3 streets. The line of the low walls should be maintained and continued. New development at the junction with Main Street should face onto Main Street and comply with the guidance for that street.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Greenspace Guidance

Lochgelly Greenspace* Policy (to be read in conjunction with Mid Fife Local Plan Policy E5):

The overall objective of the Greenspace Strategy (November 2010) is to ensure that the majority of residents in Fife have good access to life enhancing greenspace. In order to achieve this in Lochgelly the quality and usage of the existing greenspace needs to be improved. To that end the following will apply in the area covered by the Lochgelly SPTG:

New quantity and access standards are being developed to take into account the existing provision of greenspace within a settlement. Lochgelly has above average amounts of greenspace, this means that under the new quantity standards a 2 hectare standard will apply:

2 hectares of publicly usable greenspace must be provided by new development per 1,000 head of population in settlements with above average amounts of greenspace. This equates to 40m$^2$ per new house.

Access Standard
Every new house developed shall be within 250m walking distance of a publicly usable greenspace (minimum 0.5 hectare in size).

The new quantity standard means that new development in Lochgelly will have to provide 40m$^2$ of new open space per house through Mid Fife Local Plan policy E5: Housing Development and Open Space rather than the 60m$^2$ per house set out in that policy.

In addition, for any houses within a new development that are within 250m of an access into one of the existing public spaces set out below**, (measured along pathways not as the crow flies), the developer has the option to contribute to the upgrading of existing public space in Lochgelly rather than providing 40m$^2$ of new open space (as required by policy E5). The level of contribution per house will be determined through negotiation as part of the planning application process as set out in the approved Adoption of Open Spaces report (Housing & Communities Committee 14th March 2008).

SUDS
If SUDS are well designed and accessible (people can get access to the water, shallow slopes, attractive planting for biodiversity, paths, grass edges etc.) they will be considered as publicly accessible greenspace and can be included as part of the greenspace requirement for that site. The design of the SUDS will need to be approved by Fife Council before it can be considered as publicly accessible greenspace.

*Fife Council defines greenspace as publicly usable greenspace - parks, amenity greenspace, play space, sports space, natural greenspace, green corridors

**Existing public spaces this policy applies to:
LOCH01 – Public Park
LOCH02 – McGregor Avenue
LOCH06 – West End Park
LOCH08 – Brucefield Park
LOCH36 – Violet Playing Fields
Specific urban design guidance is provided for the open spaces highlighted on this plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOCH01</td>
<td>Public Park</td>
<td>Town Wide Importance</td>
<td>This park is to be the subject of a masterplan with associated public consultation. The masterplan should address the relationship with the key routes and entrances around the park and how the redevelopment of the park will enhance these routes and entrances including: Union Street, Hall Street, The Avenue, Fraser Drive, Elzy Place, Johnston Terrace and new housing to the north and east of the park. The route of the eastern link road must be safeguarded (see Key Linkages section). This route will provide an alternative route through to Lochgelly town centre from the east. New development adjacent to the park must provide active frontages to the park to provide interest and surveillance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCH02</td>
<td>McGregor Avenue</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Importance</td>
<td>Work has recently been completed to increase the permeability of this part of Lochgelly for pedestrians and cyclists by creating attractive routes through the area. This area has one of the best opportunities in Lochgelly for incorporating natural landscape into the town and for encouraging positive biodiversity which should be a key feature of this greenspace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCH03</td>
<td>Timmons Park</td>
<td>Local Importance</td>
<td>This is an open area of ground, well provided with a range of play equipment. The park is surrounded by frontages but the buildings are set back and apart from each other and do not create a well defined square around the park, so enclosure is poor. The park (and surrounding streets) would benefit from tree planting on all sides of the park to define the space to make it more attractive and welcoming. Art installations could also be used to provide greater enclosure and character to the park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCH06</td>
<td>West End Park</td>
<td>Local Importance</td>
<td>The frontage of the park along Paul Street should be enhanced by the addition of trees to make this a more attractive edge and to provide definition and enclosure to Paul Street. The entrances to the park from Paul Street, South Street and Westpark Gate need to be enhanced to encourage usage of the park. There is a key link into the park from Lumphinnans Road which is currently domestic in scale and does not create a visual link to the park. This path and entrance should be redesigned to exploit the link and create an attractive route through to Lumphinnans Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCH08</td>
<td>Brucefield Park</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Importance</td>
<td>Brucefield Park is accessed via two narrow entrances and is not currently surrounded by any active frontages. This park will form a key interface with new development to the south of Lochgelly and there is the potential to relocate the park slightly so that new development can surround it with active frontages (see Lochgelly South development principles). If the park is not relocated any new development adjacent to the park must face onto it with active frontages and provide additional entrances to the park from the south and west. The existing entrances should be enhanced, particularly the entrance to Lumphinnans Road which has a lot of charm but is down at heel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCH10</td>
<td>Launcherhead Park</td>
<td>Local Importance</td>
<td>Long term this land is to be safeguarded for the potential relocation of the rail station and associated development. However in the short term the south eastern edge of the park is located at a key point along the entry into Lochgelly. The edge should be enhanced even though it may be redeveloped in the future, tree planting or an art installation would create better definition of the space at this point. The land to the west of this site is along a key link route between the existing town and new development to the north of Lochgelly. Spaces on either side of this route must be enhanced to make this an attractive and safe route for pedestrians and cyclists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCH12</td>
<td>2 Greenspaces at Bishop Avenue</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Importance</td>
<td>These two spaces are overlarge, poorly used and exposed and they currently offer a poor facility to the local area. There is potential to identify some of this land for development which could help fund the redevelopment of the rest of the land into useful and attractive open space to serve the local area. The northern space could be developed as a curved terrace of houses or sold as a number of single house plots. This would help to improve the enclosure of Bishops Avenue which is currently very poorly defined. Some development on the southern space could help to redefine the open space and make it a more useful and manageable. If ground conditions make this land unsuitable for development trees should be planted along the road edges to give greater enclosure to the surrounding streets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCH14</td>
<td>Greenspace at Paxton Crescent</td>
<td>Limited Importance</td>
<td>This space is a flat area of grassed land surrounded by roads on three sides. The street is very poorly defined at this point as the buildings are all built well back from the road and face in different directions. Paxton Crescent would benefit from enclosure being provided either by trees being planted along the road edge or by a curved terrace of development on this land. There is area of open space opposite the site along Paxton Crescent, which has the greatest potential to be developed as a community facility so the loss of this area of open space would have limited impact. Alternatively an avenue of trees could be planted along both sides of Paxton Crescent which would help to improve the enclosure and provide some definition to the open space to the north and west.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCH15</td>
<td>Play space at Paxton Crescent</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Importance</td>
<td>This site has the potential to become a good resource for the local area. There is currently some basic play equipment placed centrally in the space which should be supplemented by more creative features including more naturalistic planting areas and sheltered seating areas. The area should be designed to enhance the permeability of this space by providing an attractive start to the path to Cartmore Road. The area is not well overlooked, if the under utilised open space on the other side of Paxton Crescent was developed it could provide active frontages to this area providing passive surveillance. The boundary along the road should be planted with trees to provide some enclosure to the open space and to Paxton Street. The fence should ideally be removed as it is unattractive and does not serve an important function.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCH18</td>
<td>Spaces at Morris Avenue</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Importance</td>
<td>These sites have little visual quality in themselves however they have the potential to improve the currently very poor permeability of this area of Lochgelly, by linking through to proposed new development (see Lochgelly North East Development Principles). These could be either narrow vehicular or pedestrian only links. Trees planted in the strip of grass at the entry into Morris Avenue would enhance the visual appearance of this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkway at Cartmore Road</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>This is an important pedestrian route which links adjacent parts of Lochgelly which currently have no other connections. The route needs to be made safe and attractive to encourage usage. The southern end and the connection to the open space at McGregor Avenue need to be made more prominent and legible to highlight that this is an important link not just a back way.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drummond Square</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>This small development includes a distinctive set of small open spaces. The corner open spaces generally provide attractive areas of visual interest which enhance the surrounding streetscapes. They include a number of attractive trees but would benefit from some enhancement of the shrubs and groundcover. The two southernmost spaces would benefit from some additional small ornamental trees being planted similar to those in the spaces to the north.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart Crescent</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>This area was designed to provide some open space for nearby houses. However, the open space is poorly defined by the buildings that surround it leaving it exposed and uncomfortable to use. Trees planted along the edge of Stewart Crescent would in help to enclose the space and enhance Stewart Crescent as a walking/cycling route.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two twin sites at Stewart Crescent</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>These are left over spaces at wide junctions that do little to enhance the surrounding area. There are mature trees on both sites but these are short and do little to help enclose the street or provide attractive features. The public realm of the area would be improved by upgrading the hardstanding and planting taller trees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melgund Place</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>This site has a number of attractive mature trees which enhance the look of this part of Lochgelly and help to define the space along David Street, these should be protected as a priority.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two sites at Grainger St.</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>These sites include some mature trees which help to enclose the space along Union Street and Russell Street and provide a relatively attractive setting. The spaces have the potential to provide good open space facilities for the local area. If the new link route is developed to the east of Lochgelly the space along Union Street will become more prominent as part of the entry into Lochgelly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank St.</td>
<td>Town Wide</td>
<td>These are two areas of wide pavement in the centre of Lochgelly that should be utilised to enhance the public realm of the High Street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall St.</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>This is a very small left over unattractive space which currently serves no purpose. It should be considered as part of the redevelopment of the Hall Street area. The existing walls could be creatively extended to provide an interesting and unusual seating area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miners Square</td>
<td>Town Wide</td>
<td>See town centre guidance for Miners Square area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violet Playing Fields</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>This area forms part of the interface with new development to the west of Lochgelly (see Lochgelly West Development Principles). The play area should be enhanced and a new route provided along the northern edge of the site linking the new development to Moffat Street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LOCH37  Town gateway at Lumphinnans Rd.  Limited Importance
These sites are located at an open part of Lumphinnans Road, most of the houses at this point are 1 to 11/2 storeys in height and the Fife Station opposite is well set back from the road. The two spaces are of limited value in terms of function and visual appearance and Lumphinnans Road would benefit from greater enclosure and definition at this point. These two sites could be developed to help provide this, particularly as there is landscaping opposite outside the firestation and the potential to create a seating area by West Park Gate so the loss of this open space would have a fairly limited impact. Alternatively the sites should be planted with street trees or an art installation to provide enclosure Lumphinnans Road.

LOCH38  Birnie Brae Neighbourhood Importance
This is a small site on a slope that has the potential to provide an attractive feature along Paul Street and Birnie Brae. Birnie Brae would benefit from some trees being planted along the southern boundary, preferably delicate small leaved trees such as silver birches so the canopy is not too dense. The pedestrian route through the site is important and should be enhanced. The sub station should be better screened.

LOCH40  Birnie St. Neighbourhood importance
Birnie Street is one of the more attractive streets in this area of Lochgelly but its appearance is let down by the lack of enclosure at the bend in the street where the open space is located. Trees should be planted along the Birnie Street boundary to provide better definition to the street.

LOCH41  Paul St. Neighbourhood Importance
All these sites would benefit from tree planting to help enclose the space along Paul Street and at wide junctions.

LOCH43  South St. corner Local Importance
In light of the new development that will eventually face onto this open space and associated road junction this whole space could be redesigned. There is the potential to create a new small public square in this area possibly including trees or art centrally placed to act as traffic calming measures. This would also create an attractive interface between the existing town and new development.

LOCH44  South Street/Hamilton Street Neighbourhood Importance
This area of greenspace should be redesigned to make a useful, functional and adaptable public space. Enclosure of the space along South Street is reasonable so the greenspace can provide a break in the vertical edges to the street without compromising it. The street trees to the west of this space are important to the visual appearance and enclosure of South Street and should be kept as a priority.

LOCH45  St Serf’s Churchyard Town Wide Importance
This space, its boundary walls and the mature trees that it contains are an important visual feature along Main Street in Lochgelly. The trees and boundary wall continue the vertical line of the buildings along the street but provide an important element of relief to that dense built edge. It is important that the qualities of this space are maintained in Lochgelly.

LOCH46  Land at Station Road Town Wide Importance
This space has the potential to provide a feature on one of the key routes into Lochgelly and would be good location for a future public art installation. It should be designed to make a positive impression as people travel through Lochgelly as well as providing interest for pedestrians and potentially incorporating a seating area.
C. Built Heritage Guidance

Specific design guidance is provided for the buildings highlighted on this plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BH1</td>
<td>St Finnian's Church, Lumphinnans Road 1938</td>
<td>Streetscape/ architectural/ heritage value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH2</td>
<td>46 - 76 Lumphinnans Road (even nos), 91-115</td>
<td>Slated bungalows. Streetscape value, repetition of low roof height and similar materials;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lumphinnans Road (odd nos)</td>
<td>emphasising domestic character of this part of Lochgelly with small front gardens. Avoid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dormer extensions. Avoid replacing slates with concrete roof tiles or artificial slate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Retain chimneys. Retain front gardens and low boundary walls where these exist. Encourage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>traditional glazing styles and traditional panelled doors. Avoid rendering/ painting exposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>masonry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH3</td>
<td>28-30 Lumphinnans Road</td>
<td>Traditional semi. Streetscape value. Encourage replacement of natural slate and removal of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>satellite dishes. Retain chimneys. Retain front gardens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH4</td>
<td>20 Lumphinnans Road</td>
<td>Traditional villa. Streetscape value. Retain chimneys. Retain front gardens. Encourage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>traditional glazing and panelled door</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH5</td>
<td>8-18 Cartmore Road (even nos), 5-17</td>
<td>Slated bungalows/ cottages. Streetscape value. Avoid dormer extensions. Avoid replacing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cartmore Road (odd nos)</td>
<td>slates with concrete roof tiles or artificial slate. Retain chimneys. Retain front gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and low boundary walls where these exist. Encourage traditional glazing styles and traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>panelled doors. Avoid rendering/ painting exposed masonry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH6</td>
<td>2-34 Zetland Place (even nos), 8-35 Zetland</td>
<td>Slated bungalows/ cottages. Streetscape value. Avoid further dormer extensions. Avoid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Place (odd nos)</td>
<td>replacing slates with concrete roof tiles or artificial slate. Retain chimneys. Retain front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gardens and low boundary walls where these exist. Encourage traditional glazing styles and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>traditional panelled doors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH7</td>
<td>11-13 Main Street</td>
<td>West End Bar with flats above. Streetscape value/focal point. Retain traditional glazing and coordinated paint scheme. Retain chimneys. Ensure any new signage is appropriate in terms of size, colour and materials as per the Fife Council Shop Front Design Guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH8</td>
<td>19-25 Main Street</td>
<td>Traditional shop fronts with flats above. Streetscape value. With gated entrance to rear of property. Encourage traditional glazing to flats above. Encourage shop front enhancement as per the Fife Council Shop Front Design Guide. Potential reinstatement/recovery of architectural details eg rusticated stonework/timber shop front fascia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH9</td>
<td>22-22 Buller St (even nos), 37-45 Buller St (odd nos)</td>
<td>Terraced cottages. Streetscape value. Avoid further dormer extensions. Avoid replacing slates with concrete roof tiles or artificial slate. Retain chimneys. Retain front gardens and low boundary walls where these exist. Encourage traditional glazing styles and traditional panelled doors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH10</td>
<td>39, 41-43, 47 Main Street</td>
<td>Traditional shop fronts with flats above. Streetscape value. Encourage traditional glazing to flats above. Encourage shop front enhancement as per the Fife Council Shop Front Design Guide. Ensure retention of any existing features including floor tiles to shop entrance, traditional painted lettering, cast iron hoppers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH11</td>
<td>49 Main Street</td>
<td>Silver Tassie bar. Streetscape/heritage/architectural value. Retain traditional glazing/paint scheme/chimneys/ridge tile detailing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH12</td>
<td>59-73 Main Street (odd nos)</td>
<td>Traditional shop fronts with flats above. Streetscape value. Encourage traditional glazing to flats above, avoid any further dormer extensions. Encourage shop front enhancement as per the Fife Council Shop Front Design Guide. Ensure retention of any existing features of merit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH13</td>
<td>8-46 Dundas Street (even nos)</td>
<td>Unusual two-storey terrace – chimneys stacks and stepped roofline give a distinctive character. Streetscape value. Encourage coordinated glazing/paint scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH14</td>
<td>5-15 Dundas Street (odd nos)</td>
<td>Terraced cottages. Streetscape value. Avoid further dormer extensions. Avoid replacing slates with concrete roof tiles or artificial slate. Retain chimneys. Retain front gardens and low boundary walls where these exist. Encourage traditional glazing styles and traditional panelled doors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH15</td>
<td>Parish Church/Manse, Main Street</td>
<td>Heritage and streetscape value/focal point. Category C(S) Listed. Provides open green space along a built-up, busy street but maintains building line with boundary wall/railings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH16</td>
<td>Miners’ Institute</td>
<td>Heritage and streetscape value/focal point. Category B Listed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH17</td>
<td>68-110 Main Street</td>
<td>Traditional shop fronts with flats above. Streetscape value. Encourage traditional glazing to flats above, avoid any further dormer extensions. Encourage shop front enhancement as per the Fife Council Shop Front Design Guide. Ensure retention of any existing features of merit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH18</td>
<td>118 – 176 Main Street (odd nos)</td>
<td>Mix of traditional terrace and flats over shops. Streetscape value. Encourage traditional glazing to flats above, avoid any further dormer extensions. Retain stone chimneys and stacks. Encourage shop front enhancement as per the Fife Council Shop Front Design Guide. Ensure retention of any existing features of merit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH19</td>
<td>149-163 Main Street (even nos)</td>
<td>Mix of traditional terrace and flats over shops. Streetscape value. Encourage traditional glazing to flats above, avoid any further dormer extensions. Retain stone chimneys and stacks. Encourage shop front enhancement as per the Fife Council Shop Front Design Guide. Ensure retention of any existing features of merit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH20</td>
<td>169-171 Main Street (odd nos)</td>
<td>Single storey cottage, now a take-away. Streetscape/ heritage value. Avoid dormer windows and encourage reinstatement of original roof coverings and chimney cans. Retain plastered doorpieces and sash windows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH21</td>
<td>2-4 Bank Street</td>
<td>Large, symmetrical town house, now a pharmacy. Streetscape/ heritage/ architectural value. The current fixed lettering is understated but reflective materials should be avoided, particularly combined with lighting. Traditional glazing pattern should be retained, and chimney cans reinstated. Dormer windows would not be an acceptable alteration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH22</td>
<td>3-17 Knockhill Close</td>
<td>Streetscape value/ focal point. A complete restoration of this building would allow it to be a focal point adjacent to the recent public realm enhancements. This would include an overhaul of shop fronts using appropriate materials, colours and signage as per Fife Council Shop Front Design Guide, and to restore symmetry. Also: Reinstatement of natural slate roof avoiding unnecessary vents, and a coordinated glazing scheme using whole window openings and appropriate windows for the age of the building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH23</td>
<td>6-14 Bank Street (even nos)</td>
<td>Traditional shop fronts with flats above. Streetscape value. Encourage traditional coordinated glazing to flats above. Encourage shop front enhancement as per the Fife Council Shop Front Design Guide. Ensure retention of any existing features of merit eg. central panelled door, cast iron rainwater hoppers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH24</td>
<td>17-25 Bank Street (odd nos)</td>
<td>Traditional shop fronts with flats above. Streetscape value. Encourage traditional coordinated glazing to flats above and avoid dormers. Encourage shop front enhancement as per the Fife Council Shop Front Design Guide. Ensure retention of any existing features of merit eg. original fascias and console brackets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH25</td>
<td>16-26 Bank Street (even nos)</td>
<td>Single storey shops; slated roofs with stone skews. Streetscape value. Encourage shop front enhancement as per the Fife Council Shop Front Design Guide. Ensure retention of any existing features of merit eg. traditional canopy. Avoid dormer windows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH26</td>
<td>St Andrews Church and War Memorial</td>
<td>Architectural/ streetscape/ heritage value. Focal point. Retain boundary wall and ensure that any new uses for the church are appropriate to its architectural character. Railings in front of war memorial could be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH27</td>
<td>27-29 Bank Street/ 2-4 Berry Street, 31-39 Bank Street, 41-49 Bank Street</td>
<td>Traditional terraced shops/ flats above. Streetscape value. Encourage traditional coordinated glazing to flats above and avoid dormers. Encourage shop front enhancement as per the Fife Council Shop Front Design Guide. Ensure retention of any existing features of merit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BH28 55-57 Bank Street  
Sharpy's Bar. Streetscape value/ focal point. Encourage traditional glazing pattern and coordinated paint scheme and appropriate signage. Retain existing features of merit eg. tall chimney stack, pilastered door pieces.

BH29 34-36 Bank Street  
Minto Lounge, Lochgelly Social and recreation club. Streetscape value. Encourage traditional glazing, panelled doors and appropriate signage. Retain existing features of merit eg. finial. Avoid stone cleaning.

BH30 46 Bank Street, 17 Robert Dow Court  
Co-op Building. Focal point, particularly clock tower. High architectural/ heritage/ streetscape value. Category B listed.

BH31 61 Bank Street/ 2 North Street  

BH32 63-65 Bank Street  
Traditional villa with sash windows, pedimented doorway, ashlar quoins and advanced bay; commercial premises. Streetscape/architectural value. Set back from street – emphasises change in character here from commercial to more domestic going north along Bank Street. Potential to remove imposed Bank of Scotland façade on extension and restore former elevation. Retain boundary wall – potential to reinstate cast iron railings.

BH33 67 Bank Street (Town Hall)  
Villa with tripartite window over wide entranceway and single pitched later extension to south. Dated 1892. Streetscape/ architectural value. Large pitched extension to rear. Encourage retention of cast iron rainwater goods and other remaining features.

BH34 56, 58 Bank Street  
Sandstone terrace, squared rubble with ashlar quoins, dated 1899. Streetscape value. Encourage retention of timber sash windows and panelled doors where these exist. Otherwise encourage reinstatement. Retain chimneys and boundary wall, potential to reinstate cast iron railings. Also retain boundary wall, gatepiers and gates to rear on Chapel Street.

BH35 3-9 Chapel Street (odd nos)  

BH36 8-28 Whyte Street (even nos), 11-17 Whyte Street (odd nos), 31-39 Whyte Street (even nos)  

BH37 Salvation Army Hall; Whyte St/ Auchterderran Road  
Good quality symmetrical sandstone façade. Architectural and streetscape value (set back on corner). Badly rendered boundary wall detracts from this.

BH38 62 Bank Street  
Traditional one and a half storey sandstone cottage with twin slated dormers, decorative skews, chimney cans and cast iron rainwater goods. Architectural/ streetscape value. Retain chimneys and boundary wall, potential to reinstate cast iron railings. Encourage reinstatement of sash windows and panelled door.

BH39 64 Bank Street  
Single storey cottage with tiled shop unit to north. Architectural/ streetscape value. Set back from road with low boundary wall. Avoid dormers. Retain chimneys and boundary wall, potential to reinstate cast iron railings. Encourage reinstatement of sash windows and panelled door.

BH40 66-68 Bank Street  
Co-op Pharmacy – shop front at odds with traditional stone villa. Streetscape value. Large box fascia and strip lighting should be removed and shop front remodelled in line with Fife Council’s shop front design guide. Large panelled door and gold lettering on transom light above should be retained.

BH41 70 Bank Street  
Piend-roofed single storey detached cottage with arched door surround and raised ashlar quoins. Architectural/ streetscape value. Encourage traditional glazing styles and traditional panelled doors, and reinstatement of chimney cans.

BH42 79-81 Bank Street  
<p>| BH44 | 2-8 Station Road | Corner block of shops with flats above. Rendered with string course. Corner bay with turret roof and finial. Pedimented door surround. Architectural/streetscape/landmark value. Group value with 72-80 Bank Street. Encourage traditional shop awning and reinstatement of traditional glazing pattern. Ensure any new signage is in keeping with building. |
| BH45 | 12-18, 34-48, 60, 66 Station Road (even nos), 9-19, 27-29 Station Road (odd nos) | Detached or semi-detached traditional cottages. Streetscape/architectural value. Slated, mostly with original dormers. Variations in architectural detailing and treatment but in keeping with the domestic character of this part of Lochgelly with low boundary walls and front gardens. Encourage traditional glazing patterns/panelled doors/retention of existing features of value eg. finials, bargeboarding, cast iron rainwater goods. Avoid hard landscaping over front gardens. Avoid painting or rendering exposed stone or replacing roof coverings with concrete tiles or artificial slate. Avoid box dormers or large rooflights. Retain stone chimneystacks and clay cans, and natural stone for boundary walls. Potential in some cases to reinstate appropriate railings. |
| BH46 | 20-32, 50-52, 62-64 Station Road (even nos), 21-23, 37-39, 51-53 Station Road (odd nos) | Larger two-storey villas of varying styles, some with larger garden ground. Architectural/streetscape value. Encourage traditional glazing patterns/panelled doors/retention of existing features of value eg. finials, bargeboarding, cast iron rainwater goods. Avoid hard landscaping over front gardens. Avoid painting or rendering exposed stone or replacing roof coverings with concrete tiles. Avoid box dormers or large rooflights. Retain stone chimneystacks and clay cans, and natural stone for boundary walls. Potential in some cases to reinstate appropriate railings. |
| BH47 | St Patrick’s Church and Presbytery, Station Road | Church of 1877. Architectural/heritage/streetscape value. Set well back from the road with large grounds to the front of the presbytery. Stepped rubble boundary wall with semi-circular copes. |
| BH48 | St Patrick’s Primary School | Small sandstone primary school facing the road, in typical style of the period, designed to provide maximum light into the classrooms. Architectural/heritage/streetscape value. Windows are a particular feature of this building and could be replaced with a more appropriate design and materials to increase the architectural value of the building. |
| BH49 | 55-57 Station Road | Dry-dashed bungalows with rosemary tiled roofs. Streetscape value – the large front gardens continue the line of the older cottages and villas on either side of Station Road. |
| BH50 | 63-69 Station Road | Symmetrical terrace, central gable with chimneystack, dated 1906. Architectural/streetscape value. Symmetry lost through dormer addition. Avoid any further dormers and encourage coordinated scheme of doors/glazing to increase architectural value. |
| BH51 | 71-85 Station Road | Prominent corner block of flats and shop unit. Timber eaves detailing, ground floor rendered and lined out. Streetscape value; different character from Station Road’s domestic properties set back from the street, terminates view along Station Road on approach to town centre. Encourage reinstatement of sash windows and panelled door. Encourage shop front enhancement as per the Fife Council Shop Front Design Guide. |
| BH53 | 70 Launcherhead Road | Single storey cottage with plastered doorpiece. Architectural/streetscape value. Retain boundary wall and chimneys; avoid dormers, large or irregularly spaced rooflights and unnecessary roof vents. Potential for traditional render finish. Encourage reinstatement of timber sash windows and panelled doors. |
| BH54  | 111 Station Road | One and a half storey cottage, slated with dormers. Decorative clay ridge tiles and finials. Architectural/ streetscape value. Encourage traditional glazing patterns/ panelled doors/ retention of existing features of value. |
| BH55  | 113-127 Station Road, 131-141 Station Road | Terraced piend-roofed miners’ rows. Streetscape/ heritage value; domestic scale set back from road adjacent to railway bridge – 115-127 above stepped retaining wall. 131-141 with decorative clay ridge tiles. Retain boundary wall and chimneys; avoid dormers, large or irregularly spaced rooflights and unnecessary roof vents. Avoid any further removal of slates in favour of concrete tiles. Potential for traditional render finish. Encourage reinstatement of timber sash windows and panelled doors. |
| BH56  | Lochgelly High School, Station Road | Streetscape/ landmark value. Brick pavilions and red-tiled roofs along with associated landscaping and open space provide a strong access point to Lochgelly from the north. |
| BH57  | 2-4 Hugh Place | One and a half storey semi-detached cottage, slated with dormers. Decorative clay ridge tiles and projecting bay windows. Architectural/ streetscape value. Symmetry lost through dormer conversion. Avoid further dormers, large or irregularly spaced rooflights and unnecessary roof vents. Encourage traditional glazing patterns/ panelled doors/ retention of existing features of value. |
| BH58  | 1 Hugh Avenue | Single storey cottage with bay window. Architectural/ streetscape value. Encourage traditional glazing patterns/ panelled doors/ retention of existing features of value eg. finials, cast iron rainwater goods. Avoid hard landscaping over front garden. Avoid painting or rendering exposed stone or replacing roof coverings with concrete tiles or artificial slate. Avoid box dormers or large rooflights. Retain natural stone for boundary walls and stone chimneystacks, and reinstate clay cans. |
| BH59  | 1-26 Drummond Square | Uniform single storey terraces. Streetscape value; attractive scale and character, formed around a central communal green. Uniformity has been retained in spite of alterations. Avoid box dormers or large rooflights. Retain chimneystacks. Potential for improved boundary treatment. |
| BH60  | 17-19 Reid Street | Two storey semi-detached villa with Arts and Crafts influence in hipped roof, bell-curved dormers and covered doorway. Architectural/ streetscape value. Encourage traditional glazing patterns/ panelled doors/ retention of existing features of value eg. cast iron rainwater goods. Avoid hard landscaping over front garden. Avoid replacing roof coverings with concrete tiles or artificial slate. Avoid box dormers or large rooflights. Reinstate clay cans. |
| BH61  | 1-15 Reid Street | Detached or semi-detached cottages. Slated, some with original dormers. Streetscape/ architectural value: Variations in detailing and treatment but in keeping with the domestic character of this part of Lochgelly with low boundary walls and front gardens. Encourage traditional glazing patterns/ panelled doors/ retention of existing features of value eg. finials, ridge tiles, cast iron rainwater goods. Avoid hard landscaping over front gardens. Avoid painting or rendering exposed stone or replacing roof coverings with concrete tiles or artificial slate. Avoid box dormers or large rooflights. Retain stone chimneystacks with clay cans and boundary walls. |
| BH62  | Brown Memorial Chapel, 37 Russell Street | Small chapel with steeply pitched roof and understated gothic detailing. Streetscape/ heritage value. Disused and in poor condition. Retain and reinstate boundary wall and windows, and encourage alternative uses. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Address/Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BH63</td>
<td>9-35 Auchterderran Road (odd nos), 32-40 Auchterderran Road (even nos)</td>
<td>Traditional terraced shops with flats above. Streetscape value. Encourage coordinated glazing to flats above and avoid dormers. Encourage shop front enhancement as per the Fife Council Shop Front Design Guide. Avoid painting or rendering exposed stone or replacing roof coverings with concrete tiles or artificial slate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH64</td>
<td>70-88 Auchterderran Road (even nos), 1-4 Minto Street</td>
<td>Semi-detached cottages with curved hipped roofs. Streetscape/ architectural value; domestic scale and character with an Arts and Crafts style, largely in good condition and unaltered other than doors and windows. Retain chimneys and natural stone boundary walls where these exist; avoid dormers, large or irregularly spaced rooflights and unnecessary roof vents. Avoid removal of slates in favour of concrete tiles. Encourage reinstatement of timber sash windows and panelled doors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH66</td>
<td>Jubilee Inn, Auchterderran Road/ Grace Street</td>
<td>Landmark/ streetscape value. Prominent corner block could perform as a focal point if adequately restored and maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH67</td>
<td>15-25 Grace Street (odd nos)</td>
<td>Originally uniform group of semi-detached cottages, now disfigured through variations in treatment and addition of large box dormers. Streetscape value. Coordination of future treatment could reinstate some of the intended uniformity. In current condition the group maintains the domestic scale characteristic of much of Lochgelly through its height and position set back from the road with small front gardens and low boundary walls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH68</td>
<td>6-12 Melgund Place (even nos), 5-7 Melgund Place (odd nos)</td>
<td>Semi-detached slated cottages. Streetscape value. Variations in detailing and treatment and additions of large box dormers, but in keeping with the domestic character of this part of Lochgelly with low boundary walls and front gardens. 5-7 is more in the miners' row tradition, directly on to the pavement. Encourage traditional glazing patterns/ panelled doors/ retention of existing features of value. Avoid hard landscaping over front gardens. Avoid painting or rendering exposed stone or replacing roof coverings with concrete tiles or artificial slate. Avoid further box dormers or large rooflights. Retain stone chimneystacks with clay cans and boundary walls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH69</td>
<td>Lochgelly West Primary School</td>
<td>Architectural/ heritage value. Set back from street in amongst new development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH70</td>
<td>Town House, Hall Street</td>
<td>Landmark/ streetscape/ architectural value. Landmark value in particular due to corbelled turreted bay with leaded roof and finial. Terminates view down High Street and visible from several other points. Any new development should avoid disrupting the view of the Town House from any angle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH71</td>
<td>79-83 Grainger Street</td>
<td>Terraced cottages/ miners' rows. Heritage/ streetscape value. One remaining pilastered doorpiece. Encourage uniformity of elements eg. doors/ windows. Retain natural slate roofs and avoid dormers, large or irregularly spaced rooflights or unnecessary roof vents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH72</td>
<td>Lochgelly South Primary School</td>
<td>1910. White render with red sandstone baroque detailing. Streetscape/ architectural/ heritage value. Potential to reinstate timber windows to emphasise the heritage value of the building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH74</td>
<td>89 High Street, Old Ship Inn</td>
<td>Heritage value. One of the older properties in Lochgelly, now heavily altered and extended. Encourage reinstatement of slate roof, chimney stacks and cans, sash windows. Ensure signage is in line with the Shop Front Design Guide – consider a more traditional hanging sign to replace projecting box sign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH75</td>
<td>16 Church Street</td>
<td>Streetscape/ architectural value. Villa with Art Deco detailing. Unusual scale/ character for Lochgelly. Encourage reinstatement of traditional glazing pattern, chimney cans and coordinated external treatment. Retain slate roof and avoid dormers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH76</td>
<td>25 Church Street (Manse)</td>
<td>Architectural value. Piend-roofed villa. Set back from the road and partially hidden by trees, the contrast between this and nearby buildings gives an insight into Lochgelly prior to post-war expansion. Encourage reinstatement of slate roof and traditional glazing pattern. Retain boundary wall and remaining gate pier (on Park Street)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH77</td>
<td>64 Mid Street</td>
<td>Architectural value. Scale/ character in contrast with surrounding buildings. Traditional cottage with pilastered doorpiece. Dry-dash render. Encourage reinstatement of chimney cans, traditional glazing and panelled door. Retain slate roof and avoid dormers or large/ irregularly spaced rooflights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH78</td>
<td>44 Park Street</td>
<td>Architectural value. Scale/ character in contrast with surrounding buildings. Traditional single storey cottage. Dry-dash render. Encourage reinstatement of chimney cans, traditional glazing and panelled door. Retain slate roof and avoid dormers or large/ irregularly spaced rooflights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH79</td>
<td>10-14 Park Street (even nos)</td>
<td>Heritage/ streetscape value. One of the older properties in Lochgelly – single storey slated terraced cottages on the street with low doorways. Now disfigured with large box dormers. Encourage uniformity of elements eg. doors/ windows. Retain natural slate roofs and avoid further dormers, large or irregularly spaced rooflights or unnecessary roof vents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH80</td>
<td>5 Park Street</td>
<td>Streetscape value. Detached single storey cottage with pilastered doorpiece, dated 1904. Encourage reinstatement of chimney cans, traditional glazing and panelled door. Retain slate roof and decorative rainwater goods, and avoid dormers or large/ irregularly spaced rooflights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH81</td>
<td>7-13 Park Street (odd nos)</td>
<td>Streetscape value. Pair of semi-detached cottages with bay windows, raised skew and quoins, now with box dormers. Slightly stepped up from street level. Encourage reinstatement of chimney cans, traditional glazing and panelled doors. Retain slate roof. Retain any existing original features eg. finials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH83 51-67 David Street (odd nos)</td>
<td>Streetscape value. Terraced cottage, slated with skews and low boundary wall. Encourage uniformity of elements eg. doors/ windows. Retain natural slate roofs and avoid dormers, large or irregularly spaced rooflights or unnecessary roof vents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH84 37-43 David Street (odd nos)</td>
<td>Streetscape value. Terraced two storey villa with projecting bays at each end. Height addresses corner. Retain slate roof and finials. Reinstate chimney cans and avoid dormers, large or irregularly spaced rooflights or unnecessary roof vents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH85 1-25 David Street (odd nos)</td>
<td>Streetscape value. Single storey cottages, slated, variation in detailing including timber eaves detailing, plastered doorpieces, skews and bay windows. Some with box dormers and slates replaced with concrete tiles. Reinstate chimney cans and avoid additional dormers, large or irregularly spaced rooflights or unnecessary roof vents. Retain front gardens and low boundary walls.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH86 2-10 Garry Street (even nos)</td>
<td>Streetscape value. Single storey cottages, slated, variation in detailing. Large box dormer. Retain slate roofs. Reinstate chimney cans and avoid additional dormers, large or irregularly spaced rooflights or unnecessary roof vents. Retain front gardens and low boundary walls.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH87 3-9 Garry Street (odd nos)</td>
<td>Streetscape/ Architectural value. Large villa with nepus gable. Box dormers. Reinstate chimney cans and avoid additional dormers, large or irregularly spaced rooflights or unnecessary roof vents. Retain front gardens and low boundary walls – potential for more appropriate boundary treatment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH88 28-32 Bank Street</td>
<td>Art Deco former cinema. Streetscape/ heritage value/ focal point. Requiring restoration of render/ paintwork/ tiled entranceway. The art deco building frontage should be retained.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH89 Ruins to south of Lochgelly</td>
<td>Heritage value. Little remains of this L-shaped former farmstead and cottage. The buildings are depicted roofed in the 1st edition of the OS 6-inch map (1856), and relate to Lochgelly House, demolished around 1980. The upstanding remains and setting of what are some of Lochgelly’s oldest buildings should be protected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>