

Other general comments to MIR

Comments on other Housing Issues

KEY AGENCIES

SEPA and SNH support the continuation of reallocating 10% of the housing land requirement from the Kinross to the Perth Housing Market Area.

SNH support the identification of allocations for small sites to help achieve the most sustainable and environmentally acceptable solutions in constrained areas.

SUPPORT

The Scottish Government notes the content of the Main Issues Report relating to housing. The emphasis on delivery of housing is welcomed. The presentation of housing figures should reflect the Draft Planning Delivery Advice: Housing and Infrastructure (Note: now abandoned). Suggest also referring to the draft Advice in updating the housing policies, in particular the inclusion of a 'flexibility policy' to set out how individual proposals will be considered where a shortfall in the 5 year supply of effective housing land supply emerges.

OPPOSITION

No consideration appears to have been given to the need for specialist housing provision, particularly Gypsy/Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. This should have been considered through the SDP2 HNDA process and, where applicable, the LDP should set out clearly the need and the action to address this.

Homes for Scotland do not support the assumption that 10% of the housing land requirement will be met on windfall sites. If sufficient land is allocated in the right places there is less likelihood of developers seeking out windfall opportunities. Scottish Planning Policy does allow for a contribution from windfall but insufficient evidence has been provided to justify 10%. The assumption should therefore be reduced to 5% until more evidence is provided.

Homes for Scotland do not support the decision not to include an additional flexibility allowance. Question the assumption that only 50-60% of allocated housing will actually be built; build rates are likely to increase further as the market continues to recover. Furthermore, lower build rates are also as a result of the Council failing to identify a generous 5 year effective housing land supply. A generous supply must be identified to allow for flexibility and changing market needs. A generosity (or flexibility) allowance must therefore be included. This should be 20%.

Table 1 of the Main Issues report should be amended as below. The Council is urged to focus on delivering effective sites which are known to be capable of being completed in the period to 2028.

Housing Land Requirement assuming a 5% windfall contribution and a 20% flexibility requirement is added 2015-28

Housing Market Area	Unadjusted Requirement*	5% contribution from windfall sites	Contribution from small sites (20%)	Reallocation from Kinross to Perth HMA	Adjustment requirement (plus 20% flexibility)
---------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--	---

Highland	1,404	70	-280		1,054
Kinross	1,092	55		-100	937
Perth	8,658	433		+100	8,325
Strathearn	2,106	105			2,001
Strathmore	2,262	113			2,149
Greater Dundee	85	0			70
Perth and Kinross	15,607	-776	-280		14,536

*TAYplan housing land requirement with additional 20% flexibility allowance added

A number of respondents made comments on housing issues which were not in direct response to any of the questions in the Main Issues Report. In many cases these are in support of an allocation or supporting comments on other issues. The summaries below therefore relate to the additional issues which were raised through the consultation which are not already addressed in response to one of the Main Issues Report questions.

Adjustments to the TAYplan Housing Land Requirement – Reallocation from Kinross to Perth HMA

The focus should instead be on alternative settlements within the Kinross HMA which do not have the potential for significant adverse impacts on Loch Leven and which contain sites which are effective or expected to become effective in the plan period. Removing the reallocation would mean a requirement for 197 units in the Kinross HMA to 2028.

Adjustments to the TAYplan Housing Land Requirement – Windfall allowance

A number of respondents, including land owners / promoters and individuals consider that the proposed reliance on 10% windfall is inappropriate. PAN 2/2010 advises that windfall sites should only be counted towards meeting the housing land requirement once planning permission has been granted and they are considered to be effective. It is more appropriate that LDP2 properly plans for sustainable housing growth by directing development towards the main settlements. There is no robust evidence (as required by Scottish Planning Policy) for a standard 10% figure. The contribution from windfall sites should therefore be significantly reduced (5% maximum) or removed and any resulting shortfall should be met by additional allocations capable of achieving completions in the short to medium term.

One Community Council considers that the actual amount of windfall development (in the Kinross HMA) needs to be recognised, and the impact of this taken into account in the planning for local infrastructure. Another community organisation also expressed concern that actual windfall development far exceeds the figure stated in the Main Issues Report.

One further respondent considers that the importance attributed to the contribution that small and windfall sites can make in sustaining villages outwith the main settlements should be recognised in the role they should have in helping to meet affordable housing needs.

Adjustments to the TAYplan Housing Land Requirement – small sites allowance

The contribution from small sites is underestimated. Further, one community organisation considers that all HMAs should have an allocation of small sites which should vary by historic evidence and future plans. Small sites provide far greater diversity than large, monotonous developments and are crucial in retaining Tayside's architectural diversity and beauty.

Housing Land Requirement and Supply

A shortfall in housing land supply has not been adequately demonstrated. There is little evidence to support the need for such expansion and there appears to be no plans for the schools and other facilities that would be required for the population growth the proposals suggest.

There is a significant surplus in housing land supply in the Perth HMA to 2028. There is therefore no reason why Scone North H29 has to be extended, or even included, in the Local Development Plan.

Based on past completions, there is a significant shortfall against the housing land requirement set by TAYplan, particularly in the Highland HMA. Respondent therefore questions whether there is a 5.6 year effective housing land supply as claimed in the Main Issues Report. This lack of delivery needs to be taken in to account to ensure the housing land requirement is met in full in line with Scottish Planning Policy. This supports a more flexible approach to housing building in the Highland HMA to encourage more small sites in more sustainable locations.

Additional supply in non-tiered settlements

If additional land is required in the Strathearn HMA (resulting from an additional flexibility allowance) the Council should review the scope for minor expansions and limited growth in non-tiered settlements. Growth should not be focused solely on tiered settlements where additional growth is not appropriate. The presumption against the allocation of additional sites in non-tiered settlements is potentially contrary to Scottish Planning Policy paragraph 79. Where a site fails to come forward the policy framework must be flexible enough to support allocations in tiered settlements first, but also in rural settlements. As such the wording and context of Policies RD7, PM3 and PM4 are critical.

Delivery issues are not solely related to economic conditions but also to a lack of variety and choice of sites within various locations. Increasing density on existing sites is not always a viable solution, and a range and choice of sites should be provided in order to meet market demand. TAYplan does not preclude LDPs providing for some development in non-tiered settlements subject to certain criteria. This would help improve variety and choice.

To reduce commuting, more housing should be provided closer to areas of employment, or employment opportunities encouraged closer to existing residential areas. This should include the smaller towns and villages.

Additional flexibility allowance

Comments came from the development industry. Respondents consider that an additional flexibility allowance should be included, ranging from 10-20%.

Object to the assumption that only 50-60% of allocated housing will actually be built. Build rates are likely to increase further as the market continues to recover. There is a substantial shortfall in the 5 year effective supply. Additional generosity allowance across all areas is therefore needed in line with Scottish Planning Policy. A generous housing land supply will give the flexibility necessary for the continued delivery of new housing, even if unpredictable changes occur, and promote population and economic growth. Additional housing allocations should be included for all settlements where existing allocations are failing to deliver.

Second homes

There should be Pressurised Area Status in some Housing Market Areas, where there isn't enough suitable land for building, to stop people buying second homes.

Single person households

More provision should be made for single person households. More opportunities for people to downsize would help free up larger houses. Small sites could be utilised for this.

Growing elderly population

There is likely to be a serious shortfall in specialist accommodation for older people unless the provision of adequate support and accommodation is properly planned. Respondent is concerned there is no mention of the housing needs of older people in the Main Issues Report. Recommend an additional policy to ensure the adequate delivery of specialist accommodation for elderly people, and suggest policy wording:

“The Council will encourage the provision of specialist housing for older people across all tenures in sustainable locations. The Council aims to ensure that older people are able to secure and sustain independence in a home appropriate to their circumstances and to actively encourage developers to build new homes to the ‘Lifetime Homes’ standard so that they can be readily adapted to meet the needs to those with disability and the elderly as well as assisting independent living at home. The Council will, through the identification of sites, allowing for windfall developments, and / or granting of planning consents in sustainable locations, provide for the development of retirement accommodation, residential care homes, close care, Extra Care and assisted care housing and Continuing Care Retirement Communities.”

Specialist accommodation for elderly people requires centrally located sites. Such sites are often difficult to deliver and viability is often marginal. Respondent has aspirations to deliver a range of specialist accommodation for elderly people in Perth & Kinross should suitable sites come forward.

COUNCIL RESPONSE

In response to comments from the Scottish Government, a new policy is proposed to set out how any identified shortfall in the 5 year effective housing land supply will be dealt with. No reference was made to Gypsy / Travellers sites in the Main Issues Report as the existing policy in the adopted Plan (policy RD5) is still considered appropriate.

Adjustments to the TAYplan Housing Land Requirement – Reallocation from Kinross to Perth HMA

The reallocation from Kinross to Perth HMAs on the grounds of environmental constraints is now established and, as explained in the Main Issues Report, although progress has been made in improving the ecological status of Loch Leven it is considered appropriate to continue to reallocate 10% in line with the precautionary principle.

Adjustments to the TAYplan Housing Land Requirement – Windfall allowance

In line with Scottish Planning Policy, past housing completions were analysed and this showed that windfall development has made a significant contribution to the housing land supply in the past. It is therefore considered appropriate to continue with the assumption that 10% of the housing land requirement will be met on windfall sites.

Adjustments to the TAYplan Housing Land Requirement – small sites allowance

Small sites make a valuable contribution to the housing land supply in all areas, not just in Highland. However, it is considered appropriate to continue with the assumption that in all other areas these are viewed as providing additional flexibility in the supply which helps increase range and choice.

Housing Land Requirement and Supply

The Housing Background paper gives further technical information on the housing land requirement and supply.

Additional supply in non-tiered settlements

The TAYplan spatial strategy is clear that first and foremost allocations should be directed toward the principal (or tiered) settlements. The strategy proposed in the Main Issues Report is therefore entirely consistent with TAYplan. The new policy will address the situation where an allocated site fails to come forward resulting in a shortfall in effective housing land supply.

Additional flexibility allowance

The issue of an additional flexibility allowance was determined through the TAYplan examination.

Second homes

Even if it were possible to use Pressurised Area Status to prevent people from buying second homes, it is not considered appropriate for the Council to seek to restrict an individual's right to purchase more than one property in this way.

Single person households

The Planning Authority cannot dictate that small houses for single person households are built. It can only assess whether proposals accord with the Placemaking policies of the Plan.

Growing elderly population

There is an existing policy in the adopted LDP on Particular Needs Housing Accommodation (RD6) and this is still considered appropriate and relevant.

Cross Tay Link Road comments

KEY AGENCIES

Transport Scotland seek involvement in early discussions on schemes which may impact the strategic transport network, such as changes to approach roads and new park and ride site to the north of the city.

Transport Scotland considers that the emerging LDP, Action Programme and associated Supplementary Guidance should set out:

- the delivery of the CTRL and levels/ and areas of development against phases of Perth Futures/ and CTRL improvements to provide some clarity
- a developer contribution protocol and mechanisms to ensure delivery of any required improvements at Broxden and Inveralmond
- how the improvements are to be fully funded if developer contributions are not meeting all costs and if phased delivery is appropriate; and consider that
- agreements are required between Transport Scotland, PKC and the developers as to who will be responsible for the design and delivery of the improvements.

Transport Scotland state that longer term options highlighted in the STPR have no funding commitment and delivery will fall outwith the plan period.

OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Network Rail comment that with the proposed growth strategy of the MIR there will be an increase in demand for rail service. They consider that this and the proposed Cross Tay Link Road has the ability to put increased pressure on the use of Perth Station which should be mitigated with a financial contribution towards rail infrastructure. Likewise the timing of the development along with actual crossing of the main Highland Line with a bridge raises issues regarding safety on and within the line, which should be addressed as part of detailed studies.

SUPPORT

There was a supportive comment received. There were no comments objecting to the principle of the CTRL. One comment sought investment in better cycling and pedestrian links before the Cross Tay Link Road is completed. Another concerned the design, worried that single carriageway would not be suitable for the full range of users including HGVs, cyclists and pedestrians, and for emergency services. There was also concern that detailed matters relating to the design, and the route were not provided, and that light and noise pollution could affect residents of Stormontfield. Scone and District Community Council also express their concern about the need for and reasons behind the inclusion of two additional roundabouts on the CTRL. They have concern that the one that connects to Stormontfield Road may be used as a rat run, and that they might generally be used to support further housing. They also have a concern about the CTRL being used for direct access to H29 due to speed/safety concerns.

A considerable number of respondents are also concerned with growing congestion specifically at Bridgend leading into Perth. One respondent stated that "traffic volumes and further house building along the A94 will merely serve to exacerbate this problem". It was considered by a number of respondents that there should be no more development until the CTRL has been committed and underway in order to alleviate these problems.

It was stated by some respondents that the existing roads around Scone are unable to cope with any further traffic. Some respondents also linked the issue of congestion with poor air quality and felt that any further development would cause pollution within the Scone area. According to one respondent, Friends of the Earth Scotland has recently conducted surveys on air pollution around Scotland, and Atholl Street in Perth and Bridgend, were amongst some of the highest levels found. Concerns regarding noise pollution were also raised.

COUNCIL RESPONSE

The LDP already sets out the phasing of development against Perth Futures, with the embargo of planning consents for 10 or more outwith Perth on the A93 and A94 corridors until the CTRL is a committed project. There is also appropriate air quality policy protection and a transport and accessibility policy which is being used to consider and assess any proposals coming forward.

With regard to the various comments made about the design of the CTRL the line of the route is set out in the report to Council December 2016. However the detailed design of the carriageway, structures, associated paths etc. will be finalised as part of the DMRB3 process which has only recently commenced.

All the roundabouts on the CTRL are required to service the existing road network of Scone north.

In response to Network Rail's comment there are no current projects for increasing the capacity of the rail network or stations, the projects in the pipeline for Perth railway station and for improved journey times to Edinburgh seek to improve the quality of the service for existing users. There is no mechanism to seek developer contributions towards these projects as they do not meet the tests of

Circular3/2012 on Planning Obligations and Good Neighbour Agreements. The need for the action must be connected to the impact of the proposed development rather than simply a desirable outcome. The population growth of Perth and Kinross should not be viewed as placing in impact on the rail services, rather an opportunity to improve the viability of services with an increased customer base.

Tay Eco Valley

KEY AGENCIES

SEPA, SNH, RSPB, Scottish Enterprise, and Scottish Government are all supportive of the Tay Eco Valley Project. Some acknowledge issues that should be picked up when the proposals come forward such as the SAC in relation to the water heat pump, and HRA requirements. Scottish Government seeks support for opportunities that integrate energy and waste innovation in a business environment and support low carbon transport in Perth City but suggests that this should be considered across the Development Plan area.

On a related note Scottish Government state that: we may wish to consider parking standard for low carbon options; reallocating any existing business sites which no longer meet current needs and market expectations for a wider range of viable business or alternative uses (whilst taking account of potential impacts on existing businesses; and locating development which generates significant freight movements on sites accessible to suitable railheads/harbours/ or the strategic road network.

SUPPORT

Almost all the comments were supportive of the Tay Eco valley project, comments included: need for projects to be economic viability and have demand; need for more detail; that there is a wider contribution from the James Hutton Institute; that reference should be made to SG on Zero waste; support for district heating; support for waste to energy proposals; Ristol planning support the land-use requirements around Broxden and considers that Perth West through its vision, layout and phasing facilitates the Tay Eco Valley Initiative.

OPPOSITION

There are some concerns and objections to the Tay Eco valley project, comments included: that the LDP should focus on its powers and its duties; seeking a requirement for renewable energy proposals associated to all new development; that there is poor green infrastructure and that air pollution is a critical issue.

Scottish and Southern Electricity seek consultation on the Renewable Energy SG alongside the LDP to ensure there is no policy conflict as the SG should not seek to change a policy or the spatial strategy provided in the Development Plan. They also consider that the SG should not be used on its own to assess proposals and that it should acknowledge its strategic nature with regard to be had to the Development Plan, national policy, the spatial framework and the detailed findings of environmental reporting, considering that only Group 1 areas can be explicit or absolute on locational acceptability. They refer to the 15th January 2015 Chief Planner letter to Heads of Planning with regards to the appropriate scope for SG and the relationship of SG to the Development Plan. They also suggest that sensitive extensions and repowering should be covered as well as other requirements specified in SPP.

COUNCIL RESPONSE

The HRA for LDP1 for the E3 site identified that “The site is immediately adjacent to the River Tay (SAC) at its northern boundary (approximately 30m away) and near to it at its eastern boundary (approximately 80m away). However, there are not likely to be any HRA implications as the site is bounded and any proposed development will connect to the public WWTW.”

The Tay Eco valley project is not localised to Perth so opportunities are being progressed in the wider area including at the World Barley Innovation Centre at Invergowrie, and at Binn Eco Park.

The Council has a Sustainable Design and Zero Carbon Development which sets standards for carbon savings from new built development in excess of those required under the Scottish Building Standards but does not prescribe how a particular standard should be achieved. The existing LDP already addresses air quality issues, and protects and seeks new green infrastructure/open space alongside new development, but because major changes to these policies were not required they were not mentioned in the Main Issues Report.

With regard to the Renewable Energy Supplementary guidance this is being prepared to support the Local Development Plan and has been out for a separate public consultation.

Highland Perthshire general issues

KEY AGENCIES

SEPA requires the removal of site E14 at Inver due to flood risk. SEPA did not object to the allocation previously but since the current LDP was adopted their flood maps have been updated and these, together with information from the detailed flood risk assessment undertaken for the A9 dualling, show that the entire site is at risk of flooding. This risk cannot be mitigated without increasing the risk of flooding to neighbouring areas. This site is located within the undeveloped/sparsely developed functional floodplain and SEPA are of the opinion that it is unsuitable for development and contrary to Scottish Planning Policy guidance.

At H42 Kenmore and H45 Murthly SEPA recommend a Drainage Impact Assessment.

OPPOSITION

Housing for young people, people on low incomes etc. is desperately needed in Aberfeldy. Some older housing stock is no longer fit for purpose.

The site at Edradynate1 (submitted through Call for Sites) for leisure / tourism uses, including holiday accommodation, is now the subject of pre-application discussions with Development Management. Tourism is a key contributor to the local economy in Highland and the site should therefore remain under consideration as an opportunity site for tourism accommodation.

The site at Keltneyburn 1 (submitted through Call for Sites) has not been correctly assessed. Firstly, the TAYplan spatial strategy cannot be a relevant objection. A proportion of the housing land requirement is to be met on windfall and small sites and as such Keltneyburn 1 will conform to the development plan. Secondly, it is not understood why the proposal has not been assessed against existing LDP policies if this is what is required.

COUNCIL RESPONSE

SEPA requires that site E14 at Inver is removed from the Proposed Plan due to flood risk. Amendments are proposed to the developer requirements for H42 Kenmore and H45 Murthly to include a Drainage Impact Assessment. These comments have been incorporated in the Proposed Plan.

The existing housing allocations in Aberfeldy will incorporate a requirement for 25% affordable housing.

Proposals for the site at Edradynate1 (submitted through Call for Sites) for leisure / tourism uses, including holiday accommodation, can continue to be assessed against Development Plan policies without requiring a specific allocation.

The site at Keltneyburn 1 (submitted through Call for Sites) is a small scale proposal which is more appropriately assessed against existing policies rather than as an allocation.

Kinross area general issues

Kinross and Milnathort

KEY AGENCIES

Tactran supports the safeguarding of routes for long distance walking and cycling routes from Crook of Devon to Kinross. This route is included in the Regional Walking and Cycling Network outlined in the Regional Transport Strategy Refresh. SEPA object to the E35 allocation subject to further air quality assessment (but this is covered in detail elsewhere under Q32).

SEPA also recommend/require adding additional developer requirements for FRA, DIA, buffers to watercourses, retention of open watercourses for a variety of sites in the Kinross area and suggest discussion with flood prevention and roads colleagues and Scottish Water on others.

Scottish Water note their response to the 2015 Housing Land Audit, which provides additional comments relating to Scottish Water's strategic and local infrastructure capacity at settlement or site level. Within this assessment at Milnathort they note that growth at works (and network investigations) may be required for the WWTW if the entire LDP plan comes forward.

OPPOSITION

Respondents mentioned matters that cover a variety of general issues. With regard to conservation areas the Kinross Civic Trust submit a paper setting out the reasons why Milnathort village should be considered for a Conservation Area. Cllr Barnacle considers a Milnathort Conservation Area should be considered and consulted on.

Kinross Community Council suggest that a masterplan/visioning exercise should be carried out involving the Council, key agencies, the community (including the business one), and developers to cover matters such as: infrastructure provision looking at public transport, southbound provision at junction 7, and addressing congestion in Kinross from the junction with the High School to junction 6, and restoring rail provision to the area with a full options appraisal before projects are confirmed; the density and the style, layout and character of development (to retain local distinctiveness);

tenure of affordable housing with a policy securing socially rented housing over other forms of affordable housing until the need for this is fully met; the mix of land uses close to the town centre; the employment land strategy; and education provision. It is considered that the Community Empowerment Act supports more active involvement from the community and that whilst some of these matters can be picked up on through the LDP, this process is wider than that. It is considered this process should start by contacting the chair of the community council.

The Kinross Civic Trust and Cllr Barnacle also pick up on infrastructure needs in their responses and Cllr Barnacle mentions the infrastructure capacity assessment motion as passed by his committee that picks up on the aforementioned infrastructure/service matters and also cemeteries, drainage, health service, parking, and recreational demand.

Several respondents seek the protection of open space between Gallowhill Road, Renton Drive, old railway line which is currently white land within the settlement boundary of the LDP. A developer's map from 1989 is submitted which shows the area identified as public open space. It is suggested that this land is used daily as a general recreation and play space and is a habitat for bats.

Several respondents have mentioned matters related to the current planning application at Lathro. Access arrangements onto the Gallowhill road are mentioned with concern about road safety particularly for school children because of a blind bend at Mavisbank. It is suggested that previous Lathro Park developments were refused access an access from Gallowhill Road. Some respondents suggest that this proposal requires a southbound junction at junction 7. The Community Council also mentions that the floor levels of the proposed development are higher than normal and they are concerned that could be because of an elevated flood risk.

Wider Kinross

Cllr Barnacle makes the following comments on matters relating to the wider rural Kinross area: the capacity of the current WWTP at Drum should be considered for expansion; suggests there is a need for a Drum ditch and watercourse management scheme in absence of a flood prevention scheme given its very high water table; there should be an aspiration for mains drainage in Carnbo (which has seen considerable recent development); suggests that the Carnbo builder's yard to the west of the village should be returned to agricultural usage; that Crook Moss should be considered for SSSI designation; seeks new Conservation Areas for Back Crook, Keltybridge/Maryburgh; notes policy EP13 but is concerned about some recent planning decisions in Portmoak seeking reassurance that this important facility will not be compromised; and asks if the Greenacre gypsy/traveller site boundary in the LDP can be enclosed to prevent further expansion (perhaps with adequate landscaping and tree planting).

Portmoak Community Council seek clarification of the status afforded to the Conservation Areas for Kinnesswood and Wester Balgedie since there are no changes proposed for the supplementary guidance conservation appraisals here. Both the Portmoak community council and Cllr Barnacle raise parking issues and concerns about HGV traffic, Portmoak community council specifically in relation to the A911 and Cllr Barnacle more generally within the Kinross area. They also raise concern about the type of housing being built with a tendency towards large villas when there is a need for a better balance with smaller housing (often single storey) seen as essential to help meet needs of the ageing population, younger and single people.

Friends of the Ochils are supportive in principle to the safeguarding of path improvements from Crook of Devon to Kinross and beyond to Fife but would like to see the exact route before they comment further.

As a matter of clarification it is commented that Scotlandwell 2 site submitted through the Call for Sites process is not within the SEPA medium flood risk area but is within a no to low risk area.

COUNCIL RESPONSE

Note comments from Tactran and Scottish Water. Disagree with SEPA regarding E35 and seek to continue E35 allocation but this is considered in more detail under Q32. Agree with SEPA regarding the suggested additional development requirements proposed in the Kinross Area.

We disagree with the suggestion that the Council should consult on/support the inclusion of a Conservation Area for Milnathort. The request for the designation of Milnathort as a potential Conservation Area has been considered but no suitably well-defined boundary is apparent and while Milnathort has several prominent listed buildings, these are diverse in character and located at fairly distant intervals throughout the town. In terms of building groups, Milnathort has a number of distinct character areas. These include the area around The Cross; the Orwell Parish Kirk and Manse; the mid-19th century cottages and villas on the principal approach from Kinross, and the more substantial villas on the approach from the east. None of these building groups is, however, of a suitably consistent high quality to merit conservation area designation in its own right. Given the distances between the groups, a larger designated area to include more than one would encompass a high number of buildings of lesser or no interest, which would dilute the overall quality of the conservation area and prove difficult to manage due to unnecessary restrictions on permitted development.

The Council has limited powers with regard to the trunk road network and restoring rail provision but will continue to liaise with Scottish Government on these matters and will seek to protect the line of the potential upgrade to M90 Milnathort junction. An infrastructure capacity assessment has been carried out by the Council to support the Proposed Plan and this picks up on infrastructure/service matters and also cemeteries, drainage, health service, parking, and recreational demand. This infrastructure study is by nature a technical assessment but can inform future community masterplanning work. The infrastructure study was prepared to ensure that the infrastructure capacity is adequate to support the level of growth envisaged. This study highlights the current infrastructure provisions within Kinross and Milnathort, and what will be provided alongside the allocations and developments underway. The Proposed LDP takes account of this and recognises the following should be addressed:

- protecting the line of the potential upgrade to M90 Milnathort junction 7 to provide southbound slips;
- that the Waste Water Treatment Works will require to be upgraded to allow future development needs; and
- that there is a future need for more cemetery space, and so the Council has identified a search area in Milnathort.

With regards to the other matters mentioned that are suggested for the proposed masterplan/ visioning exercise it is considered that the affordable housing, employment land and developer contribution policies/Supplementary Guidance of the LDP2 will provide a necessary framework for a consistent approach for the whole of the Perth and Kinross Area. The placemaking policy and its draft Supplementary Guidance require developers to pick up on local distinctiveness and respond to a site and to wider area characteristics. It is not considered that a masterplanning/visioning exercise of the nature suggested is essential to support Local Development Plan 2. However community input can inform the individual proposals as they come forward as planning applications (within the context of the strategic policies, and with consistency of approach applied when necessary). There is a recognised need for community input to the community planning and action partnership process. It is hoped that Leader funding can be gained to bring forward this. Hopefully outcomes of this process will be available to inform the preparation of the next LDP3 as well as informing other wider plans, projects and policies of the Council as appropriate.

With regards to the potential protection of land as open space between Gallowhill Road, Renton Drive, old railway line, the plans show that this was designed as open space integral to the development, rather than simply being land left over afterwards. It is Council owned and maintained. It appears to meet the quality criteria desired of open space. It is a useful size for use as an informal play/open space area (and is suitable for ball games, with a sign suggesting temporary goal posts are allowed), and has good amenity with trees bordering on two sides. Whilst it is not a particularly well over looked by housing, there is a well-used pathway that runs adjacent to it, and it is also visible from Gallowhill Road. On this basis it is considered it should be identified as open space for retention in the new Local Development Plan.

Detailed matters related to the Lathro Park development and its access arrangements have and will be considered and determined through consideration of planning applications. However for avoidance of doubt the flood risk policy requires of developers that development should not increase the rate of surface water run-off from any site, add to the area of land requiring flood protection measures, or affect the flood attenuation capability of the functional flood plain. In accordance with recent DEFRA research, PKC require a climate change (CC) allowance (a 20% increase in the estimated peak flow) to be applied to the 0.5% AP (200-year). Then Finished Floor Levels (FFL) must be a minimum of 600mm above the 0.5% Annual Probability (200-year) design flood level (the design flood level must include 20% for Climate change).

Wider Kinross

The following is provided in response to Cllr Barnacle's comments:

Scottish Water are carrying out an exercise to understand the current capacity of the Drum WWTW, and they will provide for expansion at Drum and Carnbo in line with their policy which ensures that they provide capacity for development that is ready and has the benefit of planning permission, Scottish Water have a commitment not to hold up development; with regard to Carnbo builder's yard the planning permission for 5 homes opposite the steading was approved in 2012 and has since lapsed, however this land lies within the village envelope and utilises brownfield land and therefore should continue to be shown within the settlement boundary to encourage redevelopment; with regard to the Drum comment this is a matter for the Flood risk management Plan; SSSI designation is considered by SNH not by the Council; there is unlikely to be suitable justification for making Crook, or Keltybridge/Maryburgh a conservation area as this is a very high bar and is for areas of very important and intact historic quality typically with a concentration of nationally/regionally important listed buildings. However it is important to protect the character and distinctiveness of these areas, and the current LDP provisions particularly those for greenspace, and where the settlement boundaries are drawn, along with the placemaking policy does this. If the Council is minded to designate conservation areas at these or other areas within Perth and Kinross in the future it will require to take a number of preliminary steps. This includes: conducting a thorough appraisal leading to an understanding of the character and appearance of the area identified as being of historic or architectural interest; we can reassure that policy EP13 does afford suitable protection for the Portmoak gliding facility and that recent planning permissions have not compromised this; and the Greenacre planning permission was granted on appeal and the Reporter considered that the landscape framework screening associated to this development was appropriate, any future proposals would be considered in line with policies of the plan particularly RD5: Gypsy/Travellers' sites.

There is no change in status proposed for Conservation Areas for Kinnesswood and Wester Balgeddie. With regard to concerns about HGV traffic and road improvements could be done within the road boundaries and it does not need to be identified in the Local Development Plan whilst parking proposals can come forward and be assessed against the policies and allocations of the Local Development Plan.

With regard to concerns about type of housing being built with tendency towards larger properties the Council does seek a mix of house types/tenures particularly on the larger allocations in line with our policies on Placemaking, however developer do need to be able to shape their proposals to ensure their proposal is viable and meets local demands. A new policy (policy 25: Housing Mix) has been added to the Proposed LDP2 which amongst other provisions seeks at least 10% of their homes as 1 or 2 bedroom homes (for avoidance of doubt this requirement is in addition to any on-site affordable housing units).

Friend of the Ochils point is noted and the route will be shown in the Proposed Plan. With regards to Scotlandwell 2 this site is shown within the SEPA flood mapping as having a medium flood risk.

Perth City general issues

KEY AGENCIES

Scottish Water note their response to the 2015 Housing Land Audit, which provides additional comments relating to Scottish Water's strategic and local infrastructure capacity at settlement or site level. This shows that a number of network upgrades are likely to be required for existing LDP sites but doesn't highlight any particularly significant issues.

SNH raise concern about the landscape impact/rural character of the proposed new Park and Ride to the North West of the CTRL, in combination with the CTRL itself, and the site will need to be considered in relation to the River Tay SAC within the HRA. If this is the only strategically possible location, SNH recommend mitigation with new native woodland planting toward the open rural landscape to the north, east and west, and views from the A9 and CTRL. It is considered that this planting will also be beneficial in re-connecting existing ancient woodland, and will help provide a more resilient and defensible edge for North West Perth and its surrounding countryside.

SEPA seek the removal of E1, The Triangle, and E3 Arran Road as the majority of these two sites are undeveloped, lie on the natural flood plain, and are protected by a flood prevention scheme. It is noted that both E1 and E3 would have been subjected to flooding from the River Tay and Almond during the 1993 flood event (1 in 100 year flood event). SEPA also require that any redevelopment of OP4 Mill Street site is limited to an equal or less vulnerable use and accords with vulnerability guidance and do not support the proposed development at H1 as this would be an increase in vulnerability of use to an existing building dependent on flood defences.

Development on undeveloped land behind a flood defence is contrary to reducing overall flood risk, the precautionary and flood avoidance principles set out in para 255 of SPP as it would increase the number of people and buildings at flood risk and at residual risk of flooding. The primary purpose of a flood protection scheme is to protect existing development on land at risk of flooding rather than to facilitate new development on land behind the scheme. Paragraph 21 of Scottish Government's online planning advice on flood risk identifies that flood protection schemes can reduce the flood risk but that they cannot eliminate it entirely. Flood protection schemes can still fail or be breached and subsequent flooding can be more hazardous in nature due to the speed and velocity of inundation.

SEPA note that flood events are based on the model they have at the moment but that there are ongoing discussions regarding a more updated flood study for Almond Valley development which shows far less flooding in the Inveralmond Industrial Estate and allocation E1.

SEPA also require that the development requirements for Almond Valley H73 and E38 Ruthvenfield Road with regards FRA are expanded to define that no development will occur on green field land on the natural flood plain behind the Flood Protection Scheme.

SEPA also recommend/require adding additional developer requirements for FRA, DIA, buffers to watercourses, retention of open watercourses for a variety of sites in the Perth area.

Sites put forward for consideration:

OPPOSITION

A number of sites/proposals were put forward seeking consideration for inclusion/re-designation in the Proposed Plan as follows:

- The H71 site in the existing Local Development Plan contains land in ownership of Reid family (5.2 hectares fronting Crieff Road with remaining land owned by St Johnstone football club). The Reid family want to bring this forward now which does not reflect the timescales of St Johnstone football club. The Reid land is suggested for a separate phase or allocation from the rest of the H71 allocation, for a 120 homes and a food store (circa 2,000 to 2,500 m²) development. It is suggested that the retail study and city and town centre review 2014 confirmed capacity within Perth for further convenience floorspace. It is considered to be a suitable location next to the new junction, and well served by public transport, and within convenient walking distance of a significant residential catchment. A planning application for the housing is expected shortly with advance discussions with a retail operator suggesting that this planning application won't be far behind. It is considered that continuing to treat H71 a single entity will ultimately stifle development.
- Fully support the allocation of the site H73 Almond Valley and request that the MIR Appendix 2 'Monitoring of Allocated Sites' is updated to reference the correct planning application reference (15/01157/IPM).
- Land at Ruthvenfield within E38 to the south of the CTRLR should be redesignated as housing land as the CTRLR will sever the current employment uses designation with new access points onto the new link road not permitted. Access from the west the only option. Furthermore, in light of the route of the proposed new link road, it is suggested that no other sensible uses are apparent.
- Site at Crieff Road/ Newhouse Road/Strathtay Road Perth be reallocated from a commercial centre to a Town and Neighbourhood centre, as it would provide opportunity to provide local shopping facilities and services within walking distance of homes and reconfigure and modify the existing large scale building layout. Considers that the proposal is consistent with the network of centres. It is noted that the nearest local shopping facilities from the site of note are on Rannoch Road some 620 straight line distance and almost 1km walking/driving distance, with substantial housing areas, and new residential areas (Newton Farm H71) considered beyond comfortable walking distance. It is suggested that the site is physically separated from the commercial centre and relates to the adjoining residential area; and that use for local retail would be an appropriate transitional one between residential of Strathtay Road and large scale commercial uses;
- Seek an extension to their Berthapark allocation to extend this to the north of the current LDP boundary (into land within the greenbelt) to create further opportunities for commercial/employment land in parallel with a new Park and Ride facility. It is considered that this proposal would not detrimentally impact on the landscape setting.

- Seek the “Cherrybank” eastern part of the MU1 allocation to be amended from mixed use designation to housing. It is considered that this would reflect: the granting of planning permission for residential development on the site to the north of Necessity Brae, and the potential for further residential development on the site to the south of Necessity Brae; and the extensive employment land release that was approved as part of the Broxden development.
- Seeks that a 2 hectare western part of the employment area of MU1 is reallocated as residential. This is part of the permission that provides for 8 hectares of commercial land. It is considered that this proposal reflects challenging topography and its separation from Broxden Business Park and would make a significant contribution (50 homes) towards short term housing requirements. It is considered that the 6 hectares of land remaining are better suited to residential use and market sentiment.
- Open space land at Mount Tabour Road seeks removal of this allocation and considers it of limited value as open space. It is proposed after consultation (and apparent demand) that a community garden be created on the upper section of the site and the rest of the site is proposed to be developed for housing. It is intended that a planning application will be submitted within the month.
- USS Ltd would like to propose that the area around St John’s Shopping Centre and City Hall be subject to a specific Opportunity Policy within the LDP.

COUNCIL RESPONSE

The DMRB stage 2 assessment accompanying study for the CTRL has investigated the potential operational impact of a park and ride in the vicinity of the proposed CTRL/A9 grade separated junction considering different potential locations from an operational impact and an access and visibility perspective, and a preferred option chosen which is closest to the junction. This option requires an extension to the Berthapark boundary to accommodate the Roads and Transport allocation for the park and ride facility. We recommend allocating this site for the park and ride and agree with SNH that there should be a requirement for new native woodland planting toward the open rural landscape to the north, east and west, and in views from the A9 and CTRL to minimise the landscape the visual impact of the development. There will also be potential for additional employment land to be delivered as part of this proposal.

SEPA should focus on the SPP reference to acceptable development on land within the flood plain which is protected by suitable flood protection schemes (FPS). This SPP reference is to “built up” areas rather than whether land is brownfield or greenfield/undeveloped. We recommend resisting SEPA’s suggested removal of allocations, H1, E1 and E3, and their suggested commitment regarding undeveloped land on E38, and H73 Almond Valley. We consider that all of H1, E1 and the majority of E3 lie within the built up area as they are surrounded by roads, infrastructure. The northern end of E3 is currently undeveloped land but it lies within the settlement boundary of the LDP. E3 (Food and Drink Park) is an important part of the settlement strategy, and all of this allocation should be retained. Local Authorities have a legal responsibility for maintaining their Flood Protection Schemes. Local Authorities can also seek minimum floor heights to mitigate the likelihood of significant impacts. A level of autonomy is required, and where the Local Authorities are willing to commit to maintaining schemes and protecting existing/future residents then this should be a decision available to a Local Authority. If a site lies on the periphery of the settlement then there should be scope to consider and weigh up all planning considerations before deciding whether it is the best location overall. It would sometimes be more sustainable to develop adjacent to key settlements (such as Perth and E3) rather than to push development outwith (if flood risk issues can be suitably mitigated). Flood Risk is a very important consideration, but it is not the only one, and

where flood risk is suitably addressed by a Flood Protection Scheme and mitigation then Local Authorities need to have the scope to consider development within these areas if the alternatives are much less desirable overall. The approach taken in the Proposed LDP2 is that the general approach to development behind flood protection schemes should be in line with the Flood Risk Management Plan Annex 3 Approach to Land Use Planning in the Tay Local Plan District.

“The Scottish Planning Policy sets out a flood risk framework to guide development. Areas of medium to high risk – where the annual probability of coastal or watercourse flooding is greater than 0.5% (1:200 years) – may be suitable for development provided flood protection measures to the appropriate standard (1:200 years) already exist and are maintained, are under construction, or are a planned measure in a current flood risk management plan. This is a matter for careful consideration through review of the Development Plan and its Strategic Environmental Assessment. However if the site is an important component of the settlement strategy and no other equally suitable site is available then development (apart from civic infrastructure and the most vulnerable uses) may be suitable. Any development in such areas would also be subject to appropriate mitigation measures: including water resistance, and water resilience measures and evacuation procedures.”

H73 and E38 both lie within the built up area surrounded by development and therefore whether they are on undeveloped land is not significant as the SPP test is whether they are within the built up area and whether they are protected by suitable FPS, which they are.

Within the E38 and H73 allocations SEPA seek a statement that no development will happen on greenfield land on the natural flood plan behind the FPS. This was accepted on MU73 Almond Valley, at planning application stage as the detailed FRA and masterplanning carried out to support the in principle planning application showed that this constraint can be dealt with through the design and layout, with the land beside the river being the most logical and beneficial areas for the open space for amenity reasons as well as flood risk. However it is not considered that this should be added as a developer requirement.

For E38 it would be different as the landscaping/open space requirements for employment uses are much less onerous and any flood risk areas affected lie behind existing development and would not provide riverside amenity. This would place an unnecessary level of constraint on its future development. There is also a need to consider what is now the suitable future use of land within E38 to the west of the CTLR (given the inability to access this directly from the CTLR and the need instead to access this from the west). There is also a level difference and embankments between this land and the CTLR. Given the local road network that development will be served from and the limited visibility from the CTLR frontage it is considered this land is less suitable and viable for the employment uses it is currently allocated for. It is considered this area now relates better to the Almond Valley development and should be included as a residential allocation.

The remaining part of the E38 allocation (east of the CTLR) will remain as an employment allocation and it is considered that the same position should be taken here as on E1 and E3, that greenfield/undeveloped land which is protected by a FPS is certainly suitable but any development in such areas would also be subject to appropriate mitigation measures: including water resistance, and water resilience measures and evacuation procedures.

On the northern part of E3 development could be made subject to appropriate mitigation measures rather than being removed. However even if it is questioned as to whether the northern end of E3 lies within the built up area then the suitability of this site for development is a matter for careful consideration through review of this Development Plan and its Strategic Environmental Assessment. Our view is that allocations within the settlement boundary of Perth where the flood scheme has incidentally offered protection rather than by design, should be carefully considered through review

of the LDP and its Strategic Environmental Assessment. To be clear, we do not support designing a flood defence scheme to specifically increase the developable area but where the logical engineering solution provides protection, and then such opportunities should be considered. It is considered that undeveloped land on the natural flood plain behind flood protection schemes may be suitable for development and E3 is an important component of the settlement strategy, and there is no equally suitable site. The LDP needs to provide sufficient certainty to developers, and SEPA's approach would undermine the certainty provided in LDP1, and provide an unnecessary constraint.

The SEPA recommendations to add developer requirements for FRA, DIA, buffers to watercourses, and retention of open watercourses in Perth City are accepted.

With regard to the sites/ proposals which were put forward seeking consideration for inclusion/re-designation in the Proposed Plan the following recommendations are made:

- The H71 has now been reduced and amended to exclude land granted planning for the formation of a training pitch to the north. This has reduced H71 to land within a single ownership.
- Proposals to designate employment land east of the proposed CTRLR as housing have already been discussed above in relation to SEPA's comments on flood risk. The recommendation is to reallocate this land as a housing allocation because its access arrangements cannot be directly from the CTRLR and it is not a viable employment allocation.
- Proposals to reallocate land at Crieff Road/ Newhouse Road/Strathtay for a town/neighbourhood centre should be resisted. Reallocating a commercial centre for local shopping facilities would be inconsistent with SPP and town centre first principle. Whilst there are some residential areas that are beyond easy active travel distance from Rannoch Road facilities, these areas are close to the Tesco superstore on Crieff Road and are therefore already adequately served.
- Proposals for an extension to the Berthpark allocation have already been considered above in response to SNH's comments. This park and ride proposal has been refined by the DMRB2 and accompanying work and there is a need to allocate this land for the park and ride subject to landscaping/planting requirements. With regard to the proposed extension further west to accommodate employment land as well as the park and ride facility this is also considered appropriate subject to landscaping and planting requirements.
- Proposals to seek the eastern part of MU1 allocation at Cherrybank to be reallocated for housing to reflect the planning permission on the north site of Necessity Brae is not required but it should be removed from the allocation. The proposal to reallocate land to the south of Necessity Brae is not supported and this area is proposed as an employment allocation. It is noted that the 14/00269/AMM proposal on land north of Necessity Brae was approved solely for residential but it was considered to be a partial policy departure. In the committee report it was considered that, "The broader objectives of the policy can however still be satisfied by the redevelopment of the remaining 2.44 Ha of the in principle consent site boundaries for compatible mixed use projects, offsetting the single residential element currently under consideration. By virtue of the overall site layout therefore, this proposal remains proportionate and justifiable in the wider site context in satisfying Policy ED1B". The policy statement submitted with the planning application 14/00269/AMM acknowledged: "For the avoidance of doubt it is acknowledged that in planning terms the site to the south of Necessity Brae would not be acceptable for further residential development in order to comply with the

terms of Policy ED1B in relation to establishing an appropriate mix of uses ”and then goes on to say: “When fully completed the site as approved through the previous outline application would constitute a sustainable mixed use development incorporating a range of potentially compatible uses including residential, office and a hotel. This would contribute to the viability and vitality of this part of the City and is deemed compatible with Perth and Kinross LDP Policy PM1B.”

This current proposal for residential uses does not meet with the LDP requirement for a mix of uses within this area of the MU1 allocation, or sufficiently add to the vitality and viability of the city.

- Proposals to seek reallocation of a 2 hectare employment area within MU1 are also resisted. The scope for further employment sites to be designated in the Perth area is limited. This emphasises the need to protect existing employment land from competing uses and LDP2 will continue to identify and protect such sites. Need for phased release of employment land as per planning permission 12/01692/IPN which secures this phase 2 of the business land development to be fully serviced before the occupation of 50% of the residential dwellings associated with phase 4. This is an important contribution of serviced and effective employment land in Perth.
- Proposals to reallocate open space land at Mount Tabour road are resisted. It is considered that this site meets the criteria of SPP for open space and has been identified as such for over 20 years. It is considered this this open space contributes to the network of open space which leads up out of Perth onto Kinnoull hill and Sidlaws and that it is visible and contributes significantly to the character of the area. Also the site lies immediately to the north and east of Gean Cottage which is B listed and the childhood home of Sir Patrick Geddes. The site is open space within the well-established Kinnoull residential area and is identified in the current Local Development Plan as an area of protected open space. It is a sensitive site due to impact its development would have on the open space network, rural character of the area and impact on the setting of the B listed Gean cottage. It was considered at Examination stage of the previous LDP. The Reporter agreed with the Council’s position that there was “no persuasive evidence to support the allocation of this sensitive site for housing”. There is still no compelling need for this site and it should not be supported.
- The desire to identify the area around St John’s Shopping Centre and City Hall as a specific Opportunity Policy within the LDP is understood. With regard to the City Hall the Council committee agreed on the 22nd of June to identify the building as a possible location for the development of a major new cultural attraction having completed the options appraisal which identified that such a facility could be located within the City Hall. On 16th August 2017 the Council approved plans to develop the former Perth City Hall as a new visual arts attraction for the city and recommended Mecanoo as the architectural firm to take designs forward. This would maximise the potential of the building, enabling a remodelling to create exhibition space capable of accommodating national and international quality product alongside the Council’s own museum collections. The wider public realm surrounding City Hall would also be invested in to create a dynamic civic space. It is considered that the LDP should identify this as an opportunity site.

General comments on the Perth City Plan

KEY AGENCIES

There are a few comments made about the City Plan which cover various projects that were not directly consulted on in the Main Issues Report. For example Historic Environment Scotland acknowledge that the potential development opportunity the City Plan identified for the Lesser South Inch is not consulted on but they note that a substantial area of the Lesser South Inch contains the scheduled monument Cromwell's Citadel which remains undisturbed, not visible, but with significant potential (as demonstrated by a recent archaeological watching brief).

OPPOSITION

USS the owners of the shopping centre also had a few comments to make on the City Plan. They consider that it is important that the Local Development Plan supports the aspirations of the City Plan. They support the public realm improvements; and the principle of a BID covering the City Centre is of interest to them as long as it does not place overly onerous financial burdens through increased business rates. They also consider plans for the city centre should include specific proposals for City Hall to resolve uncertainty and bring it back into active use.

Methven Community Council expressed some concern about the weight given to the City Plan and considers that this the LDP should focus on the elements that it wishes to support, and should widen the focus across the region. Another respondent raises a more general issue as they want support for the independent retailers and are concerned about the impact of new retail parks on the city centre.

COUNCIL RESPONSE

The Lesser South Inch was identified as a potential development opportunity in the City plan. It is acknowledged that there would be constraints and sensitivities including the scheduled monument Cromwell's Citadel, as well as the settings of adjacent listed buildings, and loss of open space. The site is currently within the Green Belt and with a lack of clarity over this proposal, it is not appropriate to identify an allocation in the Proposed LDP2 for this proposal.

We welcome the support from the owners of the shopping centre for the range of measures identified for the City centre. With regard to the City Hall the Council committee agreed on the 22nd of June to identify the building as a possible location for the development of a major new cultural attraction having completed the options appraisal which identified that such a facility could be located within the City Hall. On 16th August 2017 the Council approved plans to develop the former Perth City Hall as a new visual arts attraction for the city and recommended Mecanoo as the architectural firm to take designs forward. This would maximise the potential of the building, enabling a remodelling to create exhibition space capable of accommodating national and international quality product alongside the Council's own museum collections. The wider public realm surrounding City Hall would also be invested in to create a dynamic civic space which will also support our UK City of Culture aspirations. It is considered that the LDP should identify this as an opportunity site to reflect the Council's intentions.

With regard to the weight given to the City plan, it is important that the LDP puts a suitable structure in place to support delivery of appropriate key land use proposals. For this reason an allocation is proposed to support the future railway station improvements, and the PH20 leisure, hotel proposal on the Dewar's and Leisure centre site. The Proposed LDP2 supports suitable sustainable economic

growth throughout the region not just in Perth City through its allocations and policy framework. With regard to concern about out of town retail development, the LDP policy and allocations support the primacy of the city centre and a sequential approach will be followed which starts with the town centre. Proposals in edge of centre, other commercial centre or out of centre locations are only acceptable when it meets a range of criteria tests which includes demonstrating that there will be no significant impact (individual or cumulative) on any of the centres within the network of centres.

General comments on the Perth Core Area

KEY AGENCIES

Scottish Water highlight the water and waste water capacity for currently allocated and proposed sites within the Perth south area (H14, H15, H20, H23, & H72). There are no issues with capacity for the majority of sites but within Dunning and Glenfarg a growth project for the Waste Water Treatment works would be required to accommodate development.

OTHER COMMENTS

One representation suggests that the villages of Almondbank, Pitcairngreen, and Methven require sensitive care in growth, and with the surrounding greenbelt, they would like to see fine landscapes contributing more in this zone.

One representation highlights the Bridge of Earn, Kintillo and Oudenarde planning strategy needs.

It states that it is apparent that the strategy for this area as a community is becoming fragmented in that development is overtaking the needs of the community for a school and a health centre fit for purpose and for new developments, for a waste and surface water disposal system fit for purpose and for new capacity demands all to be functional prior to additional loads.

- School premises and capacity issues, currently on the Main Street, it can't cope with current demand, there is a busy main road A912 to the front, and a narrow street Manse Road to the side, the transfer of pupils is not particularly safe, nor easy. Made no safer nor easier by the development opposite of a very successful Co-op shop which is now extremely busy with parking issues on said main road, A912.
- A Health surgery which is barely fit for purpose on Main Street, A912, and the current proposal to accommodate future demand is to remote premises on the north western extremity of the village of Bridge of Earn, also on said busy street Manse Road adjacent to the school.
- A septic water service which is at capacity due to excess surface water entering the system. Scottish Water are to undertake a survey of the entire catchment.
- The surface water drainage of Kintillo is already causing flood issues in Bridge of Earn due to the canalisation of the Deich Burn which is unable to cope with spates currently, adjacent residences become flooded currently. Perth & Kinross Council are to survey these constraints.

The representation states that they are aware of the following current development proposals:

- 80 house development in Kintillo, H72, another
- 100 houses on Edinburgh Road, (Wicks O' Baiglie), H14 and a

- 400, (increased to 1,600), plus house site on Oudenarde and Hospital site, H15.

A total of 580, (potentially 1,780), houses all on the southern and eastern edge of the existing village.

It is suggested that development of houses are advancing and yet development of the hard and social infrastructure are lagging.

They highlight that within the adopted LDP 5.10.3 the development order is,

1. School at Oudenarde.
2. Drainage into Public Waste Water Treatment.
3. Drainage Impact Assessment, potential for SUDS.
4. Contribute to Affordable Housing provision.
5. Requirement for on or off site public space and play facilities where required, (unqualified), in line with Council guidance, (unquantifiable).

There is no mention of Health service provision.

It is suggested that a review of the order of development should begin with:

The septic and surface water management, this we believe is underway with Scottish Water and P&KC engaging in surveys, but until the excess surface water is segregated from septic water the septic water system, including transportation to Perth is at capacity. The other issue here is, what to do with the newly segregated surface water as the existing natural surface water course flow causes damage to riparian owners at times, flow rates need to be improved and impediments need to be removed.

The provision of a new school and a new health centre, both of which need to be central in the current / new community so the community has a sensible cohesive infrastructure, so it needs to be currently central or to the south of current central.

Then allow the various development of the open land as per the applications.

The representation states that it is very disconcerting to note that it appears that housing development is being considered prior to education requirements, infrastructure capacity and natural watercourse capacity are made competent for current demand.

It is understood that there is both a Local Housing Strategy, (2016-2021), and a Perth & Kinross Local "Main Issues Report" Strategy consultation currently open for public engagement, but it does not refer to Bridge of Earn, Kintillo or Oudenarde.

One response requested to increase the density at Stanley Housing site H31 and use the indicative landscaping as developable area.

COUNCIL RESPONSE

Where appropriate developer requirement will be ensure the adequate provision of water and waste water treatment works in line with Scottish Waters comments in the case of Glenfarg and Dunning this would involve submitting growth criteria to allow Scottish Water to facilitate the required works.

It is noted that the villages of Almondbank, Pitcairngreen, and Methven require sensitive care in growth however there are currently no allocated sites within the LDP or MIR for these settlements (there is a site in Methven that has already been granted planning permission). Large allocations (H7, H73 and H70) border the village of Almondbank and these are all required to provide a masterplan and landscape framework which will protect the setting of the village.

In response to the comments made regarding Bridge of Earn we can confirm that work has concluded regarding a S.75 agreement for Oudenarde. The nature of this agreement ensures the necessary infrastructure is delivered in line with the phasing of the Oudenarde development. This will provide key services that will benefit both the new development and the existing village including a new primary school, new community infrastructure and a SUDs facility.

To address the issues regarding drainage Scottish Water are currently involved in discussions with developers for the Oudenarde site and have recommended (as suggested may be required in the LDP) that drainage impact assessments are completed for H14 and H72.

In terms of healthcare facilities NHS Tayside was consulted during the preparation of the LDP and did not provide any indication that there was a need for additional facilities within this area. However discussions are currently ongoing between the Community Council, NHS Tayside and the Council to identify a new site.

It should be noted that the list of infrastructure considerations is not arranged in order of importance/priorities. It is simply a list of necessary considerations. It is proposed that developer requirements could be added to site H14, H15 and H72 for Drainage Impact Assessments. Infrastructure studies have been drafted for the core villages. These have helped to identify developer requirements where appropriate.

The site at Stanley has been designed with indicative landscaping to buffer the area between the allocated site and the category A listed buildings at Stanley Mills. To reduce it significantly would potentially impact on the views and prevent an attractive backdrop to the new development as well as the existing buildings.

Other comments on the MIR

A number of respondents made comments on issues which were not in direct response to any of the questions in the Main Issues Report. The summaries below therefore relate to the additional issues which were raised through the consultation which are not already addressed in response to one of the Main Issues Report questions. These are summarised below.

KEY AGENCIES

Transport Scotland - supports the principle of the preparation of Development Briefs and sees them as informative documents. Where proposed development impacts on the trunk road network, Transport Scotland requests it is included in the review process, to ensure any necessary and appropriate mitigation measures for the trunk road network are identified. The process should also consider cumulative impact from a number of sites, where relevant.

TACTRAN - The Report should refer to Regional Transport Partnerships rather than Regional Transport Authorities. We suggest that reference is made to the Council's desires for a sustainable travel hub/hydrogen refuelling station.

OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Network Rail - Development proposals affecting the safety of level crossings in Perth and Kinross are an extremely important consideration for Network Rail and Transport Scotland and emerging planning policy to address. The impact from development can and will often result in increases in pedestrian and vehicular traffic utilising a crossing, which can in turn have impacts on safety, service provision and queues. As a result of increase patronage over crossings, Network Rail could be forced to reduce train line speed in direct correlation to the increase in vehicular and pedestrian traffic using a crossing. This would have severe consequences for the timetabling of trains and would also effectively frustrate any future train service improvements. This would be in direct conflict with Government aims and objectives of the LDP for improving rail services within Perth & Kinross. We would request that the MIR provides a strategic context for LDPs to provide a designated notification zone around all operational railway infrastructure within which any development application proposals would be notified to Network Rail. This strategy would be similar to that associated with the oil and gas pipelines which run through the SDP area.

Should the boundary with Aberdeenshire be moved to the north side of Glenshee chairlift Ski Centre.

COUNCIL RESPONSE

Transport Scotland will be included/consulted in relation to all developments which are likely to have an impact on the trunk road network.

Reference is made to the sustainable travel hub/hydrogen refuelling station in the Proposed Plan.

Consideration has been given to the impact of development proposals on the safety of level crossings when preparing the Proposed Plan, and can be given further consideration where appropriate through the planning application process.

The local authority boundary is not an issue which the LDP can address.

General criticism

The LDP is a complete misnomer. It is not a plan but only a reference point for a collection of policies. It fails to set out a clear statement of the critical opportunities and challenges to be tackled in the plan period, and also fails to set out goals which are aspirational but attainable and, most importantly, quantified. Its format is inefficient and unwieldy. When it comes to identifying strategies by which we reach our goals, the LDP has little to say. Where are the strategies and targets for: developing tourism, public transport and roads, reducing traffic congestion, addressing the problems of parking, improving air quality, Green Belt protection, incorporating several Charrettes, development of sustainable power sources and competing with Dundee for economic growth?

The Action Programme lacks resource requirement estimates and completion dates and fails to acknowledge or address properly: air quality issues, economic development, retail and commercial development (restricted to monitoring planning applications), residential development, transport and accessibility, community facilities, sport and recreation, and Charrettes.

COUNCIL RESPONSE

Comments were being sought on the MIR not the LDP. The MIR is not the Plan itself but a document used to gather views on key issues which the Proposed Plan requires to address. There are also a number of other documents and strategies in place which more appropriately cover some of the issues raised.

Comments were not being sought on the Action Programme, however, it meets the requirements set out by legislation, and is updated more frequently than legislation requires.